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Prologue

The Kerikeri Mission Station, nestled within an ancestral landscape of Ngāpuhi, is the remnant of an invitation by Hongi Hika to Samuel Marsden and Missionaries, thus strengthening the relationship between Ngāpuhi and Pākeha.

Tāngata Whenua (People of the Land) maintain a strong association with the Kerikeri Basin area. Kororipo Pā stands proud and echoes an earlier age of warfare when Ngāpuhi warriors would answer a call by Ngai Tāwake war Chief Hongi Hika.

Armed with the jawbone of his Tūpuna Māhia, Hongi led and participated in the rituals of war as the swirling waters of the Ripo ebbed and flowed along the path of Te Awa o Ngā Rangatira (the river of chiefs) to Te Pēwhairangi (the Bay of Islands) and out into Te Moana Nui Ā Kiwa (the expansive Oceans of Kiwa).

In these waters the Taniwha (river serpent) Kauea presides, his presence acknowledged through whakapapa (genealogy) linking the Hokianga (west) and Taiamai (east).

The Mission tells a story of the Missionaries lives and the lives of the Māori – tamariki (children) of chiefs who were taught, learned and lived in the Mission House.

The hands of taitamariki (young people) who worked to help the Missionaries build their new home.

The Urupa (cemetery) on the hill contains the grave of Te Pākira, the brother of Tāreha, chief of Ngāti Rēhia and in the grounds of the Mission Station there is the grave of a child, all testimony to the existence of Māori and Pākeha in this special place.

The Haa (life force) that is contained in the whenua at Rewa’s Village, now under the watchful eye of Ngāti Rēhia – as kaitiaki (guardians) for Ngāpuhi, provides a trilogy of protection for the Kerikeri Basin, alongside Kororipo Pā and the Mission Station.

This ancient place has seen the layers of history unfold to reveal a powerful and culturally significant place for tangata whenua which remains with us still today.

These words were written by Pouarahi Atareiria Heihei (Ngapuhi) supported by Kaihautu Te Kenehi Teira (Raukawa, Ngati Kuia) and were approved by Kipa Munro (Ngati Rehia).

June 2014
The Mission House at Kerikeri is the oldest standing house in the country. Started in 1821, it was inhabited first by the Butler family, then the Clarkes, and after 1831–32 by the Kemps. For a brief period the Maori chief Waikato Piriniha (Prince Waikato) also lived there, just before the Kemps. The house is situated near the foot of the older Kororipo pā, which had guarded the river from at least the late eighteenth century. The famed taniwha Kauea had also dug his way through from Hokianga to take up his residence with his wandering kinsmen.

This study examines the manner in which the house was built, then modified, and finally saved through its gift to the nation in 1974 by James Kemp’s great-grandson, Ernest Kemp. It also indicates the importance of luck at various stages, not just in the continuity of the Kemp family ownership but also the danger of erroneous decisions when the failure to recognize early walls led to their too hasty removal in the 1970s. Then, in 2000 AD, two original slates were recovered from underneath the lean-to built in 1831; they had once belonged to the chief Hongi Hika’s daughter, Hariata Rongo, who had been staying with the Kemps during that year. One slate contains the earliest known written text of a waiata whakautu (song of riposte), scripted by a woman, probably Hariata herself.

The house thus represents the two worlds that became conjoined by Maori and missionaries. It is itself a simple European building but, along with the Church Missionary Society store, which was begun in 1832, it marks the erection of a permanent village in which Maori, as well as Pakeha, had multiple roles as traders, negotiators and owners. It exists in a landscape that was depicted by Augustus Earle in 1827, which has little changed. It marks the beginnings of the shared country that would evolve over 200 years with conflict, but also with courtesy and humanity that each learnt.

This conservation plan primarily studies and explains the Mission House, but it should be considered as part of the evolving society in which both Maori and Pakeha played critical roles. The house is furnished with some of the original mission furniture (Francis Hall’s chairs that he brought with him when he came in 1819), as well as Maori ornaments (whāriki, woven mats) and carved weapons and instruments. It reminds us all of our beginnings.

Judith Binney, DCNZM
1 August 2010
Kerikeri Mission Station, 1824. 'Etablissement des missionnaires anglais a KidiKidi, Nouvelle — Zelande.'
Jules Louis Lejeune, hand-coloured lithograph
Alexander Turnbull Library, F290 ¼ MNZ
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Commission

This Conservation Plan for the Mission House, Kerikeri, is the result of a commission dated 6 March 2009 from Gordon Hewston, Regional Manager Heritage Destinations North, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.

The plan includes a history of the Kerikeri Mission, and of the house itself; a description of it as it stands today; an assessment of its cultural heritage significance, and policies for its future management. It broadly follows the standard Heritage New Zealand format for conservation plans (see Guidelines for Preparing Conservation Plans, NZHPT, 2000), although with some variation in detail.

Conservation standards are those set out in the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value; the technical content of the plan meets the requirements of the New Zealand Building Code.

This study deals with the house itself, and does not extend to the remarkable collection of objects within it, nor the garden and wider setting. These elements are of extremely high heritage value, and each is the subject of a separate report now in the course of preparation. These are an inventory/conservation plan for the contents of the house (Pip Harrison, Heritage New Zealand registrar), and a conservation plan for the garden (Louise Beaumont and John Adam).

Finally, the repair and maintenance of the Mission House is dealt with in a separate document, Kerikeri Mission House Maintenance Plan (Cochran, June 2009). This includes an assessment of the condition of the building, with recommended repairs to the fabric and upgrading to improve environmental conditions within the house, many of which have since been carried out.

1.2 Ownership and Heritage Status

The Mission House is part of the Kerikeri Mission Station, 218 Kerikeri Road, Kerikeri 0230, Northland. The house is owned and managed by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, and it is open to the public as a house museum.

The legal description is Pt Lot 1 DP 29562 Blk XI Kerikeri SD.

The building is listed as a Category 1 historic place under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, and is part of the listed Kerikeri Basin Historic Area; it is also listed on the Far North District Plan. Sections 5.2 and 5.3 outline the implications of the Heritage New Zealand and District Plan listings.

It is also part of an area that is on New Zealand’s Tentative List for potential scheduling as a World Heritage Site (Cultural) under the World Heritage Convention. Section 5.4 deals with the implications of this listing.
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2.0 HISTORY

This section is in two broad parts: a history of the Kerikeri Mission and the Mission House to the present day (Section 2.1), and a description of the physical changes that the house has undergone in its near 200 year history (Section 2.2). Changes are summarised in a chronology of important dates, and a list of sources follows.

2.1 History of the Mission House

This section is written by Helen McCracken.

The Church Missionary Society in New Zealand

In 1799 a group of mainly evangelical Christians founded the Society for Missions in Africa and the East. Among their number were William Wilberforce, Henry Thornton and the Rev. Josiah Pratt (curate of St John, Bedford Row, London). The society was formed to advocate for the abolition of slavery, social reform in Britain and world evangelism. Its genesis lay in the Reformation and the abolition of monastic and religious orders, which left the Church of England without its traditional form of mission. The new society expected that English clergy would take up missionary roles. However, this did not initially occur and many of the society’s first missionaries were German Lutherans. The earliest mission was established in Sierra Leone in 1804, quickly followed by India.

In 1812 the Society was renamed ‘The Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East’. Three years later in 1815 the first English clergy left England to carry out the Society’s work. By this time the first lay missionaries had arrived in New Zealand to establish a mission at Rangihoua, Bay of Islands.

The principal force behind setting up the Church Missionary Society-supported mission in New Zealand was Samuel Marsden. Marsden had arrived in Australia in 1794 as the assistant chaplain to the colony of New South Wales. In the first decade of the 1800s he became actively supportive of missionary work in the South Seas, and in 1804 became the local agent for the London Missionary Society’s (founded 1808) Pacific operations. Through his work he came into contact with a number of Maori visiting Sydney, and felt that a mission should be established in New Zealand. In 1807 he returned to London to argue the case before what was to become better known as the Church Missionary Society (CMS). Marsden’s plan was met with resistance from both the Society and the Colonial Office, and eventually he resorted to recruiting three lay settlers, William Hall (a joiner), Thomas Kendall (a schoolmaster) and John King (a rope maker).

---

1 Limitations. This history of the Kerikeri Mission House is based primarily on secondary sources, of which there are many. It is not intended as a definitive history of the Mission House; its purpose is to provide sufficient context for the assessment of the cultural heritage significance of the house and the conservation plan’s policies and work recommendations. Where there have been significant changes to the house, these have been mentioned in the text; a more detailed description of changes is given in section 2.2.


Marsden left England with Hall and King in 1809 (Kendall left in 1813). On the journey Marsden discovered the Te Hikutu chief Ruatara. The latter had left New Zealand four years before as a crew member on a whaler with the intention of visiting England and to see George III. However, he ended up serving four years on various whalers. When Marsden found him, the chief was ill and suffering from the consequences of his harsh treatment. Marsden invited Ruatara to stay with him at Parramatta. Ruatara finally returned to the Bay of Islands in 1812. In 1814 Kendall and Hall, who had sailed from Sydney on board the Active, the newly acquired mission boat, visited Ruatara at his pa of Rangihoua to discuss the idea of setting up a CMS mission in the Bay of Islands. Ruatara returned to Sydney along with Hongi Hika of Ngai Tawake. It was under the patronage of these two Ngapuhi rangatira that Marsden was able to found a mission at Te Oihi, Rangihoua in December of 1814.

The Establishment of the Mission at Kerikeri, 1819

Prior to 1819 when the first CMS missionaries arrived, the Kerikeri inlet was the site of the ancient pa of Kororipo. Ngati Tautahi took the pa from Ngati Miru during the 1770s. The

---

pa was strategically located to control the junction of the Wairoa and Kerikeri rivers, the headwaters of which reached into the fertile hinterland of the Bay of Islands. During the 1700s members of the Ngapuhi confederation expanded their influence, either by conquest or alliance from the Hokianga east to Waima, Taheke, and Kaikohe. By the time the first Europeans began to settle in the Bay of Islands (Tokerau), Ngapuhi dominated most of the area. In the 1790s Te Hotete of Ngati Tautahi occupied Kororipo, but it was under the occupation of his son Hongi Hika (1772-1828) that Kerikeri was to become a key meeting place for Ngapuhi.

In 1819 Marsden agreed to take up Hongi’s invitation to establish a second mission settlement at Kerikeri. Almost from the start of the mission in the Bay of Islands, Marsden had set his sights on the Kerikeri Basin as a location for a mission settlement, attracted by the fertile nature of the soil, the plentiful supply of fresh water and a suitable harbour for shipping. From as early as 1815 Marsden had even arranged with Hongi for the first missionaries at Te Oihi to plant wheat at Kerikeri in the following spring. The attraction of Kerikeri was not only the physical suitability of the place, but also the opportunity to convert some of the key Ngapuhi figures of the day and, perhaps more importantly in the volatile situation that existed, the protection of Hongi. For Hongi, the further cementing of his relationship with the missionaries offered continued access to European goods and technologies (including tools and weapons) and enhanced his mana.

On 14 November 1819 Marsden acquired from Hongi c. 5250 hectares (13,000 acres) of land at Kerikeri, in return for 48 axes. The transaction also came with the added incentive of one large kettle of gunpowder for Hongi and one tin can (half gallon) of the same for Rewa, half-brother of Hongi, who witnessed the deal. It has been argued that the trip undertaken by Hongi and Waikato to England in 1820 in the company of Thomas Kendall and the promise of a double-barreled gun and twelve muskets was also part of the ‘purchase price’ of Kerikeri. On that trip Hongi was to acquire nearly a thousand guns that on his return to New Zealand allowed him to carry out his devastating campaigns of the 1820s.

The new settlement was left in the charge of Reverend John Gare Butler (1781-1841). With him were Francis Hall (a schoolmaster and storekeeper), James Kemp, their families and servants. Kemp was born in Norfolk, England in July 1797. He later became a blacksmith. In 1818 he married Charlotte Butcher (b. 1790) also of Norfolk. Shortly after their marriage they left for Australia, eventually reaching the Bay of Islands in August 1819. Charlotte was one of the first European women to live at Kerikeri.

The land had been surveyed in the previous August, and by September building sites (consisting of a public store, smith’s house and shop) had been marked out. Hongi had also made a commitment to put up temporary accommodation for the mission.

---

inhabitants. Until the houses were built the blacksmith’s shop served for ‘a dwelling house and lodging house for all Europeans.’ By October the first gardens were being planted.

The first house to be built was that to be shared between the Kemps and Halls. There was also an attempt to build in brick, using bricks made by ‘George’ a Maori who had learnt the trade of brick making in Sydney. However, this had to be abandoned less than five months after they started when George left the settlement.

Maori labourers played an important part in the building of the settlement and the establishment of the gardens and farms. Butler’s journals record a number of Maori working with the missionaries, employed in planting, animal husbandry, felling timber and construction of the houses, associated buildings and fences. Their work could be paid for in clothes, agricultural implements and food, depending upon the availability of supplies.

Each house in the settlement was to have its own garden and home farm. A plan showing the layout of the Butler house and garden was probably drawn up by its future resident sometime before April 1821. In that month Butler began work on his garden, constructing a fence and in May laid out a garden with the assistance of James Shepherd (1796–1882), and began planting. (Shepherd, a CMS catechist, was born in Sydney. In 1820 he was sent by Marsden to the Bay of Islands to help establish European agriculture and gardening of which he was considered somewhat an expert.) In the following month the garden became the last resting-place of William Bean’s (a carpenter with the mission) infant.

The Building of the Butler Residence

The planned construction and eventual building of the Butler residence showed the differences that already existed in the New Zealand mission. Butler’s appointment as Superintendent of the New Zealand Mission had not been well received by other missionaries, particularly those who had been in New Zealand since 1814. Butler was also against the trading in muskets and powder, a practice that had developed from early on in the mission and which Marsden was forced to censure his missionaries for on more than one occasion. As a result there was a strong reluctance among some of Butler’s fellow missionaries to progress the building of the house. At one point William Hall, mission building overseer based at Rangihoua (and second only to Kendall in his gun trading) wrote to the Secretary of the CMS in London, complaining of what he saw as an overly

\[\text{References}\]

17 Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, p.11
21 G. H. Scholefield, A Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, Wellington, 1940, p.296
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elaborate plan for a house proposed by Butler for his residence. Butler also had to compete for the services of the mission sawyers who, at the behest of Marsden, were engaged in the commercial supply of timber for the shipping as a way of funding the mission. Butler, undeterred, acquired his own team of mainly Maori sawyers and proceeded to obtain his own timber for the house from up the Kerikeri River. Eventually Hall did help.

Although it is thought that some of the timbers for the house were sawn at Te Oihi, most were prepared at Kerikeri under the supervision of William Puckey, and most of the iron work was undertaken by Thomas Foster at Rangihoua. The mission carpenters, William Fairburn and William Bean, were contracted to provide the labour to build the house for £250 and by June 1821 work had started. The framework for the house was laid on basalt river boulders that served as house piles.24

Work on the house was delayed by the return of Hongi and Kendall from England in June 1821, but by late September Butler had completed the construction of a chimney and lined the kitchen. The family took up temporary residence in the detached but unfinished kitchen, located behind the dwelling.25 At that point there was ‘no window or upper floor’ to the dwelling.26 By this stage the house was surrounded by seven-foot pale fencing, garden house, potato house, fowling house, a goat house, a house for Maori labourers to live in, and a small school.27

From November 1821 Butler was absent from Kerikeri visiting Parramatta. By the time of his return in February 1822 the house was substantially built, to the extent that Butler could hold services within at least one of its rooms. The Butlers moved in at the end of March 1822. In August the Butlers hosted the newly arrived Marianne Williams and her children, while Henry Williams established a new mission site at Paihia, just south of Kerikeri. Marianne later recorded her first impressions of the house:

We entered through a small court, enclosed by high paling, a house, two stories high and a viranda [sic] in front. At a distance it had appeared, like stone or stucco. But it was built of wood, painted white and lined with plank within, and finished in a superior manner to the wooden houses in Hampstead.28

The Williams family left the house in October 1823 for Paihia. Only a few months later the Butlers were to leave the mission. Butler had made himself so unpopular with his fellow missionaries that by November 1823 he had been sacked.29

In the absence of a permanent tenant, James Shepherd moved his family into the Butlers’ house. However, their tenure was short-lived, and they were removed when George Clarke and his family arrived at Kerikeri in May 1824. Clarke had known Kemp prior to arriving in New Zealand, they having grown up together in the same Norfolk village of Wymondham.30 During his teenage years Clarke learnt carpentry and gunsmithry from his father, as well as gaining a scholarly education. In 1818 he attended the CMS school

24 Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, p.11
27 October 1821 Barton, p.183, Quoted in Sue Clunie.
28 Letters from New Zealand Rev. & Mrs H. Williams 1822-1824, p. 124, quoted in Nola Easdale’s Mission House, p.12
in London. In 1822 he married Martha Blomfield and they sailed to New Zealand in April 1822. After a stop in Sydney, they finally arrived at Kerikeri in March 1824. Five of the 15 Clarke children were eventually born in the Mission House; they were Samuel Ludbrook (1824-1897), Henry Tacy Clarke (1824-1902), William (1827-1914), Martha Elizabeth (1828) and Mary Anne (1829-1890).

Following his arrival, Clarke set up a school for Maori children where he taught both academic subjects and practical skills. The Kerikeri settlement began to expand. Sometime in 1824 a building was erected on the foreshore for Christian worship. It is believed that this was likely to be the first building dedicated to Christian worship erected in New Zealand. In 1829 a larger lath and plaster chapel was built on the hill overlooking the settlement. The Clarkes were to host a number of fellow missionaries during their stay at Kerikeri. In August 1824 the house provided shelter for the Davis family, but they were soon moved to Paihia. In 1828 William Yate (1802-1877) arrived in the Bay of Islands and boarded with the Clarkes.

At the time of Yate's arrival there was considerable upheaval in the local Maori population. In 1825 at the Battle of Te Ika a Ranganui, Ngapuhi under the leadership of Hongi Hika finally extracted revenge on Ngati Whata for the losses they had sustained at the battle Moremonui, at Maunganui Bluff, in 1807 or 1808. However, following a series of misfortunes, Hongi's influence in the Waimate and Kerikeri area began to wane. Sometime in 1826 Hongi resolved to move to Whangaroa. Here he attacked Ngati Pou and Ngati Uru. During the fighting he was wounded by a musket shot. He died at Whangaroa on 3 March 1828. With the death of Hongi and the establishment of other missionary settlements, particularly Paihia, the importance of Kerikeri diminished. By the end of the 1820s there were very few Maori living at Kerikeri.

In 1830 the Clarke family left Kerikeri to take up residence at the new mission settlement at Te Waimate, along with Yate, Davis, James Hamlin and their respective families and servants. When the new colonial government was set up in 1840 Clarke was appointed chief protector of aborigines, a position he held until it was abolished in 1846. He later served on the Auckland Provincial Council and was made a judge of the Native Land Court in 1865. He died at Waimate North in 1875.

For a brief period after the departure of the Clarkes, the Rev. Thomas Chapman and his wife Anne Maria occupied the house at Kerikeri. Either just before or during their brief occupancy work began on a skillion or lean-to along the western elevation of the house. The first stage was the construction of a pantry. The work was carried out by Benjamin Nesbit. Late in 1831 and early 1832 the kitchen was extended north from the pantry, terminating in a brick structure which featured a copper boiler, large open fireplace and

---

35 Fergus Clunie also states that there was an unwritten understanding between Marsden and Hongi that the people of Nga Tawake who lived at Kerikeri would leave so that Marsden could establish a large settlement for European immigrants. Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, pp.8, 13.
an oven. Again Nesbit undertook the carpentry work, while the brick structure was built by William Parrott. By mid-1832 the Chapmans had exchanged houses with James and Charlotte Kemp and family.

The Kemps

The Kemps had been one of the founding missionary families at Kerikeri, having arrived with Butler in 1819. James Kemp had spent the first decade in the mission helping with the boys’ and adults’ schools as well as visiting the surrounding Maori settlements. Since 1822 he had been in charge of the mission store and in 1832 he supervised the construction of the new stone store at Kerikeri (completed 1836). Charlotte Kemp also took on the role of teacher, taking the girls’ and infant schools. She was also entrusted with the care of daughters of chiefly families, whom she took into her home to train.

Soon after the Kemps moved in, the skillion was extended south from the pantry, with the intention of constructing three further rooms. However, the end room remained incomplete, with only the foundations constructed. This work ended in 1834. Both chimneys on the west wall were rebuilt at this time. (There were also several partitions built upstairs, including in the attic. These may have been built at this time or earlier than the Kemp occupancy.)

---

40 Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, pp. 18–28
41 Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, p.29
By 1835 Charlotte and James had had eight children. (Their last child was to be born in 1838). The death of their youngest child at the time in 1835 and the news that they were to be transferred to the new mission at Tauranga led Charlotte to have a mental breakdown. For the sake of her health the decision was made that the Kemps would stay at Kerikeri.42

By 1840 the Kemps were the only missionaries left at Kerikeri. About 1842 they began extensive renovation of the house. The verandah was either completely demolished or parts of it were incorporated into a new structure. The rooms at either end of the verandah were removed, and the new verandah returned down the sides of the house to meet the skillion.43 Windows were then inserted into the door spaces left by the removal of the verandah rooms.44

In 1843 the Stone Store was leased to the newly arrived Bishop George Selwyn for the diocesan library, which was set up on the first floor of the building. Selwyn would travel from Te Waimate where he lived, to work in the library, often staying overnight on a camp bed which he set up for the purpose adjacent to his books. The stock held at the store was purchased under bond to the CMS by two of Kemp’s sons, James and Richard, who had

---

43 Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, p.30
44 Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001,
set themselves up as traders. They moved most of the stores to another house at the station previously occupied by the stone mason John Edmonds (1801 – 1865).45 (Edmonds had arrived from England with his family in 1834 to work for the CMS. He was supposed to have been employed to build the store. However, by the time he arrived the store was all but complete. He was eventually paid off by the CMS in 1839 and went to live on land he had purchased at the mouth of the Kerikeri inlet.)46 In November 1844 Selwyn removed the library to his new residence at Auckland, and the Stone Store was then leased to Kemp’s sons.47

During the Northern War (March 1845 to January 1846) colonial troops passed through Kerikeri twice. The first was in May 1845 when 700 men (including 100 Maori) under the command of Colonel William Hulme were marched to Kerikeri, where they camped two nights before heading inland to confront Hone Heke’s forces.48 While stationed at Kerikeri the officers took over the chapel to sleep in. They were to pass through Kerikeri again in

---

June 1845 going to Ohaeawai. Later Kemp submitted a bill to the government for damage to property including fences, outbuildings and the Stone Store.\textsuperscript{49}

In 1848 the decision was made to close the Kerikeri Mission Station. The Kemps remained. In March 1850 James Kemp was granted an allowance of £80 per annum, but two years later Kemp agreed to end the allowance to remove his sons’ debt to the CMS. The Kemp sons, with the assistance of their father, continued to run the Stone Store until 1857 when it was leased to an Ebenezer Norris. Norris was later to marry Charlotte Kemp, the daughter of James and Charlotte Kemp.\textsuperscript{50} Kemp (snr.) also continued to farm on his land at Kaeo and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{51} Charlotte Kemp died at Kerikeri on 22 June 1860.\textsuperscript{52} On 8 October 1860 James Kemp (snr.) acquired the title to the Mission House, and in June 1867 acquired the trading business based in the Stone Store from the estate of the previous lessee (Samuel John Edmonds).\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{flushright}
\textit{View from the south-east. This shows the fourth verandah on the house, built c. 1895.}
\end{flushright}

\textit{Alexander Turnbull Library, F1377 ½ MNZ}


\textsuperscript{50} Gavin McLean (ed.) (Draft) Conservation Plan for the Stone Store, Kerikeri, NZHPT/Pouhere Taonga 1995, p.15-16


\textsuperscript{52} Daily Southern Cross, 28 June 1860, p.1

\textsuperscript{53} Gavin McLean (ed.) (Draft) Conservation Plan for the Stone Store, Kerikeri, NZHPT/Pouhere Taonga 1995, p.16; Daily Southern Cross, 11 January 1868, Page 4
Sometime after 1869 but before 1885 the Mission House verandah was narrowed and completely rebuilt.\(^{54}\) On James’ death in Auckland in February 1872 the house at Kerikeri became the property of Charlotte and James’ second son, also named James, and his wife Sophia, the youngest daughter of the Rev. Richard Davis.\(^{55}\) In the mid-1890s the verandah was again rebuilt.\(^{56}\)

James Kemp (jnr.) purchased the Stone Store from the CMS in 1874, although he did not get full legal title until 1892.\(^{57}\) He continued to operate a business from the Stone Store until 1888 when he leased the business to a John Black, who was to marry James and Sophia’s daughter Ethel Jane.\(^{58}\) James died in 1899. Sophia, who had been left the house by James, continued to live in the house until her death in April 1915.\(^{59}\) On her death the house, referred to in her mother’s will as the ‘Homestead’ became the property of Francis (Frank) Kemp (1855-1923). Frank’s father had already handed him the Stone Store in 1893.\(^{60}\)

Although the house now belonged to Frank, James and Sophia’s daughters Charlotte and Gertrude occupied it as life tenants as specified by Sophia’s will.\(^{61}\) In 1926 a bathroom was added to the rear of the house and other changes were made to the skillion. The roof was covered with corrugated iron, which was placed over the existing shingles. The sisters also altered the windows, replacing several of the 6-paned sashes upstairs with more modern twin paneled, horned sash windows. Window architraves were also replaced.\(^{62}\) Although the sisters did undertake these alterations to the house, there are at least two accounts that show they were unwilling to make significant changes. One account, published after Gertrude’s death, states that she would have nothing changed, and that she ‘kept her mother’s bedroom exactly as it was when her mother was alive.’\(^{63}\) Charlotte died in 1942 and Gertrude in 1951. They were both buried in the St James churchyard on the hill above the house.

In 1955 Alfred Ernest Kemp and wife Dorothy moved into the Mission House. Ernest, along with his brothers, Hayward, Ralph and Athel Louis, had inherited the lands at Kerikeri, including the house and Stone Store, as tenants in common house their father Francis when he died in 1923.\(^{64}\) Ernest and Dorothy Kemp made several changes to the house including the introduction of electricity to the house (although there is some suggestion that electricity had been supplied to the house before this date).\(^{65}\) Major changes were made to the kitchen, and outside the fence was removed from in front of the property and replaced by a rock wall and plantings.\(^{66}\)

\(^{54}\) Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, p.31
\(^{56}\) Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, p.31
\(^{59}\) Probate of James Kemp, BBAE 1569 Box 105, p.328, Archives New Zealand, Auckland.
\(^{63}\) Weeky News, 9 January 1952
\(^{64}\) Probate of Francis James Kemp, BBAE 1569 Box 546, p.1668, Archives New Zealand, Auckland.
Looking across the inlet to the house, 1885 (?)
F Barnett Album, Special Collections, Auckland City Libraries, A3262

Looking east over the house and Kerikeri Inlet, 26 March 1885
PF Barnett Album, Special Collections, Auckland City Libraries, A3265
In 1970 Dorothy died, and in 1973 Ernest Kemp moved out of the house. In March of following year Ernest gifted the house and the grounds to the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. He died in October of that same year and was buried alongside his wife in the churchyard of St James. Ernest left the Stone Store to his son, Frank, on the condition that the NZHPT be given the first offer to buy the store should it be put on the market. Not long after, Kemp’s solicitors, acting on behalf of the family, offered the Stone Store to the NZHPT for $40,000, which the latter accepted in September 1975.67

**Kerikeri as an Historic Place**

Many years before the acquisition of the Mission House, the Kerikeri Basin had been recognised as a place of great historic significance. As early as 1889 Dr Thomas Hocken, the eminent historian, stopped by after a visit to the Kerikeri Falls to take a photograph of the ‘oldest house in New Zealand.’68 While there he was presented by James Kemp (jnr.) with Church Missionary Society reports dating to 1813–1825, and copies of letters to the CMS from Marsden.69 There is also a record of the Governor Lord Ranfurly visiting Kerikeri during his tour of Northland in 1900, although it is not clear what places he visited in Kerikeri.70

During the twentieth century the Bay of Islands became a popular tourist destination. At one point in the 1920s Charlotte Kemp wrote to the local Member of Parliament, asking that Kerikeri Falls, located not too far from the Mission House, be made a reserve, as there were increasing numbers of visitors from Auckland and elsewhere visiting and carrying away the ferns and plants.71 It has been suggested that the Mission House and Stone Store became a tourist attraction in the lifetimes of Charlotte and Gertrude Kemp.72 Certainly during the 1930s the New Zealand Railways Magazine promoted Kerikeri along with other places to visit in the Bay of Islands, as the place which had the oldest wooden building and the oldest stone building in the country.73 Many tourist postcards attest to the popularity of the Kerikeri Basin, and images of the house appear on a range of souvenirs.

The Basin also became the destination for Fuller’s tourist cruises. A relative of Gertrude and Charlotte, on commenting on how her aunts gave the impression of being rather severe, related that:

Gertrude was known to have remarked with a snort, ‘Another boat load of iniquity!’ when one of the earliest Fuller’s launches came in to the Stone Store Basin, carrying young people singing to a guitar, with some of the girls in shorts.74

There is also evidence to suggest that the sisters allowed tourists into the house, although not upstairs.75 From about 1919 the sisters kept a visitors book and according to one account ‘thousands of visitors, local and overseas, to this historical centre of Kerikeri’,

---

68 ‘Dr. Hocken’s visit to the Bay of Islands, interesting tour through historic regions, Taranaki Herald, 15 April 1889, Page 3.
69 ‘Dr. Hocken’s visit to the Bay of Islands, interesting tour through historic regions, Taranaki Herald, 15 April 1889, Page 3.
70 Evening Post, 6 February 1900, Page 5.
71 AANS 7613 ACC W5491 190 Res 2N/8/2/6, 1908–197?, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.
72 Jan Harris to Sherry Reynolds, 1 October 1997, PRO 052B.
73 For example The New Zealand Railways Magazine, Volume 5, Issue 9 (April 1, 1931), Volume 7, Issue 7 (December 1, 1932)
75 Charles Hale, Report on Kerikeri House, Kerikeri, Bay of Islands, examined 15th and 14th November, 1951, copy held at Alexander Turnbull Library Wellington, P919 31 HAL 1951.
Souvenir jug showing the 'Mission Station Kerikeri 1819 N.Z.' Crown brand, made in England.

Souvenir tea spoon, inscribed 'Kemp House, Kerikeri, NZ'.
called into the Mission House. Even the Governor General Lord Bledisloe knew the sisters and visited the house.\textsuperscript{76}

It is not known when the Government first became interested in acquiring the Mission House to preserve it as part of the nation’s heritage, but certainly by the mid-twentieth century there was some interest. In 1937 the head of the Tourist and Publicity section of the Department of Internal Affairs wrote to Joe Heenan the under secretary, suggesting that Kemp House, the Stone Store and Pompallier be preserved by the Government.\textsuperscript{77} In 1940 the Ministry of Works, Whangarei, undertook a survey of the property and prepared a report with measured drawings.\textsuperscript{78}

In 1951-52 the Director of the Dominion Museum, Dr Falla, and other individuals and organisations became increasingly concerned about the loss of New Zealand’s built heritage, what should be preserved, where should expert advice be found, and who should pay for it.\textsuperscript{79} It is at this time that Charles Hale of the Dominion Museum undertook a photographic inventory of the Mission House and its chattels.\textsuperscript{80} The photographs were taken not long after Gertrude died and are now held at Te Papa. If it is true that Charlotte and Gertrude did little to change the furniture and fittings of the house, then these photographs are a remarkable record of a mid- to late-Victorian dwelling.

In November 1952 the Director General of Crown Lands wrote:

\begin{quote}
The desirability of the preservation of the above buildings [Stone Store and Mission House] has been under consideration for some time, but it is understood that both at the present time are occupied and are kept in a good state of preservation.\textsuperscript{81}
\end{quote}

In 1959 the recently formed National Historic Places Trust (later the New Zealand Historic Places Trust and later again Heritage New Zealand) wanted to mark the Kerikeri buildings with a plaque. In 1962 a plaque was put up in front of the Stone Store to replace one that had been erected by the local chamber of commerce. In 1966 the Ministry of Works erected a sign in front of the Mission House for the NZHPT.

As the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the Mission Station loomed, some members of the Kerikeri community became concerned with the proposal to subdivide the land behind St James Church and adjoining Kororipo Pa, for a large housing development. Those opposed to the development formed the Society for the Preservation of the [Kerikeri] Stone Store Area, with the objective of ensuring that the government acquired sufficient land to protect the heritage of the Kerikeri Basin. Eventually the local authority agreed to purchase a portion of the land, leaving the remainder to the Society to purchase. To help raise the money the group built a replica Maori village on land opposite

\begin{footnotes}
\item[76] Susan Clunie, ‘Kerikeri Mission House Garden’, unpublished report for the NZHPT, 2004, held on PRO 052 ZZ Kerikeri Mission Station General, NZHPT, p.39 There is a photograph of the Governor General’s visit held by NZHPT.
\item[77] L J Schmidt to J Heenan, 26 October 1937, IA1, 135/37, Archives New Zealand, Wellington. Information supplied by Gavin McLean.
\item[78] Charles Hale, Report on Kerikeri House, Kerikeri, Bay of Islands, examined 13th and 14th November, 1951', copy held at Alexander Turnbull Library Wellington, P919 31 4 HAL 1951.
\item[79] ‘Are we neglecting the past, the preservation and restoration of old buildings’, in New Zealand Design Review, Vol.4 Issue 2 Sept-May 1951-1952, pp.31–32
\item[80] Charles Hale, Report on Kerikeri House, Kerikeri, Bay of Islands, examined 13th and 14th November, 1951’, copy held at Alexander Turnbull Library Wellington, P919 31 HAL 1951.
\end{footnotes}
the Stone Store and leased for a peppercorn rental from local identity Nancy Pickmere. A petition containing 6000 signatures was presented to the government at the 150th anniversary celebrations in November 1969.

In December 1970 the government announced through the gazette that it was going to acquire 17 acres of the land at Kerikeri as a national historic park. However, within weeks this was reversed, much to the ire of the members of the Society. The latter continued to fundraise, receiving support from throughout New Zealand. Eventually the Society acquired the land, but needed help with a small loan, at which point they approached the government for assistance. The newly elected Labour Government agreed that the land should be acquired for the nation and that the Society should be repaid its money in full.

During this time the government had also entered into negotiations with Ernest Kemp to acquire the Mission House. At one point in 1971 Ernest Kemp, who was also concerned at the development in the Basin, wrote to the Prime Minister Keith Holyoake asking that the government acquire a large portion of the Veale Estate to protect the inlet from unwanted development. In his reply, Holyoake stated that although the Crown could only purchase a small portion of the estate, he assured Ernest Kemp that the house would be ‘a memorial to the Kemp family as well as to the past.’ Eventually the house was transferred to the New Zealand Historic Places Trust as a gift, and in the following year the Trust acquired (by purchase) the Stone Store from the estate of Ernest Kemp.

**NZHPT and the Restoration of the Kerikeri Mission House**

The National (later New Zealand) Historic Places Trust was formed in 1954. In the first few years of its existence the organisation had no policies to acquire any properties or the funding to do so. It was not until 1959-1960 that the NZHPT acquired its first historic properties. From the mid-1960s, with the restoration of the Waimate Mission House (opened to the public in 1966), the acquisition in the same year of Pomahani House, Russell, followed by Old St Paul’s, Wellington and Hurworth, New Plymouth, the Trust began to develop a significant portfolio of properties. By 1975 the Trust had acquired many of the properties that it owns today. The Mission House was acquired during this time.

---

83 Ibid.
Kerikeri River in flood, from the verandah; possibly 1975
NZHPT, XKH 800

Damage from the flood of March 1981
Jeavons Baillie, Alexander Turnbull Library, 884 E

Damage from the flood of March 1981. Pantry, looking through to the kitchen
Jeavons Baillie, Alexander Turnbull Library, 886 E
On taking possession of the Mission House on 14 March 1974, the NZHPT began a restoration of the building to the original layout. The work was based on the recommendations of John Stacpoole, Architect, Historic Buildings, Ministry of Works and Development. Unfortunately, the initial work undertaken on the house was based on inaccurate historical information and resulted in the loss of early fabric. On the landing a partition wall was demolished under the mistaken belief that it was only 30-40 years old, when it actually dated to the 1830s. The mistake was realised too late and a new partition had to be built to replace the original. A number of changes were also made to the bathroom lean-to at the back of the house. The electrical wiring installed by Ernest Kemp was removed, but the installation of the replacement wiring caused significant damage to the fabric of the house.87

In 1978 the corrugated iron roof cladding was removed and replaced with wooden shingles. However, the work was poorly executed and it was a number years before all the ensuing problems were fixed. In the meantime substantial water damage occurred to the building.88 The verandah was also replaced at this time, to resemble the verandah of 1869.

In March 1981 the Mission House was flooded for the first time in its history. Although the grounds had been flooded before, this was the first time that the house itself had been inundated.89 It is believed that the flooding was due to the raising of the road bridge approaches and the raising and strengthening of the bridge to above the flood level. The changes had the effect of causing a bottleneck in the Kerikeri River, a waterway that was already prone to flooding. The flood severely damaged the verandah and furnishings on the ground floor. The Stone Store was also flooded at this time. The only positive aspect of the flood was that the damage to the wall coverings in the house revealed ‘lost’ features.90

After the flood Peter O’Hagan, the curator of the Mission House, undertook an investigation of the house and from this the decision was made to restore the building to its form of the 1840s. However, much of the restoration work was based on poor information, resulting in the installation of features incongruous to this period. Misinterpretation of partitions, doorways, and ceiling heights etc, saw the destruction of some original fabric dating to the earliest periods of the occupation of the house. The result was a house that bore little resemblance to any historic period in its life.91 During the remaining 1980s and the 1990s only minimal work was undertaken.

In August 1994 a celebration was held to mark 175 years of the establishment of the ‘Kerikeri settlement’. The weekend included an official party composed of the Governor General, the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, the Mayor of the Far North District Council, local members of parliament, Chairman of the Regional Council, the Bishop of Auckland and the Bishop of Tai Tokerau. The Ratana Brass Band provided entertainment along with a pageant depicting the settlement and growth of Kerikeri.92

Between 1999-2001 extensive conservation work was undertaken. The chimneys were substantially rebuilt with a grant from the Sir John Logan Campbell Residuary Estate,

87 Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, p.33
88 Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, p.34
90 Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, p. 34
92 Kerikeri 175th Anniversary, 1819-1994, p.34.
and by local and visitor donations. Care was taken to ensure that the brickwork matched the original.\footnote{Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, p.36} Other work included securing the timber frame structure and fixing the extensive rot, particularly in the house’s near-ground timbers. The New Zealand Lottery Grants Board funded the latter work.\footnote{New Zealand Historic Places Trust Media Release, 9 January 2001, See www.historic.org.nz}

Floodwaters again threatened to inundate the Mission House in May 2001. This and the effect of the vibrations from increased road traffic on the Stone Store increased concern over vulnerability of these two significant buildings.\footnote{Heritage at Risk, Kerikeri Mission Station & Stone Store, New Zealand Historic Places Trust Media Release, February 2002, www.historic.org.nz} The NZHPT and Far North District Council convened a meeting with the Minister and Associate Minister for Transport, the local Member of Parliament, representatives of Transit, Transfund, the Department of Conservation and the Ministry for Culture and Heritage to discuss what could be done. \footnote{Heritage at Risk, Kerikeri Mission Station & Stone Store, New Zealand Historic Places Trust Media Release, February 2002, www.historic.org.nz}

In May 2003 the government agreed to set aside funding for what was to be called the Kerikeri Historic basin project. This project was to be jointly managed by the Department of Conservation and the NZHPT, with the aim of preparing a development plan for the Kerikeri Basin.\footnote{New Zealand Historic Places Trust Media Release, 7 May 2003, www.historic.org.nz} A year later funding was finally set aside by the Government to construct the Kerikeri Bypass.\footnote{Liz Rossie, et al. “Moving On” in New Zealand Heritage, NZHPT, Winter 2005, p.55} Before the bypass was complete yet another flood occurred, in March 2007. The sustainable development plan was finally completed and adopted in June 2007 and involved the Far North District Council, tangata whenua, the Society for the Preservation of the Kerikeri Stone Store Area, as well as DoC and the NZHPT.\footnote{http://www.doc.govt.nz/publication}

At the same time as the release of the sustainable development plan the Kororipo-Kerikeri Basin (including the Kerikeri Mission House and Stone Store) was placed on the New Zealand Tentative List for consideration as a world heritage site. The list is an inventory of significant heritage places that might be submitted to the World Heritage Committee at some future date.\footnote{New Zealand Historic Places Trust Information Release, 22 June 2007, see www.historic.org.nz} The other cultural sites on the tentative list at that time were the Napier Art Deco historic precinct, the Waitangi Treaty Grounds historic precinct and the Auckland Volcanic Field.

The bypass, referred to as the Heritage Bypass, was eventually opened on 18 July 2008 and the dismantling of the bridge at Kerikeri was begun almost immediately after.\footnote{New Zealand Historic Places Trust Information Release, 18 July 2008, 23 July 2008, see www.historic.org.nz} In September 2008 the Department of Conservation and the Far North District Council jointly purchased the last remaining piece of land that had been in private ownership. This land had previously been held by members of the Kemp family and is the location of a blacksmith’s shed, and pear tree believed to have been planted in 1819. It is also possibly the location of the remains of an early mission building that has now been incorporated into the current restaurant facility.\footnote{http://www.infonews.co.nz/news.cfm?l=170&t=0&id=27657; Kororipo-Kerikeri Basin bought for conservation, 17 September 2008, http://www.nzherald.co.nz/government/news/}

\footnotesize

93 Fergus Clunie, Kerikeri Mission House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, February 2001, p.36
99 http://www.doc.govt.nz/publication
100 New Zealand Historic Places Trust Information Release, 22 June 2007, see www.historic.org.nz
The Kerikeri Mission House Today

Today the Mission House is open daily to the public. Tours start at the Stone Store, and visitors are taken through the garden and house in guided groups by volunteers. During the 2009 calendar year there were 9,352 visitors.

Behind the house, the former Curator’s Cottage, built in 1976, is in use as a café and offices for the Kerikeri Mission Station Manager, Liz Bigwood, and her staff.

2.2 The Mission House

Information for this section, which is a description of the physical changes to the fabric of the house, comes from pictorial and drawn records, examination of the fabric, and written sources listed in section 2.4. The drawings of the front elevation of the house at the end of the section show the main stages of development.

PERIOD I 1819 to 1860
In the Ownership of the Church Missionary Society

Butler’s Mission House, 1822 (see page 30)
The Kerikeri Mission House began as a two storey structure rectangular in plan, 4.8m/15' 10" wide by 14.1m/46' 3" long, with a verandah along the front (east) elevation, and a high hipped roof sheathed in shingles. The walls were clad in weatherboards with a beaded lower edge.

The verandah was a prominent feature of the house. It was enclosed by a room at each end, some 2.560m/8' 5" wide, the rooms accessible from inside the house, and each was lit was a large shuttered window facing east.

These rooms framed the central front door to the house, which opened from the verandah into a hallway, with a staircase, and a formal room on each side, drawing room to the left and dining room to the right. Both rooms had fireplaces on the west wall, with delicately modelled Georgian surrounds and sandstone hearths.

The staircase led to the first floor hall, with two bedrooms, one at the north end and one at the south, with a ladder to an attic above (possibly added later). The house was thus of six rooms, four on the ground floor and two on the first, with a central hall and stairway giving access.

Of the joinery, the front door was a Georgian-style six panel door with a sunburst fanlight above, while the internal doors were likewise six panelled but simpler. Each of the four main rooms were lit by windows on three sides; the downstairs windows being large 12 and 8-paned double-hung sashes, and the first floor windows being 6-paned, acknowledging the different status of the rooms.

The building was thus broad and symmetrical from the front, with a very clear expression of the room layout in the disposition of the door and windows. The western side would have been just as logical in its design, but stark in comparison with the front in the absence of a verandah.

The ground floor layout is shown on the 1822 plan of Butler’s house (reproduced on page 4). This plan also shows the kitchen as a structure detached from the house to the west.
(2); a mill and storehouse further west (3), and a privy just to the south (4). Access to these service spaces may have been through a door from the hall, under the stairs.

This was the form of the house through the 1820s.

The Skillion, or Lean-To, 1831 – 1838
The first major changes came during the 1830s, when a skillion\textsuperscript{103} was built along the back (west) elevation of the house. It measured 21.3m/76' 5" long × 3.9m/12' 9" wide, and extended beyond the end walls of the house so that the composition from the front remained symmetrical.

It was built in three main stages.

\textbf{Stage I, Pantry, 1831 – 1832}
The first part of the skillion\textsuperscript{103} to be built was the pantry, unlined, and accessed from the dining room through a door that took the place of the now-redundant west-facing window. It had doors out to the north and south sides; these would become internal doors as the lean-to grew. While originally an earth floor was built up between the wall plates, it soon had a timber floor laid.

\textbf{Stage II, Kitchen, 1831 – 1832}
The kitchen extended north from the pantry, timber framed as for the pantry, and terminating at its northern end in a brick structure that extended across the full width of the lean-to; this contained three fire compartments – a copper boiler, large open fireplace and an oven, each heated by its own fire. Access to the outside was through a door in the east wall, and to the main rooms of the house, through the pantry. The kitchen was unlined, but had a timber floor from the beginning, with sandstone flags laid in front of the fireplace.

Benjamin Nesbit was the builder, and William Parrott the bricklayer.

\textbf{Stage III, South End, 1832 – 1834}
The skillion was extended south from the pantry, with a narrow hall to the back door, and then three further rooms, the southern-most one balancing the kitchen at the northern end. This was to have had a fireplace, perhaps as a second kitchen, but the foundation only was built.

The west-facing windows were removed, and both the chimneys on the west wall of the Butler house were completely rebuilt at this time.

\textbf{Partitioning and Lining, 1834 – 1838}
Lining of the spaces south of the pantry was carried out intermittently during this period.

This work was carried out by James Kemp, who had moved into the house in 1832.

\textsuperscript{103} For a more detailed description of the construction sequence of the skillion, see Clunie, Fergus G A U, Kerikeri Mission House, Cyclical Maintenance, NZHPT, Feb 2001, pages 18 – 28.
Early Partitions Upstairs

Early in the life of the house, two partitions were erected upstairs. The first was to divide the south bedroom into two, and it was built with one skin of horizontal tongue and groove boards fixed to studs. Although intended to be left as natural timber, it was later papered; a page of The Illustrated London News pasted to the east side of the partition is dated 9 May 1846.

The other was to divide off a small room from the first floor landing, and was lit by the central east-facing window. This was built with vertical boarding. (This partition was demolished in the 1970s, and immediately rebuilt when it was established that it was very early fabric.) The door to this room is a simple four-panel door with no mouldings, contrasting with the moulded six-panel doors to the other rooms.

Attic Partitioning

Remnants of collar ties in the roof framing indicate that there was no intention (originally) of using the attic, since the collar ties, spanning across the space, would have restricted movement. However, early in the life of the building (possibly the 1830s), the collar ties were removed, and a partition with a door was installed to divide the space into two rooms. The partition and underside of the roof structure were whitewashed. (There is no apparent distress in the roof structure attributable to the removal of the collar ties, although a detailed structural analysis should address this issue.)

Skylights have at some time (unknown) been incorporated in the west-facing slope of the roof; in the earliest photos of the rear of the house the skylights do not show.

Verandah Rebuilt, 1842 – 1843 (Verandah No 2)

The verandah is an extremely important element of the house, both for its function and for its aesthetic value. There have been five quite distinct verandahs, the first rebuilding coming just 20 years after the house was built. This possibly incorporated elements of the original. The end rooms were dispensed with, and the verandah was wrapped around the north and south ends of the house to finish against the east-facing walls of the skillion.

This verandah followed its predecessor in resting against the house at the level of the first floor window sills, so that its roof was flush with that of the skillion; its roof was shingled.

The doors that had previously opened from the drawing and dining rooms into the verandah rooms were replaced with the windows that had become redundant when the skillion was built along the west wall. Each of these rooms now had two matching east-facing windows (as one sees today), and all three windows in each of the rooms were shaded by the new verandah; the rooms were therefore somewhat darker than they were originally, when each room had two of its windows unshaded.

The best image of the original verandah is the Richard Taylor sketch of 1841 (see page 11), while the second verandah is clearly shown in the drawing of December 1844 from W C Cotton’s Journal.
PERIOD II 1860 to 1974
In the Ownership of the Kemp Family

Verandah Rebuilt, post-1869 (Verandah No 3)
The first major change to the house in Kemp ownership was the rebuilding of the 1842 verandah. It appears to have been completely rebuilt because the width was narrowed from approximately 2.4m/8’ 0” to 1.9m/6’ 3”, and its roof was lowered two weatherboards or so below the first floor window sills, as it is today.

It was possibly roofed in timber board and batten, or in zinc sheet, with close-spaced upstands at the joints running down the slope. This verandah shows most clearly in the Hocken Library photo of 1889 (see page 12), and while the cladding material is uncertain, the thin paired verandah posts are clearly evident.

Verandah Rebuilt, c.1895 (Verandah No 4)
James Kemp Jnr carried out yet another rebuilding of the verandah around 1895. It is not known why it was rebuilt so often, with periods of just 20 or 25 years between reconstructions; it is likely to have been a combination of function (the life of a shingle roof is about 25 years) and fashion.

The new verandah followed the plan shape and height of the previous one, but with a gentle concave curve to the roof, which was clad in corrugated iron; there was cut-out timber fretwork to the post/beam junctions, ‘union jack’ cross bracing to the handrail, and the floor boards ran at right angles to the house. This was typical detailing for the time, commonplace (and fashionable) in Auckland villas of the period.

There are many photos of this verandah (see page 13), since it remained until 1978; it is also shown in measured drawings of 1940 and later (see page 39).

1925–26
Misses Charlotte and Gertrude Kemp (daughters of James Kemp Jnr) made the only addition to the house since CMS days in 1925–26. They added a small lean-to on the north-west corner of the skillion containing a back porch (now the sprinkler valve room), a bathroom and a toilet. They had a range and hot water service installed in the kitchen (Charles Hale refers to the kitchen as ‘much modernised’ in his report of 1951), and they had repairs done to the verandah at this time which cost £25.

1940
The form of the house was documented in measured drawings (see page 39).

1951
Charles Hale of the Dominion Museum visited the house, and made an extensive photographic of it, included views of most rooms.

1954 – 1956
Ernest Kemp carried out quite significant improvements, including the installation of a range in the kitchen fireplace; lining the kitchen, pantry and bathroom with hardboard; installing a new bench and cupboards in the kitchen, and lining the room immediately to the south of the back hall in the skillion with hardboard. Upstairs, he installed a new fire surround in the south-west bedroom, and the main rooms were lined with scrim and paper. (Stacpoole 74041.)

For these references, see the unpublished NZHPT reports listed in Section 2.4.
Outside, the corrugated iron and shingles of the skillion roof were replaced with new corrugated iron. (Clunie 01.)

PERIOD III 1974 to the Present
In the Ownership of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

The house was gifted by Ernest Kemp to the NZHPT on 14 March 1974. The Trust was well prepared for the gift, and as soon as 2 May they received a three page report from John Stacpoole, Architect, Historic Buildings in the Ministry of Works and Development entitled 'Kemp House Kerikeri'. This covered the condition of the house and recommended work.

Subsequently, on 20 June, the NZHPT Board minutes recorded a resolution:

1. 'That restoration work on the Kemp House be confined to – restoration of the original layout and internal appearance of the first floor rooms by removing the comparatively recent partition walls and hardboard. Replacement of decaying timber. Removal of modern ceiling height cupboards.'
2. 'That the original river stone and staddle (sic) foundations be retained.'
3. 'That a sprinkler system be installed to become operative when mains water is available.'

Authorisation of this and other work came in a letter of 27 June from John Stacpoole to the Resident Engineer, Whangarei. Instructions were to:

1. 'Remove unoriginal upstairs partitions … Remove all hardboard and wallpaper in the areas immediately affected but leave wallpaper in main bedroom.'
2. 'Remove modern cupboards in the pantry and kitchen but leave the sink bench until the second stage…'
3. 'Remove hardboard linings in the back passage …'
4. 'Remove any decayed timber in structure or joinery …'
5. 'Repair floor in sitting room and side porch and replace missing floor boards in side verandah.'
6. 'Replace original upstairs windows where they have been changed, the original windows being stored in the house.'
7. 'Lay field tile drain along the back wall of the house.'
8. 'Resite the septic tank on higher ground to avoid flooding.'
9. 'Install portable fire extinguishers as provided by Fire Protection Officer.'
10. 'Remove bees from framing with assistance of local beekeeper.'
11. 'Rendeorate, i.e. paint and paper, the two small rooms under the lean-to at the south western corner of the house … and remove any late and unnecessary fittings from the schoolroom leading to them.'

The house was subsequently opened to the public, although further major work was planned.

1976

In a three page report to the NZHPT Board dated 9 November 1976, 'Kemp House Kerikeri, Brief for Completion of Restoration', John Stacpoole recommended:
Shingling of the main and lean-to roofs.
Board and batten to the verandah roof ‘as in the earliest photographs of the house’.
The floor of the verandah on the river side and the balustrading ‘will be restored’.
Two first floor windows, east elevation, to be replaced with original ones.
Repairs to wall framing in areas below these windows, and by a sidelight to the front door.
Ground floor passage – hardboard to be stripped from walls and ceiling and kauri linings made good.
Kitchen and pantry – modern fittings and hardboard to be stripped.
The door between the pantry and dining room to be retained.
‘It appears that stove, oven and mantel shelf are still in good order’.
Bathroom and lavatory – bath to be replaced with a bench.
Schoolroom and rooms beyond – ‘require little more restoration than paint on the wallpaper’.
Upper stair landing – ‘make good ceiling and walls where a partition has been removed’.
Main bedroom – no work.
Small bedrooms – no change, although the fireplace in the back room ‘is unconvincing and will be boarded over’.
Removal of pendant light fittings, and new power outlets in each of the main rooms. (Some of this wiring was in surface run conduit.)
Painting of the exterior.

Some of the above work was carried out in 1978/79. The main and lean-to roofs were re-battened and clad in sawn kauri shingles, and the verandah was rebuilt. (Clunie, 01.)

Verandah Rebuilt, 1978 (Verandah No 5)
As recommended by John Stacpoole, the verandah was rebuilt yet again as part of the main restoration work. Thus the verandah of c.1895 was removed and rebuilt to the form that one sees it in today. This has quite slender timber posts arranged in pairs; floor boards running parallel with the walls of the house, and a roof clad in timber board and batten.

As Stacpoole says in the report, ‘Some people would regret the (loss of the) present, more picturesque, railings but the older form would be more in character with the period of the house’. It is understood that the new verandah was to be a replica of Verandah 3, which was on the house from c.1869 to c.1895; the photographic evidence was interpreted as showing this verandah with timber board and batten cladding.

1981
On 19-20 March 1981, the Kerikeri River flooded, with severe damage to the house inside (to furniture and linings) and outside (the northern end of the verandah was demolished). The sub-floor space was choked with silt and mud.

Post - 1981
Post-flood making good included the reconstruction of the damaged verandah and the removal of linings in ground floor rooms. In the southern part of the skillion, a partition
wall and shelving was constructed to divide the ‘schoolroom’ (room 1 on the measured drawings) from the passage, and a ceiling added.

1989
The shingles on the roof of the skillion were covered with corrugated iron, and copper gutters installed. This is the roof as one sees it today. (Clunie, 01.)

1999 – 2001
The masonry of the house had been known to be in perilous condition for some time. Under Fergus Clunie’s guidance, the lower halves of both the fireplace chimneys were stabilised and the stacks and upper storey fireboxes taken down and rebuilt; sound bricks were re-used and were supplemented with specially made new bricks. Wrought iron lintels and pot-hanging bars, which had corroded and spalled adjacent brickwork, were replaced, and new flashings installed.

The kitchen chimney and fireplace and associated oven were taken down, carefully recorded, and reconstructed on a new foundation. The original design for this special feature of the house – copper, open fire and oven, each separately heated – was accurately reproduced.

Structural, cladding and floor repairs were carried out to the kitchen and pantry; interior surfaces were whitewashed. (Clunie, 01, and stonemason Denis McCondach’s diary.)

Post-2001
The horizontal ceiling in the rooms at the southern end of the skillion was removed; scrim and paper linings removed from first floor bedrooms. (Salmond Reed photos.)

2015
The partition in the southern part of the skillion (referred to above as post-1981) was removed, shelving built in the ‘schoolroom’, and paper linings in the passage conserved. (A resource consent was granted for this work, based on an Assessment of Effects, 11 April 2014).

Evolution
The following drawings show the front elevation of the house as it has evolved, as described above.

**Period I 1819 to 1860**
In the Ownership of the Church Missionary Society
Drawing 1 1822 Original form
Drawing 2 1838 Skillion added
Drawing 3 1842 Verandah rebuilt (verandah no 2)

**Period II 1860 to 1974**
In the Ownership of the Kemp Family
Drawing 4 1869 Verandah rebuilt (verandah no 3)
Drawing 5 1895 Verandah rebuilt (verandah no 4)

**Period III 1974 to the Present**
In the Ownership of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Drawing 6 1978 Present form (verandah no 5)
1822
Original form

1838
Skillion added
1842
Verandah rebuilt (verandah no 2)

1869
Verandah rebuilt (verandah no 3)
1895
Verandah re-built (verandah no. 4), two first floor windows altered.

1978
Present form (verandah no. 5)
2.3 Chronology

This chronology includes dates important in the history of the place; changes to the fabric, which are dealt with in the previous section, are in summary only.

PERIOD I 1819 to 1860
In the Ownership of the Church Missionary Society

1814
Base established at Rangihoua by Church Missionary Society.

1819
18 August
At Kerikeri, ground marked out for settlement by Church Missionary Society. First buildings begun.
December
CMS families (Rev John and Mrs Butler, blacksmith James Kemp and his wife Charlotte, and Francis Hall) arrive at Kerikeri.

1821
11 June
Butler’s house begun. (Easdale p.34)

1822
21 February
First dinner in the house. (Easdale p.34)
25 March
Butler moves things into the house. (Easdale p.34)

1824
Wharf operational.

1824 – 1831
George and Martha Clarke living in the house.

1828
3 March
Death of Hongi Hika.

1831 – 1838
The skillion built on the west side of the house in three stages.

1832
James and Charlotte Kemp and seven children living in the house. (Construction of the Stone Store begun in 1832.)

1843
House undergoes thorough repairs. (Easdale p.36)

1845
May
British troops passed through Kerikeri.
1846 to 1850
Several references to repairs needed, including to the shingled roof. (Easdale p.36) In August 1846 Kemp’s journal notes: ‘this house being built about 26 years and it being wood, cannot last much longer without requiring considerable repairs’. (Pickmere p.75)

1848
Mission at Kerikeri closed.

1852
March
James Kemp ‘released’ from CMS, rents the house and Stone Store from CMS. (Easdale p.24)

Dates not Known
The south bedroom upstairs divided into two rooms.
A small bedroom divided off the first floor landing.

PERIOD II 1860 to 1974
In the Ownership of the Kemp Family

1860
8 October
Deed transferring the house and surrounding land (3 acres 16 perches) to James Kemp.

1872
21 February
James Kemp dies at Auckland.

1899
3 May
James Kemp Jnr dies, property passes to Sophia.

1914
First bridge built across the mouth of the Kerikeri River.

1915 – 1951
Misses Charlotte (d.1942) and Gertrude Kemp (d.1951) live in the house as life tenants.

1923
Ernest Kemp inherits the property from his father Francis Kemp when he died in 1923.

1925–26
Lean-to added to the north-west corner of the skillion and other small scale changes made.

1940
The form of the house is documented in measured drawings.

1951
Charles Hale makes an extensive photographic record of the house.

1954
Main rooms lined with scrim and paper. (Stacpoole 2 May 74.)
1955
Ernest and Dory Kemp come to live in the house.

1956
Ernest Kemp carries out improvements in the kitchen, lining some rooms, installing a new fire surround, and re-roofing the skillion with new corrugated iron. (Clunie 01.)

1966
NZHPT erects a notice board at Kemp House.

1967–1969
Ministry of Works carries out investigation of fire protection for the house.
(Archives New Zealand 13/15/1/1.)

**PERIOD III 1974 to the Present**

*In the Ownership of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga*

1974
14 March
Alfred Ernest Kemp, great grandson of James Kemp, formally gifts Kemp House to the New Zealand Historic Places Trust.

Alfred Ernest Kemp dies at Whangarei on 23 November 1974.

1974 – 1978
Various changes made as detailed in the previous section. An automatic fire sprinkler system was installed, and the verandah rebuilt; this is verandah number 5, the one that is part of the house today. The Curator’s Cottage, now a cafe, was built in 1976.

1981
On 19-20 March 1981, the Kerikeri River flooded, with severe damage to the garden and house.

Post-1981
Flood damage rectified, and changes made in the southern part of the lean-to. In December 1981 the house was re-opened to the public.

1989
The skillion re-roofed with corrugated iron.

1999 – 2001
The two chimneys on the west side of the house repaired/rebuilt, followed by the repair and restoration of the fireplace and chimney at the north end of the kitchen, and of the kitchen and pantry. For a detailed description of the work done at this time, see the report by Denis McCondach, reproduced overleaf.

Diary entry by Denis McCondach, who worked on fireplace repairs in 2000.
18 April 2011

Attn: Tony Pickard – Historic Places Trust, Kerikeri

From: Dennis McConach

Report on work carried out on Kemp House from October 2000- March 2001

Stone work on South wall was found to be crumbling. This was dismantled and relayed in lime mortar. Weather boards on South and West walls had dry rot in them. These were replaced with new weatherboards which were from Kauri timber. When weatherboards were removed it was found that some of the studs were also rotten – up to approximately 500mm above the bottom plate. This was cut off at 45° angle and replaced with Kauri timber, nailed and glued.

The floor in the kitchen area was lifted and the main bearers had damp rot in them. These were taken out as well as the stone supports that were holding them in place. Holes were dug for new Jack Studs. These were 200mm round plastic pipes filled with concrete and fibreglass reinforcing rods. New Bearers and floor joist put in place. The outside Bearer on the west wall had to be replaced up as far as the back door, this was replaced with new Puriri timber. Rot was cut out of the main Bearer between the dining room and pantry. Access to this area was from under the stairs and along the ground. All this timber was then sealed with Metal X. All this floor area was cleared of debris most of it from the 1981 flood.

The two chimneys in the back hallway were taken down to about 1.8m from the floor and completely rebuilt using the old bricks and lime mortar.

The kitchen fire place and cooking area was taken down to ground level. A concrete footing was poured with reinforcing mesh. The fire place, oven, laundry and copper were all rebuilt to the exact size and shape of the original using old bricks, lime mortar and a lime wash.

The fireplace in the dining room and lounge have had new stools and rebuilt hearths made from Sand Stone sourced from Sydney, Australia.

Some rafters in the kitchen pantry area have had the rot cut out of them and replaced with Kauri timber, then lime washed.

New windows have been made for the West wall and new facings were the weatherboards were taken off. Most of the floor has been re-nailed and some of the floor in the kitchen area has been screwed down so it could be lifted to gain access under the building.

Most of the spouting has been replaced with copper. All the chimney tops have a copper lid over them to stop bird and water damage.

Note: All timber used in the Kemp House was Puriri and Kauri.
2011
Extensive repairs carried out to the verandah.

2014

2015
Partition in the southern part of the skillion removed, shelving built and paper linings conserved.

1974 – the present
Property Managers (formerly designated 'curators') at the house since 1974 have been:
- Beverley Quenault, 1981 – 1991 (?)
- Detlef Klein, Jan 1992 – July 1994
- Cindy Beavis, Sept 1994 – 1998
- Fergus Clunie, 1999 – 2005 (?)
- Elizabeth Bigwood, 2005 to the present

2.4 Sources
Unpublished Reports
These are held by Heritage New Zealand unless otherwise noted.
Beca, Kemp House Chimney Assessment, 18 Dec 2015.
Clunie, Fergus G A U, Kerikeri Mission House, Cyclical Maintenance, NZHPT, Feb 2001. This report contains a detailed analysis of the sequence of construction, especially of the skillion, and is drawn on heavily in Section 2.2.
Clunie, Fergus G A U, Heart of the House, Rehabilitation of the Kerikeri Mission House Kitchen, 1831, NZHPT, Oct 1999. This report describes work done on the kitchen fireplace and proposed to be done in the rest of the kitchen and pantry.
Hale, Charles, Report on Kerikeri House, Kerikeri, Bay of Islands, Examined 13th and 14th November 1951, Dominion Museum, Wellington. (Held by Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington; accompanying photos held by Te Papa Tongarewa.)
Object Lab, Kemp House Wallpaper-Condition Report, 30 Jan 2015.
Quenault, Beverley, Skilling Passage and Skilling Notes, NZHPT, no dates
Salmond Reed Architects, Kerikeri Mission House/Kemp House Cyclical Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, Feb 2006
Salmond Architects, Kerikeri Mission House Condition Report, NZHPT, June 2001
Stacpoole, J M, Kemp House Kerikeri, report to NZHPT, 2 May 1974
Stacpoole, J M, NZHPT, Kemp House, Kerikeri, letter to resident Engineer, Whangarei, 27 June 1974
Stacpoole, J M, Kemp House, Kerikeri, Brief for Completion of Restoration, report to NZHPT, 9 Nov 1976
Our World Heritage, A Tentative List of New Zealand Cultural and Natural Heritage Sites, Department of Conservation, Nov 2006

Heritage New Zealand Files
Heritage New Zealand files are held in Kerikeri; Highwic, Auckland, and Antrim House, Wellington. Those of most relevance are:
PRO 052
PRO 052U Kemp Chimney Fund Project
Registration Form, Kerikeri Mission House, Martin Jones, 2 Nov 2001

Published Sources
Porter, Francis, ed, Historic Buildings of New Zealand North Island, NZHPT/Cassell, 1978, including an essay by R I M Burnett, 'Kerikeri'
New Zealand Historic Places, Number 84, NZHPT, Feb 2002, 'Kerikeri Mission Station'; Number 85, May 2002, 'Kerikeri: A Pocket Parramatta', Fergus Clunie
The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, Volume 1, 1769 – 1869, entries for George Clarke, Hongi Hika, James and Charlotte Kemp, Thomas Kendall, Samuel Marsden and William Yate.

Architectural Drawings
1940
‘Residence of Misses Kemp at Kerikeri. Oldest Wooden House in New Zealand. Commenced 1819 – Completed 1820.’
Drawn by ‘R A R’, (R.A Rogers), June 1940.
Original held by Archives New Zealand, Auckland Regional Office, file no 13/15/1/1, Ministry of Works, Kerikeri Historic Building.
A print of this drawing (in two halves) is held at Kerikeri. See reproduction opposite.
This drawing is a definitive record (three plans and front elevation) of the house in 1940. It shows a ‘spare’ room immediately to the south of the back hall; the kitchen layout of the time, and the bathroom and toilet in the lean-to in the north-west corner. This is noted as built in 1926, at which time a ‘hot water service and range’ were installed at the north end of the kitchen. There are no doors from the skillion to the original dining room.
The first floor has a ‘lumber’ room in the space at the top of the stair, and there are fireplaces in both the west-facing bedrooms.
Measured drawing 'Residence of Misses Kemp at Kerikeri', June 1940
Copied from print (in two parts) held by Heritage New Zealand, Kerikeri; original held by National Archives, Auckland
1969(?)
Nancy Pickmere’s book *A Lamp Shines in Kerikeri* (1969) includes measured floor plans of the house ‘as it is today’. They show the 1925-26 lean-to as ‘new work’; the kitchen ‘recently modernised’, and in the south-west part of the skillion, three rooms in a row without the passage that is there today.

1970
‘Kerikeri Mission House’
Drawn by P G Long, 1970
There are three A1 drawings in this set, held by the School of Architecture Library, University of Auckland, with a set of prints held at Antrim House.
This set of drawings shows the ‘House drawn as it was in 1850’. Since it is not correctly drawn (the verandah, for example, is not the verandah of 1850) it is judged to have limited use for understanding the growth of the house.

1977
‘Restoration Drawings, Kemp House, Kerikeri’
Ministry of Works and Development, drawn by A R Larder, Aug 1977; checked by JMS (John Stacpoole).
A print of this drawing is held at Kerikeri. See reproduction opposite.
This is not a measured drawing, but shows proposed changes, including a new verandah, a ‘schoolroom’ immediately to the south of the back passage, and an open space at the top of the stair.

2009
Measured drawings of the building as it is today are included in Appendix II.
A set of A1 prints of the drawings, and an electronic file of them, is lodged with Heritage New Zealand.

Photographs
There are a great many photographs of the Mission House, taken throughout its life; a selection of these is reproduced and credited in this plan. Photos are held by:

- New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Kerikeri and Antrim House
- Auckland Public Library
- Auckland Institute and Museum
- Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington
- Te Papa, Wellington
- Hocken Library, Dunedin

Te Papa holds a particularly interesting set of photos, over 60 in all, taken by Charles Hale in 1951; these document very precisely the interior of the house at this time. A number of them are included in section 4.2.
Restoration drawing, Ministry of Works and Development, Aug 1977
Copied from print held by Heritage New Zealand, Kerikeri
3.0 DESCRIPTION

This section is a description of the site, and the house as it stands today. It should be read in conjunction with the measured drawings in Appendix II.

3.1 The Site

The Mission House occupies a site of great natural beauty, at the head of the Kerikeri Basin where the Kerikeri River joins a long inlet of the Bay of Islands. It is on the true right bank of the Kerikeri River, on a rise sufficient to get stunning views from the house of the river, basin and the long arm of land that was the site of Kororipo Pa.

Buildings in the vicinity include the Stone Store, 1832, and further to the south, The Pear Tree, now a cafe. On the hill above is St James Church, 1878. The Stone Store is important as a companion to the Mission House, sharing a history if not a building technology; both the store and St James are extremely important in views of the Mission House, from the headlands of Kororipa Pa and the replica Rewa’s Village (on the northern side of the inlet). From the pa in particular there is an iconic New Zealand view to the west that includes the basin, the three buildings and the mouth of the Kerikeri River; it is much admired and photographed.

Close at hand to the west is the house built by the the Historic Places Trust for curator’s accommodation, which is presently in use as the Honey House Cafe. This stands on the site of a mission building, from which it takes its form; see for example, the photo of 1885, page 15. This building is relatively discreet in the main views of the front of the house, and is a prominent part of the view from the pedestrian bridge.

Roads and Bridges

For most of last century a road ran across the front of the house to cross the Kerikeri River at the ford, just where it meets the sea; the first bridge at this site was built in 1914. In recent
years, this road had become very busy, threatening the peacefulness of the site, the structural
stability of the Stone Store from the vibration of heavy vehicles, and the Mission House itself
from flooding. During the flood of March 1981, debris built up against the bridge and caused
water to back up and flow through the garden and house, causing serious damage.

As part of the Heritage Bypass, a new crossing was built much higher up the river, and
this allowed the demolition of the road bridge in 2008. There is now no traffic in front
of the house, although vehicles can still reach the wharf in front of the Stone Store. It has
brought about a remarkable transformation of the setting, with much of the tranquillity
and ambience of the site evident in early photographs now restored.

A pedestrian bridge was built upstream of the site of the road bridge in 2011. It has gently
arched form, in steel, with its southern abutment just behind the cafe; it allows elevated
views of the Mission House from the north-west not seen before, and obstructs views too,
as seen in the photo above.

3.2 Description of the House Today

Style

The Mission House can be described as Georgian in style. The style, popular in Britain
in the late 18th century, is classical in its symmetry, simple in its form and detail, and
surprisingly well suited because of these characteristics to the demands of construction in
an early Colonial environment. In its original form, indeed even in its present-day form,
the building shows the good manners of the style, unadorned and simple. The joinery is
the one element of the building that rises above what is necessary, the sun-burst fanlight
over the front door providing a focal point in the centre of the composition.

Inside, plainness is again to the fore, with the joinery – doors and fireplace surrounds –
being subtly embellished to lift the otherwise severely plain finish and to give the spaces
an atmosphere of quiet elegance.

The house shares these characteristics with several others – including the Mission House
at Te Waimate (1832) and the Elms in Tauranga (1847) – such that they form a small but
distinctive group of their own in our architectural history, called the 'Mission Style'.105

105 See Old New Zealand Houses, Jeremy Salmond, Reed Methuen, 1986, p.80.
Plan

The earliest part of the house is a simple arrangement of a formal room on either side of a central hall on the ground floor, dining room to the north and drawing room to the south. A staircase leads to the first floor landing, where there is a large bedroom at the northern end, while that at the southern end was early on divided into two; there is another small room subdivided off the landing. The attic is partitioned into two spaces near the mid-point.

The skillion is divided into two parts by a hall running through to the back door; to its north is the pantry and then the kitchen, while there are three rooms to the south joined by a back hall made narrow by the protruding chimney of the drawing room.

A small lean-to off the kitchen includes a work room, toilet and sprinkler valve room. This is the only addition to the house made after the completion of the skillion in 1834, it being added in 1925-26. At this time the work room was a bathroom and the sprinkler room a back porch.

The plan of the house has been described more fully in Section 2.2, and can be readily understood from the measured drawings in Appendix II.

Structure

The structure of the house is a remarkably robust timber frame. A large section timber plate, 200 × 185 (sawn as 8" square) rests on river boulders, say 600mm/2' 0" across, around the perimeter of the building and under the main walls. Timber studs 200 × 125/8" × 5" are joined by mortice and tenon to the plates. The ground and first floor joists vary in size (like most of the framing timbers) but are commonly about 150 × 75/6" × 3".

The principal junctions of the frame were made with wrought iron straps, bolted vertically to the plate and horizontally through joists and studs. These would have been made by James Kemp.

There is evidence of steel rods across the whole width of the house, effectively holding the long external walls together.

The roof is framed with four main trusses spanning the width (east–west) of the house, the bottom chord of the trusses measuring 215 × 145/8 ½" × 6" and the main rafters 140 × 80/5 ½" × 3". Collar ties between the main rafters have been removed. Between the trusses are five or six pairs of rafters, varying quite markedly in cross section from around an average of say 100 × 75/4" × 3". Ceiling joists spanning between the bottom chords of the trusses in the north-south direction are 150mm/6" deep.

All the timber described is hand sawn, and this accounts for some (often quite wide) variability in cross-sectional sizes. In addition, some faces have been left unsawn, with the irregular face of the trunk of the tree untouched; this can be seen on the underside of some ground floor joists and also the underside of roof rafters. Timbers have been left like this quite simply to save labour in unnecessary sawing.

There are some carpenters marks to be found on framing timbers. For example, the roof truss members are marked I to IV, north to south, indicating that these members were cut to shape on the ground for re-assembly at high level.

Timbers found in the building are mainly puriri (ground plates and joists), and kauri (framing, weatherboards and finishing timbers), and there is also totara (framing).
Cladding
The main roof is clad in kauri shingles. While the original roof was shingles, there was corrugated iron on the main roof (and the verandah roof) for much of the 20th century.

The walls of the main part of the house, and the skillion, are clad in weatherboards, nominally 8" × 1", neatly finished with a beaded lower edge, worked by hand.

Interior
Interior finishes are mostly wide tongue and groove boards, with a fine beaded edge, fixed horizontally. These have been dressed by hand to give a remarkably smooth finish, clearly intended to be the surface finish without paper.

Rooms in the skillion and attic were not originally lined, or were only partly lined, and were whitewashed, while first floor bedrooms were lined and whitewashed, and some later had scrim and paper or just paper fixed to the lining boards.

The lining timber is kauri.

Services
Mains supply electricity is laid on to the house, and is reticulated to provide power outlets for lights. Electrical wiring installed by the Kemps and generally surface run in conduit, was removed by the NZHPT in 1976.

Plumbing consists of a tub and a toilet, both in the 1925-26 lean-to. Kitchen plumbing from the 1925-26 renovations and later has been removed, as have the corrugated iron water storage tanks that show in 20th century photos; these were by the back door, and later at the south end of the skillion.

A fully automatic fire sprinkler system provides reliable fire protection for the building, although there is some visually obtrusive pipework, and some places where structural members have been notched for the pipework in such a way as to threaten their structural integrity.
4.0 SIGNIFICANCE

This section summarises the cultural heritage values of the Kerikeri Mission House in a general statement, and then in a room by room analysis. Assessment criteria are those used for listing purposes in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, and include ‘aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, technological, or traditional significance or value’ (section 23).

Here they are grouped under the four headings of historic, social, aesthetic and scientific value as recommended in Guidelines for Preparing Conservation Plan, (NZHPT, 2000). An inventory of elements and spaces is included.

4.1 Statement of Significance

The Kerikeri Mission House is a building of very great heritage significance, being the oldest surviving European building in the country and one intricately woven into the story of the early period of contact between the indigenous people of Aotearoa and the European settlers. It is well known and is held in high regard, almost venerated, by the people of New Zealand, standing as it does as a symbol of the interaction of the two peoples and of the birth of a modern nation.

The importance of the place is recognised by its listing as a Category 1 historic place under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, meaning it is a place of ‘special or outstanding historical or cultural heritage significance’; by its ownership by Heritage New Zealand on behalf of the people of New Zealand; by its listing on the Far North District Plan, and by it being a part of a listed historic area and of an area being considered for World Heritage status.

Historic Value

Values associated with particular events or uses that happened at the place, and which have importance for their impact on the community.

Kerikeri during the 1820s played a pivotal role in the evolving relationship between Maori and Pakeha. It was the place where the Church Missionary Society became firmly established in New Zealand, and at the same time it was the place from where the great Ngapuhi chief Hongi Hika, with overwhelming superiority in arms, set out on far-reaching and devastating raids to places south.

The house and the place is associated with people of national importance, including Samuel Marsden, Hongi Hika, John Butler, and James and Charlotte Kemp. It is also associated with events of national importance, including the introduction of Christianity to New Zealand; of European plants and methods of agriculture, and of technology, including firearms. The place is right at the heart of the beginnings of a bi-cultural nation, and the house itself has not only been part of these beginnings but has stood throughout the whole of the modern history of Aotearoa New Zealand.

A special quality attaches to anything that is the oldest of its type in the land. The Kerikeri Mission House, preceded by many buildings of the tangata whenua as well as some more makeshift European buildings, is nevertheless today the oldest European building standing in New Zealand. It is thus an immensely important landmark in our history, the place where our European architectural heritage begins.
Social Value
Values associated with the use of the place; what it means to people, and the spiritual, artistic, traditional or political values that the place may embody.

The influence of the Church Missionary Society and its activities in the Bay of Islands and beyond on New Zealand life and culture has been far-reaching in cultural, religious and social ways, and the Kerikeri Mission House stands as an important monument to their activities. Its physical proximity to Kororipo Pa underlines its bi-cultural purpose, while its construction by European carpenters and Maori sawyers is acknowledgement of an early working relationship between the races, enhancing its bi-cultural value.

The care and maintenance of the house for 142 years (1832 – 1974) by four generations of the Kemp family, rare in the New Zealand context, ensured that the house survived into the modern period, while most of its near contemporaries have disappeared. The gifting by Ernest Kemp of the house and associated land to the people of New Zealand was an act of very great generosity. It ensured that the place would be maintained and made accessible to all people, allowing a greater understanding of early Maori and European interaction and New Zealand history.

It is also an important place in illustrating attitudes to historic preservation in New Zealand, because, since public acquisition in 1974, there have been substantial modifications made to the building to aid the understanding of visitors.

Aesthetic Value
Values associated with the formal qualities of the fabric of the place and its setting; with style, form, scale, colour and texture, and with one’s emotional response to the aesthetic qualities.

The aesthetic qualities of the place are extremely high, first for the beauty of the landscape of hills and trees, the ever changing mood of the Kerikeri Basin, and the constancy of the Kerikeri River falling into the head of the inlet. It is a remarkable natural setting for an historic building, perhaps unmatched in New Zealand.

In this natural setting, the Mission House benefits from being part of a group of buildings of high heritage value. It has a close relationship with the Stone Store, sharing its orientation and form of a high hipped roof, and a more distant but picturesque relationship with St James’ Church.

The formal architectural qualities of the building are of consequence. It has a self-assured character, formal and symmetrical, yet opening itself to the world with a wide relaxed verandah. It was an ambitious building for the time and place, but was designed in a straightforward manner to allow ease of construction with the technology and skills available. Its Georgian character means that the house stands as a benchmark in New Zealand architecture – simple, unadorned, fit for its purpose.

Scientific Value
Values associated with building materials and technology, with structure and services, and with evidence of past use, especially as may be revealed using archaeological techniques.

The building has very marked technological significance since it is the oldest building standing in the country and it has survived from the 1820s with a great deal of its original
fabric undisturbed. A study of its structure can reveal much about the early use of timber and methods of timber construction. Because it is a well built structure, it stands as an important exemplar of house construction in New Zealand from the earliest days of European settlement.

The technological value of the building derives from the main construction and finishing materials, especially the timber framing. This is very unusual in New Zealand, since framing members are of such great size, and the erection and jointing of these members called for considerable skill and ingenuity in the primitive pioneering conditions of the time. A high level of trade skill is evident in the structure and finishing details of the building, more particularly in the light of all timber being cut down from the logs by hand (by pit-sawing), and finished by hand.

Archaeological values are high, given the long period of occupation of the land and building. (Archaeological values are not dealt with in this report, but see the List of Sources for relevant reports.)

**Tangata Whenua**

Given the origins of the Mission House in the early contact period between Maori and Pakeha, the sourcing of materials and its construction by Maori artisans, and the role it played in early Maori/Pakeha relations, its level of importance to tangata whenua is very high. Its significance to tangata whenua is spelt out in the words of the prologue on page iv.

**Other Values**

Although not formal criteria included in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, it is useful to consider several other matters.

**Authenticity**

The level of authenticity of the building is reasonably high. There have been alterations throughout its life, but since c.1836 they have been of low impact in terms of the plan layout and architectural form of the building. Internal changes have been more extensive, with many small-scale changes made by the Kemp family, reflecting the changing requirements of domestic life over a period of 150 years, with further changes made in the post-1974 restoration, some as a result of flooding.

**Rarity**

Buildings in New Zealand that pre-date the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) are very rare. Others include:

1832  Stone Store, Kerikeri  
1832  Te Waimate Mission House  
1834  Busby’s (or Treaty) House, Waitangi  
1835  Christ Church, Russell  
  c.1837  Kohi Kohi’s Cottage, Riverton  
1839  Mangungu Mission House

All these buildings are listed as Category 1 historic places under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.
The Mission House is the oldest European building in the country by some ten years, and it stands in association with the oldest stone building; these two buildings are thus important landmarks, with a strong claim to uniqueness in the New Zealand context.

4.2 Inventory

Following is an inventory of the exterior elements and spaces of the building, with an indication of the age of significant fabric identified. The reason for making this assessment is so that future changes (whether repair, restoration or adaptation) to the fabric of the building can be carried out with least impact on heritage values.

**Elements and Spaces**

Each element and space is assigned a cultural heritage value, and the meanings of the assigned values are:

**Heritage Value 1 (HV 1)**
This means the element or space is of **exceptional** cultural heritage value. It is generally assigned to spaces that date from the period of CMS ownership.

**Heritage Value 2 (HV 2)**
This means the element or space is of **some** cultural heritage value. It is generally assigned to spaces that date from the period of Kemp family ownership.

**Heritage Value 3 (HV 3)**
This means the element or space is of **little** cultural heritage value. It is generally assigned to spaces that date from the period of public ownership, beginning in 1974.

**No Heritage Value (NHV)**
Elements or spaces of **no** cultural heritage value, or that detract from the heritage value, is assigned to elements or spaces that are inappropriate in such an important heritage building. (There are in fact no elements or spaces that fall into this category.)

**Fabric**

Fabric is described, and dates are assigned where possible.

Generally, the heritage value of fabric is as follows:

**Heritage Value 1 (HV 1)**
This means the fabric is of **exceptional** cultural heritage value. It is generally assigned to fabric that dates from the period of CMS ownership.

**Heritage Value 2 (HV 2)**
This means the fabric is of **considerable** cultural heritage value. It is generally assigned to fabric that dates from the period of Kemp family ownership.

**Heritage Value 3 (HV 3)**
This means the fabric is of **some** cultural heritage value. It is generally assigned to fabric that dates from the period of public ownership, beginning in 1974.
No Heritage Value (NHV)
Fabric of no cultural heritage value is fabric that plays no part in establishing the heritage value of the building; it is generally modern.

Negative Heritage Value (Neg)
Fabric of negative cultural heritage value is fabric of modern origin that detracts from the value of the building because it is inappropriate in such an important heritage building.

Notes
It should be understood that in some cases there is repair material of a later date incorporated in the element. Unless such repairs have been extensive, or badly executed, they are judged to have little negative impact on the heritage value of the element.

Doors are identified according to the space in which they are first encountered (after one has come through the front door), rather than with the room they open into.

Dimensions given for joinery items and dressed boards are accurate to the nearest 5mm, although apparently similar boards (such as the floor boards in any particular room) can vary in width board to board. For sawn timbers, dimensions should be treated as indicative only, since in some circumstances they vary considerably along the length of the member, and between members; imperial equivalents are given for important timbers.

In some cases, the verandah for instance, the element has a heritage value of 1 while the fabric that it is made up of has a value of 3; this is because the verandah is of fundamental importance to the building, while the fabric of the present one is all of modern origin.
EXTERIOR ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Heritage Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a steep-pitched hipped roof over the main part of the house, sheathed in timber shingles. There are two skylights set near the top of the west-facing slope. The skillion roof slopes away from the west wall of the house; it is hipped at each end. Shingles on this roof have been covered in corrugated iron, but are visible inside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main roof</td>
<td>Timber shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillion roof</td>
<td>Corrugated iron fixed over timber shingles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutters</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downpipes</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The house from the rear, showing the hipped form of the main roof and the lean-to form of the skillion.
Verandah Heritage Value 1

**Description**

The verandah runs across the front (east) elevation of the house, and wraps around the north and south elevations to end against the east-facing walls of the skillion. It rests against the house some 600mm below the first floor window sills, and is supported on paired verandah posts. Decking boards run parallel to the house.

The present verandah is the fifth of quite distinct design to have been built on to the house. It dates from 1978, and its design is based on the Hocken Library photo of 1889 (see page 12).

**Fabric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>HV 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>300 × 20 boards, 50 × 25 battens over joints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutters</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downpipes</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof framing</td>
<td>90 × 45 rafters and purlins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts</td>
<td>60 × 60 timber, chamfered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handrail</td>
<td>60 wide × 65 deep, moulded profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decking</td>
<td>135 × 20 boards on 95 × 45 joists @ 375 centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detail of the southern end of the verandah.
**East Elevation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The east elevation has, at ground floor level, a central door with sidelights, with two double hung windows on either side lighting the drawing room (left) and dining room (right); at first floor level there are three equally spaced windows, one to each of the rooms on the east side. All the joinery is arranged symmetrically. This elevation includes the east-facing walls of the skillion as it extends beyond the ends of the main part of the building; a door opens from the south end room of the skillion onto the verandah, and a window to the kitchen occupies the corresponding position at the north end.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joinery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door D1 Front door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window W5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window W6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window W8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Window W18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window W19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

East elevation, c.1950.

*Photo, NZHPT, XKH 858*
East elevation, 2016.

East elevation, detail of drawing room window.

East elevation, detail of front door.
**North Elevation**  

**Description**

The north elevation has the return northern end of the verandah abutting the skillion, with a window at ground and first floor level. The northern end of the skillion is a brick wall, being the exposed face of the brickwork that makes up the northern wall of the kitchen; it includes a chimney rising above the skillion roof.

A lean-to at the western corner has a door into the small space that now houses the sprinkler valves; this used to be a back porch.

**Fabric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Heritage Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weatherboards</td>
<td>192 cover × 20, lapped boards, beaded bottom edge</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherboards to lean-to</td>
<td>180 cover × 20, plain lapped boards</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickwork</td>
<td>Brick wall resting on timber sill, 2.4m high, rebuilt 1999 using some original material</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Joinery**

| Door W1                   | 750 × 1680 × 25 ledged door of vertical t, g and beaded boards         | HV 3           |
| Window W1                 | Matching W1                                                           | HV 1           |
| Window W21                | Matching W18                                                          | HV 3           |
| First Floor               |                                                                       |                |
North elevation of the house, May 1975.

Photo, Alexander Turnbull Library, 23688 1/4

North elevation, 2009.
West Elevation | Heritage Value 1
---|---
**Description**
The west elevation, ground floor, is the skillion added to the main part of the house in the 1830s; the lean-to at the northern end, containing service rooms, was added in 1926. The main part of the elevation has a row of five matching windows, each lighting one of the five main rooms of the skillion, and there is a door into the back hall. At first floor level, there are three evenly spaced windows, and two prominent chimneys rising through the skillion roof. These elements make a symmetrical composition.

**Fabric**

| Weatherboards                  | 192 cover × 20, lapped boards, beaded bottom edge | HV 1 |
| Weatherboards to skillion     | 180 cover × 20, plain lapped boards              | HV 1 |
| Chimneys                       | Two tall brick chimneys, rebuilt in 1999 using some original material | HV 1 |

**Joinery**

| Door D3                        | 900 × 1805 × 32, framed, vertical t and g boards, 3 light fanlight above | HV 3 |
| Hood over door                 |                                                                      | HV 3 |
| Window W9                      | 290 × 445, louvred window                                           | HV 3 |
| Window W10                     | 580 × 815, top hung                                                 | HV 3 |
| Window W11                     | Matching W8                                                        | HV 3 |
| Window W12                     | Matching W8                                                        | HV 3 |
| Window W13                     | Matching W8                                                        | HV 3 |
| Window W14                     | Matching W8                                                        | HV 3 |
| Window W15                     | Matching W8                                                        | HV 3 |
| First Floor                    |                                                                      | HV 3 |
| Window W22                     | Matching W18                                                       | HV 3 |
| Window W23                     | Matching W18                                                       | HV 3 |
| Window W24                     | Matching W18                                                       | HV 3 |

*Back view of the house; no date.*

Photo, Auckland Institute and Museum, C2057; NZHPT, XXH 850
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Back view of the house, 23 September 1964.

Photo, R I M Burnett, NZHPT, 1996

West elevation, 2009.
# South Elevation

## Heritage Value 1

### Description

The south elevation has the return southern end of the verandah abutting the skillion, with a window at ground and first floor level. The southern end of the skillion is weatherboarded as for the western face, with a single window.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weatherboards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weatherboards to skillion</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joinery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Window W16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Window W17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Floor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Window W25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
View of the house from the south, no date.
Photo, National Publicity Studios, Special Collections, Auckland City Libraries, B5969

South elevation, 2009.
**INTERIOR, GROUND FLOOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hall</th>
<th>Heritage Value 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hall is the central circulation space in the house. It is entered via the front door on the main (east) elevation, and has internal doors to the drawing room (south), dining room (north) and through to the skillion and back door (straight ahead). There is a staircase to the first floor on the south side, with three flights between two landings. Natural light comes from the fanlight and side-lights to the entrance door, and from a window above the stair on the west wall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor</strong></td>
<td>Timber boards of various widths, 170 – 210, running east – west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walls</strong></td>
<td>T, g and beaded matched lining, whitewash finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skirtings</strong></td>
<td>No skirting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architraves</strong></td>
<td>Timber, painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceiling</strong></td>
<td>T, g and beaded matched lining, whitewash finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cornice</strong></td>
<td>Timber bead moulding, painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joinery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door D5</td>
<td>910 × 1960 × 40, six panel, 20 × 16 panel moulding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door D6</td>
<td>850 × 1810 × 35, matching D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door D7</td>
<td>915 × 1950 × 40, matching D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door D18</td>
<td>605 × 900 × 14 cupboard door under the stairs, ledged, t, g and beaded boards, T-hinges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staircase</td>
<td>240 going × 182 rise, 20 × 20 balusters @125 centres, moulded handrail 55 wide × 48 deep, see measured drawings for set out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>4 × ceiling mounted sprinkler heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Hall staircase, 23 November 1951.
Photographer: Charles Hale, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, MU000025/001/0041

Looking through to the Back Hall, 23 November 1951.
Photographer: Charles Hale, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, MU000025/001/0004
The hall viewed from the stair landing, 2009.

The view out through the front door, January 1957.
Photo, T Ramsfield, Alexander Turnbull Library, 39594 ½
**Drawing Room**

**Heritage Value 1**

**Description**

The drawing room is the main formal room of the house. Two windows face east, one south, all shaded by the verandah, while a fireplace forms the focus on the room on the west wall. On the north side of the fireplace there is evidence in the timber lining of the west-facing window that was removed when the skillion was built.

**Fabric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Timber boards, 172 – 210 wide</th>
<th>HV 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>T, g and bead matched lining, 148 – 228 wide; 130 wide triangular bead in all corners</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>Timber, moulded top edge, 195 high</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>Timber, painted</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Flush boarding, 195 average width, whitewashed</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td>Timber bead moulding, whitewashed, 25 diameter</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplace</td>
<td>Timber surround, painted</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>4 × ceiling mounted sprinkler heads</td>
<td>NHV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Drawing room, January 1957, looking north-west.**

Photo, T Ramsfield, Alexander Turnbull Library, 39595 ½
Drawing room, looking south-west, 2009.

Drawing room, detail of fireplace surround.
The dining room originally matched the drawing room in its design, and was symmetrical with it, although it now has two openings on the west wall. It has two windows facing east, one north, all shaded by the verandah, with a fireplace forming the focus on the room on the west wall. Either side of the fireplace are openings to the pantry (left, presently with no door) and to the kitchen (right). The opening on the left was the location of the original west-facing window that was removed when the skillion was built.

**Fabric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Timber boards, 172 – 210 wide</th>
<th>HV 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>T, g and bead matched lining, 160 – 178 wide; 130 wide triangular bead in all corners</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>Shadow of timber skirting only, 130 high</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>Timber, painted</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Flush boarding, 195 average width, whitewashed</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td>Timber bead moulding, whitewashed, 25 diameter</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplace</td>
<td>Timber surround, painted</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Joinery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Door D8</th>
<th>Opening only, no door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door D9</td>
<td>860 × 1965 × 32, matching D5 but no mouldings to inside face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Services**

| Fire protection | 4 × ceiling mounted sprinkler heads | NHV |

Dining room fireplace, 2009.
Dining room, January 1957, looking north-west, the fireplace just out of view on the left.

Photo, T Ransfield, Alexander Turnbull Library, 39596 ½

Dining room, a similar view in 2014, looking north-west.
Dining room fireplace, 23 November 1951.
Photographer: Charles Hale, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, MU000525/001/0049
Dining room, the two east-facing windows, 23 November 1951.
Photographer: Charles Hale, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, MU000525/001/0046
## Back Hall

### Heritage Value 1

#### Description

The front hall opens through to the back hall, which gives access (on the left) to the southern part of the skillion; straight ahead to the back door, and (on the right) to the northern part of the skillion. It is a narrow space, lit by a fanlight above the back door.

#### Fabric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Timber boards</th>
<th>HV 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>T, g and bead matched lining</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Rough sarking, with remnants of paper, and scrim and paper linings</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Joinery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Door</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>HV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door D10</td>
<td>895 × 1780 × 20, ledged, t, g and bead, T-hinges</td>
<td>HV 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door D14</td>
<td>740 × 1815 × 35, four panel, 22 × 12 panel moulding, remains of 3-pane fanlight above</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Services

| Fire protection | 1 × ceiling mounted sprinkler head | NHV |

---

Back Hall, looking east, showing the door through to the front hall, 2009.
Pantry Heritage Value 1

Description
The pantry is entered from the back hall, has a door through to the kitchen, and an opening to the dining room. A dominant feature is the back face of the brick chimney to the dining room fireplace.
The room is unlined, so the whole of the wall and roof structure can be seen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Timber boards HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>All exposed wall framing, whitewashed HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling structure</td>
<td>Exposed rafters, whitewashed HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Shingles and battens on original rafters NHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney</td>
<td>Whitewashed brick HV 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joinery
Door D11 835 × 1800 × 20, ledged, t, g and bead, T-hinges HV 3

Services
Fire protection 1 × ceiling mounted sprinkler head NHV

Pantry, south wall, 2009.
**Kitchen Heritage Value 1**

**Description**

The kitchen forms the northern end of the skillion, and is entered today both from the dining room and the pantry. Its dominant feature is the brickwork associated with the copper, open fire and oven, each separately heated, which extends the full width of the northern end of the space. There is a window on each of the east and west walls, and a door on the west wall which gives access to the lean-to of 1925-26.

**Fabric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Timber boards</th>
<th>HV 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>All exposed wall framing, whitewashed</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling structure</td>
<td>Exposed rafters, whitewashed</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Shingles and battens on original rafters</td>
<td>NHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplace</td>
<td>Plastered brickwork</td>
<td>HV 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Joinery**

| Door D 12   | 755 × 1865 × 40, framed, t, g and beaded boards, T-hinges, 140 step down to lean-to floor level | HV 3 |

**Services**

| Fire protection | 2 × ceiling mounted sprinkler heads | NHV |
| Sprinkler pipework |                                        | Neg |

Kitchen, south wall, 23 November 1951
Photographer: Charles Hale, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, MU000535/001/0049
Curator’s Room/Bathroom  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This room was the Kemp bathroom in the 1925-26 lean-to addition. It had a bath along the south wall and a basin on the west wall; this has been replaced with a tub. Today the space is a general purpose work and store room, not open to the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joinery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door D13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curator’s Room, from the kitchen, 2009.
Toilet Heritage Value 2

**Description**

This space was the Kemp toilet in the 1925-26 lean-to addition, with access from the bathroom; it still functions as a toilet today, for the use of staff.

**Fabric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Timber t and g boarding, narrow</th>
<th>HV 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Hardboard</td>
<td>HV 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Hardboard</td>
<td>HV 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire protection</th>
<th>1 × ceiling mounted sprinkler head</th>
<th>NHV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td>Wc pan and cistern</td>
<td>NHV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Toilet, looking from the Curator’s Room, 2009.
**Sprinkler Room** | **Heritage Value 2**

**Description**
This small space is the back porch of the 1925-26 lean-to addition. It has a door opening from the outside to the north, and had a door into the kitchen; this door (D12) was moved at the time of the modern reconstruction of the fireplace in the kitchen, so is now partially blocked by the south wall of the sprinkler room.

| Fabric |  
| --- | --- |
| **Floor** | Timber t and g boarding, narrow | HV 3 |
| **Walls** | East and south, weatherboards | HV 3 |
| | West and north, hardboard | NHV |
| **Ceiling** | Hardboard | NHV |

| Services |  
| --- | --- |
| **Fire protection** | Space dedicated to fire sprinkler system | Neg |

---

*Sprinkler Room, from the kitchen, 2001.*

*Photo Salmond Reed Architects.*
## Passage

### Description

This space opens off the back hall and gives access to the schoolroom and two other spaces in the southern part of the skillion. The brickwork of the fireplace in the drawing room intrudes and narrows the space.

### Fabric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Heritage Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Timber boards, running through from the back hall</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Rebated plain boards, painted</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West wall, modern partition to Room 1</td>
<td>NHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>160 × 22, beaded top edge</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>Hardboard with moulded battens to horizontal part of ceiling, also broken hardboard over t and g boarding</td>
<td>HV 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td>32 × 32 moulded timber</td>
<td>HV 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney</td>
<td>Whitewashed brick</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Joinery

| Door D15  | Opening with sliding sheet of glass | NHV |
| Door D16  | 850 × 1950 × 35, 6-panel, matching D5 | HV 1 |
| Door D17  | 745 × 1815 × 35, 4-panel, matching D14, 3-pane fanlight above | HV 1 |

### Services

| Fire protection | 2 × ceiling mounted sprinkler heads | NHV |

---

Passage, looking south, 23 November 1951.

Photographer: Charles Hale, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, MU000525/001/0008
Passage, looking south, 2016, the schoolroom on the right.
Room 1, or Schoolroom Heritage Value 1

**Description**

It appears that for much of its history, this space was open to the passage, and it certainly was in 1940 (see 1940 measured drawings, where the room is labelled 'spare', page 39), and in 1977 (see MWD drawings, page 41).

No documentary evidence has been found for the construction of a partition that made it a separate room, but it is understood to have been part of the work carried out in the late 1970s. The partition was removed in 2015.

The room is lit by one west-facing window.

**Fabric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Timber boards</th>
<th>Heritage Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Flush boarding to west wall, north and south walls unlined, exposing the wall framing (70 × 55/60 studs)</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East wall, modern partition to the corridor</td>
<td>NHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>NHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>NHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling structure</td>
<td>Exposed (original) rafters, whitewashed</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Shingles and battens</td>
<td>NHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>1 × ceiling mounted sprinkler head</td>
<td>NHV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Room 1, looking north-west, 2016.
### Room 2 (Bedroom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Heritage Value 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The second room along the passage is approximately the same size and again has a single west-facing window. It is labelled 'bedroom' in the 1940s drawings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fabric</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Timber boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Flush boarding to all walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling structure</td>
<td>Exposed rafters, whitewashed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Shingles and battens (on original rafters)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Services</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>1 × ceiling mounted sprinkler head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Room 2, looking north-west, 2014.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room 3 (Bedroom)</th>
<th>Heritage Value 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main room at the south end of the passage fills the southern part of the skillion. It opens with a door to the end of the verandah, and has a window facing south and west. It is labelled 'bedroom' in the 1940s drawings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Timber boards, 145/150 wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Flush boarding, 170 wide, 10 × 14 bead in each corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>120 × 22, beaded top edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling structure</td>
<td>Exposed rafters, 70/110 × 65/70, whitewashed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>155 × 15 plain boarding to horizontal part of ceiling, elsewhere shingles and battens on original rafters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>1 × ceiling mounted sprinkler head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Room 3, looking north-west, 2009.
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## INTERIOR, FIRST FLOOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Floor Landing</th>
<th>Heritage Value 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staircase starts on the southern wall of the front hall, turns right to rise across the west wall, and turns right again to finish on a landing. The space gives access to all four upstairs rooms, as well as the attic via a ladder and hatch in the ceiling. It is lit by a high west-facing window.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>130/165 wide t and g boarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>T, g and beaded matched lining, whitewash finish East wall, vertical boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>Timber, painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>T, g and v matched lining, whitewashed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td>Timber bead moulding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balustrade</td>
<td>240 going × 182 rise, 20 × 20 balusters @125 centres, moulded handrail 55 wide × 48 deep, see measured drawings for set out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic ladder</td>
<td>120 × 40 rails supporting 7 rungs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch</td>
<td>880 × 620 hatch in ceiling, to attic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joinery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door D19</td>
<td>860 × 1905 × 32, 6-panel, matches D16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door D20</td>
<td>800 × 1800 × 27, 4-panel, no mouldings, panels fielded on outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door D21</td>
<td>860 × 1950 × 34, 6-panel, mouldings both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door D22</td>
<td>850 × 1950 × 32, 6-panel, matching D21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>1 × ceiling mounted sprinkler heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |                  |
|          | NHV              |
First Floor Landing, 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedroom 1 Heritage Value 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the main bedroom, occupying the north end of the house, with a window in each of the exterior walls – to the east, north and west. It is lined throughout with dressed timber boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bedroom 1, looking to the north-east corner, 23 November 1951.
Photographer: Charles Hale, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, MU000525/001/0058
Bedroom 1, looking north, 2000.
Photo Salmond Reed Architects.

Bedroom 1, looking north, 2016.
**Bedroom 2**

**Heritage Value 1**

**Description**

This is a small room opening off the landing, called a ‘lumber room’ in the 1940 drawings. It was divided off from the landing as a separate room early in the life of the house; the partition is a modern one, the original one having been demolished in the 1970s and then rebuilt. The room is lit by the centre window of the front elevation.

**Fabric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Timber boards</th>
<th>HV 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>T, g and beaded boards; vertical flush boards for the west partition wall</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>Timber, painted</td>
<td>HV 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Flush boarding, whitewashed</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td>Bead moulding</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Services**

- Fire protection: 2 × ceiling mounted sprinkler heads  
  - NHV

---

*Bedroom 2, 2016.*
### Bedroom 3

#### Heritage Value 1

**Description**

The smaller of two rooms that have been sub-divided from the large room that originally occupied the full width of the south end of the house; the division was made very early in the life of the house. This room is lit by an east-facing window.

**Fabric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>195/205 timber boards</th>
<th>HV 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>165/265 t, g and beaded boarding; partition (west) wall, 70 × 35 beaded studs, lining on west side, whitewashed; 75 wide triangular bead in south-east corner</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>Timber, painted</td>
<td>HV 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Flush boarding, whitewashed</td>
<td>HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Services**

| Fire protection | 2 × ceiling mounted sprinkler heads | NHV |

---

*Bedroom 3, looking south, 23 November 1951.*

Photographer: Charles Hale, Museum of New Zealand Te Puna Tongarewa, MU000535/001/0057
Photo Salmond Reed Architects.

### Bedroom 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Heritage Value 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The larger of the two sub-divided rooms, this one benefits from a south-facing as well as a west-facing window, and a fireplace on the west wall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Timber boards, tongue and groove HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>165/265 t, g and beaded boarding all walls, whitewashed; 75 wide triangular bead in south-west corner HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>Timber, painted HV 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Flush boarding, whitewashed HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplace</td>
<td>Timber surround HV 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth</td>
<td>Sandstone HV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>2 x ceiling mounted sprinkler heads NHV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bedroom 4, looking north-west with the fire surround on the left, 23 November 1951.

Photographer: Charles Hale, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, MU000525/001/0061
Photo Salmond Reed Architects.

Bedroom 4, looking south, 2009.
**ATTIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attic, South Space</th>
<th>Heritage Value 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attic space, accessible by ladder from the landing, has been partially lined and whitewashed, and roughly partitioned into two spaces. Collar ties have been removed to make the space accessible; there is a skylight on the west-facing slope of the roof. Here one can see the structural framing of the roof, principally by four triangular trusses that span (east-west) across the house; these are of heavy timbers, 140 × 80, with intermediate rafters of smaller size 80/115 × 65/80. The trusses have incised carpenter’s marks I to IV from north to south.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>145/220 boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Partition lined with 230 × 22 horizontal boards, otherwise roof structure forms the space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling structure</td>
<td>Exposed rafters, whitewashed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Shingles and battens (on original rafters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joinery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door D23</td>
<td>690 × 1675, ledged, t, g and bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>4 × ceiling mounted sprinkler heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attic South Space, looking north, with hatch showing on left, 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attic, North Space</th>
<th>Heritage Value 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The partition divides off the northern two-fifths of the attic space to make a separate room. Fabric matches that of the South Space; see previous entry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>145/220 boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirtings</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architraves</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling structure</td>
<td>Exposed rafters, whitewashed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Shingles and battens (on original rafters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>2 × ceiling mounted sprinkler heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attic North Space, looking south, 2009.
5.0 INFLUENCES ON CONSERVATION

This section deals with matters that will influence how the Mission House is treated in the future, including the objectives of Heritage New Zealand, legislative and legal requirements and appropriate conservation standards to be met.

5.1 Heritage New Zealand’s Objectives

These words were provided by Belinda Burgess, Collections Registrar, Heritage New Zealand.

The purpose of this Conservation Plan is to ensure that this record of historical continuity is preserved as nearly as possible intact and as truthfully as is possible in the absence of its original inhabitants. It sets out to establish realistic and achievable policies for the continuing use and maintenance of Kemp House.

The policies set out in this section derive from an understanding of the building’s provenance, its present condition and the assessment of cultural significance, as recorded in Section 4. These policies should guide the conservation of Kemp House, future developments on the site and all on-going maintenance and repair of the building and grounds.

The policies have the following principle objectives:

- To assess the significance of the character of the building;
- To provide a foundation for policies and strategic planning for the long term conservation of the building;
- To maintain the heritage values of the building;
- To ensure all design and maintenance decisions for the building are based on sound conservation practises;
- To present the occupation of the House by the early missionaries and the Kemp family;
- The discreet incorporation of necessary new works or elements which will enable Kemp House to continue to be used as an historic site for public use and enjoyment in a manner which minimises any loss of cultural significance;
- The establishment and implementation of a conservation process which will manage the ongoing repair and restoration of damaged and missing building elements.

5.2 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act

The purpose of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act (HNZPTA) 2014 is ‘to promote the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand’ (section 3). In achieving the purpose of the Act, all persons performing functions and exercising powers under the Act must recognise:

(a) The principle that historic places have lasting value in their own right and provide evidence of the origins of New Zealand’s distinct society; and
(b) The principle that the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of New Zealand’s historical and cultural heritage should –

(i) Take account of all relevant cultural values, knowledge, and disciplines; and

(ii) Take account of material of cultural heritage value and involve the least possible alteration or loss of it; and

(iii) Safeguard the options of present and future generations; and

(iv) Be fully researched, documented, and recorded, where culturally appropriate; and

(c) The principle that there is value in central government agencies, local authorities, corporations, societies, tangata whenua, and individuals working collaboratively in respect of New Zealand’s historical and cultural heritage; and

(d) The relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wahi tapu, and other taonga.

Heritage New Zealand maintains the New Zealand Heritage List / Rarangi Korero, and acts in a variety of ways to ensure the preservation of heritage.

**Heritage Listing**

Part 4 of the HNZPTA, ‘Recognition of places of historical, cultural, and ancestral significance’ makes provision for a New Zealand Heritage List / Rarangi Korero.

The purpose of the New Zealand Heritage List is to ‘inform members of the public about historic places …, to inform the owners of historic places … as needed for the purposes of this Act, and to be a source of information about historic places … for the purposes of the Resource Management Act 1991’ (Section 65.)

Any place may be entered on the List provided that Heritage New Zealand ‘is satisfied that the place or area has aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, technological, or traditional significance or value.’ (Section 66; part 3 of this section.)

The Kerikeri Mission House is included in the New Zealand Heritage List as a Category 1 historic place; it was entered on 23 June 1983, item number 2. Category 1 means that it is a ‘place of special or outstanding historical or cultural significance or value’.

An important implication of the listing is that any work requiring a building consent (or an application for a project information memorandum) will trigger a statutory notification to Heritage New Zealand under Section 39 of the Building Act 2004. Thus in the case of work on the Mission House that requires a building consent, Heritage New Zealand would have dual roles as applicant and reviewer.

The building is also an integral part of the Kerikeri Basin Historic Area, listed in 1986, item number 7000. The area comprises the Mission House and Stone Store; The Pear Tree, now a café, opposite the Stone Store; St James’ Church; Kororipo pa and associated kainga and wahi tapu, and land publicly owned by the Crown, Regional Council and District Council.
The area thus includes a powerful conjunction of sites, each one benefiting from a cultural heritage perspective from the presence of the others. All are visually related.

**Conservation Plans**

Section 13 of the HNZPTA lists one of the functions of Heritage New Zealand as being to ‘manage, administer, and control historic places, buildings, and other property owned or controlled by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga or vested in it to ensure their protection, preservation, and conservation’. To this end, Heritage New Zealand may adopt a conservation plan for any of its own properties (section 19).

If it does so, it shall first publicly notify the availability of a draft plan for inspection and comment, and ‘must consider any comments received and review the draft (conservation plan) before adopting it as a statement of general policy’ (section 17).

Heritage New Zealand ‘must not act inconsistently with a … conservation plan adopted under section 19 unless the Board resolves on reasonable grounds that an action may be taken that is inconsistent with a … conservation plan’ (section 20).

**Archaeological Sites**

The HNZPTA contains a consent process for any person intending to do work that may modify or destroy an archaeological site. The Act defines an archaeological site as any place that was ‘associated with human activity that occurred before 1900’ and which ‘may provide through investigation by archaeological methods, evidence relating to the history of New Zealand’ (section 6).

Any person intending to undertake work that may ‘modify or destroy the whole or any part of an archaeological site’ must first obtain an authority from Heritage New Zealand for that work. An authority is required by any person who ‘knows, or ought reasonably to have suspected, that the site is an archaeological site’, whether or not it is ‘an archaeological site or is entered on (a) the New Zealand Heritage List … or (b) the Landmarks list’.

An authority ‘is not required to permit work on a building that is an archaeological site unless the work will result in the demolition of the whole of the building’. In issuing an authority to carry out work, conditions can be imposed by Heritage New Zealand. (See sections 42 to 53.)

Certain below ground works at the Mission House (such as re-piling, should this be required), would require an archaeological authority.

Another function of Heritage New Zealand is to act as a heritage protection authority under Part 8 of the Resource Management Plan 1991 (see below).

5.3 **Resource Management Act**

The Resource Management Act 1991 is concerned with the sustainable management of natural and physical resources; it aims to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse affects of development on the environment. The Act identifies (section 6) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as a matter of national importance, and defines historic heritage as:
‘those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand’s history and cultures, deriving from any of the following qualities: archaeological, architectural, cultural, historic, scientific, technological’ and includes sites, structures, places and areas; archaeological sites; sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu, and surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources.

The Act establishes the framework for the preparation and administration of district plans ‘to assist territorial authorities to carry out their functions in order to achieve the purpose of this Act’ (section 72). A district plan may include rules which ‘prohibit, regulate or allow activities’ (section 76) in order to achieve the plan’s objectives.

Section 88 of the Act requires an application for a resource consent on a listed heritage item to include an assessment of any actual or potential effects of the work and lists matters to be considered in the Fourth Schedule of the Act. These can include ‘any effect on those in the neighbourhood, and where relevant, the wider community’ and ‘any effect on natural and physical resources having aesthetic, recreational, scientific, historical, spiritual, or cultural, or other special value for present or future generations.’

**Far North District Plan**

On the Far North District Plan, the Mission House, Kerikeri is listed as a heritage building in Appendix 1E, site number 91, and it is included in the Kerikeri Basin Heritage Precinct (12.5A).

Permitted activities are dealt with in section 2.5.6.1 of the District Plan. According to rule 2.5.6.1.2 Alterations to and Maintenance of Historic Sites, Buildings and Objects, any proposal to ‘alter, remove or destroy’ a listed building requires a resource consent. Minor repairs and maintenance are exempt.

Restricted Discretionary Activities are covered by rule 12.5.6.2 and Discretionary Activities by rule 12.5.6.3 and these too require a resource consent.

Demolition or Removal of Specified Buildings are prohibited activities in the Plan (Section 12.5.6.4); the Kerikeri Mission House is listed (see 12.5.6.4.1) as a building covered by this section.

In applying for a resource consent, and assessing the impact of any proposed change, the assessment criteria of the Resource Management Act are relevant. Under the Fourth Schedule of the Act, matters to be considered when preparing an assessment of effects include, in section 2 (d), effects on ‘natural and physical resources having aesthetic, recreational, scientific, historical, spiritual, or cultural, or other special value for present or future generations.’

There are additional criteria in the District Plan which are set out in 12.5.7 Assessment Criteria. One of these, part (n), requires consideration of ‘the policies of any conservation plan and heritage inventory relating to the heritage resource’, thus tying this Conservation Plan into any assessment process.
**Heritage Orders**

Under section 187 of the Act, a heritage order can be sought for an historic building (not necessarily a listed historic building) by a heritage protection authority. A heritage order is a provision made in a district plan to protect ‘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’, also ‘such area of land surrounding that place as is reasonably necessary for the purpose of ensuring the protection and reasonable enjoyment of that place’ (section 189).

A heritage order can be sought by a Minister of the Crown, a territorial authority, Heritage New Zealand, or by a specially approved heritage protection authority (sections 187 and 188). The effect of an order is to prevent the owner changing the place in a way that would ‘nullify the effect of the heritage order’ unless with the consent of the heritage protection authority (section 193 and 194).

Such orders are rarely sought, and generally only as a last resort where an important structure is threatened with severe alteration or demolition. In the case of the Mission House of course, a heritage order is not necessary.

### 5.4 World Heritage Site

The Mission House is part of an area that is on the Tentative List of New Zealand sites for consideration as a World Heritage Site. The site is delineated in *Our World Heritage, A Tentative List of New Zealand Cultural and Natural Heritage Sites* (Department of Conservation, Nov 2006), and follows the boundaries of the historic area listed by Heritage New Zealand. It includes the Mission House and Stone Store, Kororipo pa and associated kainga and wahi tapu, and the Kororipo whirlpool, home of the Nga Puhi ancestral taniwha Kauea.

This area is considered to have ‘outstanding universal value’, meeting some five of the criteria laid out in the UNESCO ‘Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention’. In summary, these are:

- ‘The site reflects a significant encounter between two cultures … Literacy, religious conversion, trade and technology, all had fundamental effects on Maori society.

- Introduction of firearms produced a Ngapuhi strength which changed the pattern of iwi (tribes) throughout the country and affected European settlement.

- The pa represents a traditional Maori settlement, and the buildings … represent the earliest stage of European settlement in New Zealand.’

Should the Kerikeri Basin be scheduled as a World Heritage Site sometime in the future, there would be an expectation that very high conservation standards would be applied to all parts of the site. There would also be increased visitation, with consequent demands on the fabric of the place.

The conservation and interpretation of the wider basin area, and the management of threats to the place, is developed through the policies and plans of the Kororipo-Kerikeri Basin governance and management groups.
5.5 Building Act 2004

The Building Act 2004 controls all matters relating to building construction. The following matters are of particular relevance when considering repairs, maintenance and alterations to existing and historic buildings. Several do not apply to the Mission House, but are included here for completeness.

**Repair and Maintenance (Schedule 1 Exempt Building Work)**

A building consent is not required for ‘...the repair and maintenance of any component or assembly incorporated in or associated with a building, provided that comparable materials are used’ or for ‘...the replacement of any component or assembly incorporated in or associated with a building, provided that: (a) a comparable component or assembly is used and (b) the replacement is in the same position’.

The exemption does not include the complete or substantial replacement of structural or fire rating systems or replacement of any component or assembly that has not met building code requirements.

All exempt work is required to comply with the Building Code. In particular this means compliance with durability requirements (clause B2): for structural elements, this means not less than a 50 year life; for cladding and similar elements, 15 years, and for linings and other elements that are easily accessible, 5 years. It is usually appropriate to aim for a much longer service life when carrying out repair work to an historic building; at a minimum, the repair work and new materials should have an expected durability matching or exceeding the existing elements.

Regardless of this exemption, a building consent should be sought for any significant work on the building to help keep a permanent record of major works.

**Principles to be Applied (Section 4)**

Assessment of a consent application for building work subject to the Act is required to take into account, amongst others things,

- ‘the importance of recognising any special traditional and cultural aspects of the intended use of a building’, and ‘the need to facilitate the preservation of buildings of significant cultural, historical or heritage value’ (sub-sections d and l); also
- ‘the need to facilitate the efficient and sustainable use in buildings of materials and material conservation’ (sub-section n).

**Historic Places (Section 39)**

When a Territorial Authority (TA) receives an application for a project information memorandum or a building consent for an historic place, historic area or wahi tapu that is recorded on Heritage New Zealand’s List, it must inform Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, who may review the proposed work and provide commentary on heritage matters to the TA for consideration within the consenting process. The TA may include this advice as part of the conditions of consent.
Building Consents (Sections 40 – 42)

It is an offence to carry out building work not in accordance with a building consent, except for exempted buildings and work as set out in Schedule 1 of the Act, and the Act sets out a range of fines that apply.

Section 41 (c) allows for certain urgent work, such as emergency repairs, to be carried out without a consent, but the building owner is required to obtain a Certificate of Acceptance directly after completion.

Code Compliance Certificate (Section 91)

A building consent authority must issue a code compliance certificate if it is satisfied on reasonable grounds that the building work complies with the approved building consent, and that all specified systems are capable of performing to the standards set out in the building consent.

Compliance Schedule and Warrant of Fitness (Sections 100 – 111)

The building is subject to a Compliance Schedule regime, as it contains a sprinkler system and smoke detection system, as well as escape routes and signage that need to be regularly checked to verify compliance. Section 105 sets out the building owner’s obligations to ensure that all specified systems perform as intended. Section 108 sets out the requirements for a Building Warrant of Fitness.

Putting the building back to use will require a thorough check of all the specified systems and features before an updated Compliance Schedule and a new Building Warrant of Fitness can be issued.

Alterations to Existing Buildings (Section 112)

Alterations to existing buildings require a building consent, which will be issued by the consent authority if they are satisfied that after the alteration the building will ‘...comply, as nearly as is reasonably practicable and to the same extent as if it were a new building, 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, and
continue to comply with the other provisions of the building code to at least the same extent as before the alteration’.

Alterations that do not comply with full requirements of the building code may be allowed by the territorial authority if they are satisfied that:

‘(a) if the alteration were required to comply ... 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; and
(c) the improvements referred to in paragraph (b) outweigh any detriment that is likely to arise as a result of the building not complying with the relevant provisions of the building code.’
Subsection (1) of this clause allows alterations to existing buildings to be granted consent provided that the consent authority is satisfied that after the alteration the building or part of a 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) the building will:
   (i) if it complied with the other provisions of the building code immediately before the building work began, continue to comply with those provisions; or
   (ii) if it did not comply with the other provisions of the building code immediately before the building work began, continue to comply at least to the same extent as it did then comply.

Subsection (2) allows for alterations that do not comply with the full requirements of the building code if the territorial authority is 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; and

(c) the improvements referred to in paragraph (b) outweigh any detriment that is likely to arise as a result of the building not complying with the relevant provisions of the building code.’

The ‘reasonably practicable’ provisions recognise that it not always possible to make an existing building comply with the same standards as a new building. This approach should enable some flexibility in considering other potential impacts, or any requirements for consequential work that could arise when considering building code compliance matters.

**Change of Use (Section 115)**

Similar but more onerous provisions exist for the change of use of a building. Section 115 states that an owner of a building must not change the use of a building:

“(b) unless the territorial authority gives the owner written notice that the territorial authority is satisfied, on reasonable grounds, that the building, in its new use,—

(i) will comply, as nearly as is reasonably practicable, with every provision of the building code that relates to the following:
   (A) means of escape from fire, protection of other property, sanitary facilities, structural performance, and fire-rating performance:
(B) access and facilities for people with disabilities (if this is a requirement under section 118); and

(ii) will:

(A) if it complied with the other provisions of the building code immediately before the change of use, continue to comply with those provisions; or

(B) if it did not comply with the other provisions of the building code immediately before the change of use, continue to comply at least to the same extent as it did then comply.”

**Access (Sections 117 – 120)**

In carrying out alterations to any building “…to which members of the public are to be admitted … reasonable and adequate provision by way of access, parking provisions and sanitary facilities must be made for persons with disabilities.”

These provisions are not triggered for lawful repairs and maintenance work (see above), but any significant alterations to the building, or a change of use, could potentially trigger this requirement. Strengthening work by itself is unlikely to provide a trigger, and section 112 of the Act may be applicable in some cases.

If improvements to access were to be required, NZS4121 is an acceptable solution for the design of access works. The Standard covers matters such as access ramps, toilet facilities and staff facilities.

**Dangerous, Earthquake-prone and Insanitary Buildings (Sections 121 – 132)**

A dangerous building is one likely to cause injury or death in the course of ordinary use (excluding earthquakes), whether through collapse or fire. An earthquake-prone building is one that will have its ultimate capacity exceeded in a moderate earthquake and would be likely to cause injury or death. An insanitary building is offensive or likely to be injurious to health because of its condition or lack of appropriate facilities. A territorial authority can, if it judges a building to be dangerous, earthquake prone or insanitary, require work to be done to reduce or remove the danger or to render it sanitary.

Sections 126 – 129 enable the Territorial Authority to carry out remedial work on a building if the owner will not, including issuing a prohibition notice to prevent use of the building, hoarding off the site or demolishing the building.

**5.6 Appropriate Standards**

The most appropriate conservation standards for use in New Zealand are those set out in the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value. (ICOMOS stands for the International Committee on Monuments and Sites.) The charter has been formally adopted by Heritage New Zealand and a number of territorial authorities. Given the significance of Mission House, it is recommended that all relevant requirements of the Charter be followed.
Important conservation principles contained in the charter and that are relevant in the case of Mission House are explained below. The full text of the Charter is included in this report as Appendix I.

**Carry Out Regular Maintenance**

Regular maintenance is essential to the long life of heritage buildings. If maintenance is not carried out on a planned basis, repairs become progressively more difficult and expensive, and fabric of heritage value can be lost, thus diminishing the significance of the building. A well maintained building will survive the effects of earthquakes, storms and other natural disasters better than one that is poorly maintained.

**Repair Rather than Replace**

When repairs are necessary, cut out and replace only decayed material. It is better to have fabric that is worn and carefully patched than modern replica material, however faithfully copied.

**Repair in Compatible Materials**

In carrying out repairs, materials matching the original should always be used if they are available. Work to a higher technical standard is good practice in some circumstances, and may be required by the Building Code.

**Restore with Care**

Restoration of lost features should be carried out only if there is clear evidence of the original form and detail. Such evidence could come from original drawings, early photographs or elements relocated to other parts of the building. Detailed examination of the fabric of the building can often reveal information that is not available from other sources.

**Keep Change to the Minimum**

Where alterations are carried out, change should be the minimum necessary to suit the new functional requirements. There should be the least possible loss of building fabric of heritage value.

**Make New Work Reversible**

Where possible, new work should be reversible, so that change back to the present form remains a possibility should this be required in the future. This can sometimes be difficult, particularly with major work such as earthquake strengthening. Recycle or store early fabric that has to be removed, and make new junctions with the old fabric as lightly as possible.

**Respect Alterations**

Additions and alterations to heritage buildings can have historic or aesthetic significance in their own right. Returning a building to its original form is recommended only when the significance of the original structure is outstanding and later alterations have compromised its integrity.
Document Changes

Changes should be fully documented in drawings and photographs, with the latter taken before, during and after conservation work. New materials should be identified by date stamping.

Respect the Patina of Age

Patina, the visible evidence of age, is something to protect carefully. Buildings should look old as they mature, as age is one of the qualities we value them for.

Respect the Contents and Setting

The contents and setting of a heritage building can often have heritage value in their own right and both should be regarded as integral with the building.

Illustrated London News, 1846, on the wall of Bedroom 3.
6.0 POLICIES

This section sets out a rationale and appropriate policies to guide future work on the Kerikeri Mission House, its management and interpretation.

6.1 Background

The act of restoration – returning a place as nearly as possible to a known earlier state by re-assembly, reinstatement and/or the removal of extraneous additions\(^{106}\) – is not to be undertaken lightly.

Professor J C Beaglehole, then Deputy Chairman of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, said this when opening the Mission House at Te Waimate\(^{107}\) in 1966:

‘… exactly what point in history are we to go back to in our restoration …? And how do we know exactly what the place was like at any particular moment? Only when we begin to study the history of a house do we begin to find out how difficult it is to answer that last question.

Of course we had descriptions, and drawings…. But when you want to work from such descriptions and drawings, you find, inevitably, that they don’t take you far enough. Drawings are not to scale, they’re ambiguous, they break down at some critical point, they’re contradicted by some other drawing. Descriptions fade out just when you want them to be precise. Then there is the evidence carried by the house itself, as you lift a decayed board or take down an obviously twentieth-century bit of timber. All over any old house are the evidences of change, if you know how to interpret them; but some evidence will be gone forever. Your house is, as it were, an historical document written out in wood and saw-cuts and nail holes and random roughnesses; and just as it is impossible for the ordinary historian to say about the past, This is precisely and dogmatically how things happened, these are the facts – so it is impossible for the historian of our house, reconstructing it, to say, This is exactly what the house was like when Clarke [read Butler] lived in it, or Selwyn [read Kemp] lived in it …’

The Kerikeri Mission House already stands as an exemplar of the difficulties Beaglehole enunciates. The present verandah is familiar to visitors over the last 30 years; it is the fifth one on the house and close in form to the third one. The kitchen fireplace assumes today the form it had when first built, 1832; at this time the kitchen roof was shingled, but now it is sheathed in corrugated iron, while its west-facing door opened to the outside rather than into the lean-to addition made by the Misses Kemp in 1925-26.

Restoration to the CMS Period

Actions since 1974 have set the course of the restoration of the house back to some earlier period. It is apparent from the most recent work that the intention is to see the house restored to the CMS period, perhaps to c.1840, by which time the house had matured to something close its present form, or perhaps to 1860 when the property formally came into Kemp ownership.

Such restoration is made explicit in the O’Hagan report of May 1981, which has a section headed ‘The Kemp House – Restoration to the 1840 – 1845 Period’ with illustrated evidence of the early form and details of the building.

\(^{106}\) Definition from the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage value.
\(^{107}\) Leaflet of the NZHPT, speech delivered 4 Dec 1966.
To go back to a date of c.1840 would mean the construction of a new verandah to replicate the original one; the removal of the 1925-26 lean-to; replacement of some window joinery, and many small-scale changes including to wall surfaces. Our knowledge of the original verandah is limited to early sketches, general descriptions and a few details (such as the width of the end rooms) that can be deduced from the existing fabric; there would thus inevitably be considerable supposition in its design.

To go back to the end of the period of CMS ownership, 1860, would mean reconstruction of a new verandah (to replicate the second verandah, of which our knowledge is likewise sketchy), and again the removal of the 1925-26 lean-to, replacement of window joinery, and other small-scale changes. 108

And after that, it would be difficult to say ‘precisely and dogmatically’ this is exactly what the house was like at the particular time chosen. It would also negate the Kemp family’s long history of ownership and change, and would require the ‘undoing’ of some of the significant changes made since 1974.

**Acknowledgement of the Kemp Family**

It is important to remember that James and Charlotte Kemp were living in the house from 1832, and were responsible for the construction of the southern portion of the skillion. If one considers how the family’s impact on the later history of the house might be acknowledged, through the second half of the 19th century and up to 1974, then there is a difficulty. The kitchen alterations they carried out in the 1920s and 1950s, and the decorative changes they made, however one might judge them, have all gone. Most particularly, the verandah that James Kemp Jnr built c.1895, the fourth on the house, has gone; it had stood for over 80 years, it was a graceful verandah, and a good example of period design.

The rather sad lean-to which today contains a workspace, toilet and sprinkler valves is hardly adequate recognition of their long occupation.

**Authenticity**

The truly authentic Mission House, or Kemp House, might be considered to be the one that stood on the day that Ernest Kemp gifted the building and handed over the keys to the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. At that time, the Trust inherited a building that was a seamless documentary record of 152 years of life: it had been lived in all that time, and each year, each decade, had seen very gradual change that had overlain what had gone before. As Jeremy Salmond has said 109 ‘What is remarkable is not how the house has changed, but how little it has changed during its lifetime’. This is largely due to the conservative Kemp stewardship of the building. While in its early life it had played host to events and people of importance, for a long time it slumbered quietly in a rural backwater with change coming slowly. The ‘saw-cuts and nail holes and random roughnesses’, not to mention the paint colours and the wallpapers, spelt out a long and interesting family story.

---

108 The author has seen one suggestion that the building be restored to its form on completion, 1822. This would mean (amongst much else) the complete removal of the skillion and the construction of a new verandah.

Were the house of 1974 still extant, this conservation plan would be likely to recommend its preservation, 'maintaining a place with as little change as possible'\textsuperscript{110}. (This would still allow protective measures and building code compliance requirements to be met.) The house of 1974 is of course long gone, not just by conscious action but also by the effects of time and flooding. The changes that have been made since 1974 have not been generated by the need to improve an old house to make it more comfortable to live in, but to keep it standing and to aid the understanding of visitors to a museum-type object.

The result today (albeit with 'work in progress') is a building of 2017: changes over its long history have been made first for reasons of domestic necessity (for mission families, including the Kemps, and then the Kemp descendants), and in recent times for purposes of interpretation and understanding. All changes have a distinct and important validity of their own.

\textbf{Three Stages}

The life of the Kerikeri Mission House, or Kemp House, can be considered in three parts, as set out in sections 2.2 and 2.3: the period of its construction and use by the organization that built it, the Church Missionary Society, 1819 to 1848; the long period of its occupation (and therefore survival) by James Kemp of the CMS and Kemp family descendants, 1852 to 1974, and finally its ownership by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust / Heritage New Zealand on behalf of the people of New Zealand, 1974 to the present day.

David Hamer, considering the initial history, the survival and the preservation of historic monuments, says\textsuperscript{111}: ‘The historian is interested in the history of this entire sequence or continuum and the process by which ingredients from each stage in it have fused ultimately to create the phenomenon of a preserved building. The historian’s conclusion is certain to be that what has emerged and exists today, is very different from anything that actually ever existed at any previous given point in history!’

If this position is accepted, and all change is treated equally, then the difficulties of restoration are avoided, no fabric and no evidence need be lost, and the building can tell a story that is almost 200 years long.

Salient points are:

- The house has a documented history lasting almost 200 years.
- At no particular time during those 200 years is our knowledge of the form and decoration of the house complete.
- The Church Missionary Society, James Kemp and his descendents, and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust / Heritage New Zealand have all played important roles in the creation and survival of the house.

\textsuperscript{110} Definition from the 'ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value'.

Summary
These considerations lead to the policies set out in the following section. No particular period is chosen to which the house is to be restored; instead, the house is to be presented as the continuum that it is, exhibiting the ‘random roughnesses’ of almost 200 years. While pre-1840 fabric is regarded as of exceptional cultural heritage value, and later fabric of somewhat less importance, this does not mean that the later fabric will necessarily be sacrificed. No fabric should be removed unless it is threatening the stability of the building or is in irreparable condition.

In the presentation of the house, the early period up to the 1840s is to be favoured, while the influence of the Kemp family over 142 years is to be acknowledged where possible. The actions of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust / Heritage New Zealand during the last 43 years are also accorded respect. Individual decisions would be made space by space, according to its history, its present form and furnishings, its usefulness in interpretation, and the reliability of our knowledge of earlier forms and finishes. In the broadest sense, this means an emphasis on CMS history in the ground floor rooms, and of the Kemp family in the first floor bedrooms.

6.2 Policies

Policies for the management and treatment of the Kerikeri Mission House are as follows.

1 Use
The use of a building is simply the functional purpose(s) to which it is put.

The Kerikeri Mission House shall continue in use as a house museum, available to be visited and enjoyed by New Zealanders and overseas visitors.

Only in the (presently unforeseeable) circumstance of this use ceasing to be viable, will other compatible uses be considered. A compatible use is one that does not require alterations that would reduce the cultural heritage significance of the place.

2 Maintenance
Maintenance means the protective care of a place.

The house shall be regularly maintained according to the principles and practices set out in the Mission House Kerikeri Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, 2009. (This plan includes principles on the maintenance of heritage buildings, inspection check lists and specifications.)

Maintenance shall include, as well as the day-to-day and regular work, long-term strategic work that will ensure, as far as possible, the survival of the building in perpetuity.

3 Repair
Repair means making good decayed or damaged fabric.

Repairs to the fabric shall be carried out according to the principles and practices set out in the Mission House Kerikeri Maintenance Plan, NZHPT, 2009.

In particular, repairs shall be carried out in a manner that respects the original fabric, using materials that match the original materials as closely as possible in strength, texture
and colour; details should match adjoining work. The minimum amount of decayed material shall be replaced, commensurate with a sound repair.

In all maintenance and repair work, it is important to protect the patina, the visible evidence of age, of adjacent materials.

4 Restoration

Restoration means returning a place as nearly as possible to a known earlier state.

No particular period is chosen to which the house is to be restored. Instead, it is to be presented as the continuum that it certainly is, the ‘random roughnesses’ of some 200 years.

Additions and alterations to heritage buildings can have historic and aesthetic significance in their own right, and in the Mission House changes and additions throughout its history are judged to have heritage value. The layering of history that is evident in the built fabric of the house should therefore be retained, illustrating not just early changes carried out by the Church Missionary Society, but also changing Kemp family needs and aspirations, and the aims of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust / Heritage New Zealand, over some 200 years.

The exceptions to this are:

- Where later alterations have been badly executed and should be removed or re-built for technical or functional reasons; or
- Where they have resulted in some inexplicable confusions, or
- Where they are so patently at odds with the age and character of the house that they should be re-built for the sake of authenticity.

In these cases, restoration should be considered.

Restoration, where carried out, must be based on clear evidence of the original form and detail; this information can come from early photographs, drawings, or detailed examination of the fabric of the building.

Levels of change in the fabric of the place that are appropriate for the different levels of heritage value (as defined in section 4) are set out below. The intention is that those parts of the building that are identified as having high heritage value should be retained and conserved to the greatest extent possible.

Appropriate conservation processes for the assigned values are as follows:

**Heritage Value 1 (HV 1)**

This means the space or the fabric is of **exceptional** cultural heritage value. It is generally assigned to fabric that dates from the period of CMS ownership.

Modification should be allowed only for the purpose of safeguarding the element, or to meet statutory requirements. Any such modification should be carried out only if no other reasonable option is available; it should be as discreet as possible and the minimum necessary.

Allowable processes of change include **maintenance, stabilisation, repair and restoration**.
Heritage Value 2 (HV 2)
This means the space or the fabric is of considerable cultural heritage value. It is generally assigned to fabric that dates from the period of Kemp family ownership.

Modification should be allowed for the purpose of safeguarding the element, to meet statutory requirements, or to enhance the heritage value of the place. Any such modification should be carried out only if no other reasonable option is available; it should be as discreet as possible and the minimum necessary. In the case of the enhancement of heritage value, this will be based on sound historical research.

Allowable processes of change include maintenance, stabilisation, repair, restoration and adaptation.

Heritage Value 3 (HV3)
This means the fabric is of some cultural heritage value. It is generally assigned to fabric that dates from the period of public ownership, from 1974.

Modification should be allowed for the purpose of safeguarding the element, to meet statutory requirements, or to enhance the heritage value of the place. Any such modification should be carried out only if no other reasonable option is available; it should be as discreet as possible and the minimum necessary. In the case of the enhancement of heritage value, this will be based on sound historical research.

Allowable processes of change include maintenance, stabilisation, repair, restoration and adaptation.

No Heritage Value (NHV)
Fabric of no cultural heritage value is fabric of modern origin that plays no part in establishing the heritage value of the building.

Elements of no heritage value can be retained, modified or demolished, either to accord with modern functional needs or to allow for the enhancement of heritage value.

Allowable processes of change include maintenance, stabilisation, repair, restoration and adaptation, also demolition or removal.

Negative Heritage Value (Neg)
Fabric of negative cultural heritage value is fabric of modern origin that detracts from the value of the building because it is inappropriate in such an important heritage building.

Elements of negative heritage value should be programmed for removal or redesign.

5 Adaptation
Adaptation (or alteration) means modifying a place to suit it to a compatible use, involving the least possible loss of heritage value.

Any changes to the building, which are necessary to improve its safety or to comply with code requirements, should be the minimum necessary to achieve the stated goal. Change
should be carried out in a way that respects cultural heritage values, and has least impact on fabric of cultural heritage value.

6 Execution
Execution means the carrying out of any work on the fabric of the house.

In planning and executing any work on the fabric of the building, Heritage New Zealand should ensure that proper consideration has been given to the necessity of the work; to alternative courses of action, and to whether the work complies with the requirements of this plan and the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value.

Appropriate professional advice will be sought where necessary.

All legal requirements (including those arising from the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, Resource Management Act, Building Act and Health and Safety in Employment Act) will be met.

7 Contents
The contents are the moveable objects inside the house.

The collection of artifacts and furniture in the house constitute a very important part of its heritage value.

To aid the long-term management of the collection, a conservation plan should be prepared covering all items. This should include an inventory, a description of each item, its provenance, condition, as well as cleaning and maintenance requirements. It will require the input of a specialist with knowledge of artefact conservation.

Along with this, a display and interpretation policy should be developed. This may impinge on building issues, especially in relation to circulation of visitors around the building.

8 Garden Setting
The garden setting is all that land within the legal boundaries of the site.

The garden setting is an integral part of the place that makes up the Kerikeri Mission, and an important component of its heritage value.

A conservation plan for the garden is in the course of preparation. It is important that policies for the house and the garden align, and Heritage New Zealand’s approval regime should take this into account.

9 Wider Setting
The wider setting is the visual context of the house, of roads, house and gardens, in all directions.

The wider setting of the house is also an important part of the heritage value of the place. Every effort shall be made to ensure the wider setting remains a compatible one, and that views to and from the house are protected. Building projects and planning changes in the vicinity of the house should be monitored. Heritage New Zealand should maintain a close working relationship with the Far North District Council to ensure that district plan provisions do not compromise the setting in any way.
10 Interpretation

Interpretation means any material (visual, audio, electronic) that aid people’s understanding and appreciation of the place.

Interpretation will present a story as long as that of the European settlement of New Zealand, and will deal with all facets of the history of the place and its peoples.

Specific policy on interpretation is beyond the scope of this plan. It is important to note however, that interpretation of the place is critical to people’s understanding and enjoyment, and therefore indeed, to the long-term survival of the place as a house museum.

A special onus arises from Policy 4 Restoration, since this does not allow for a blanket presentation of the building such as ‘Mission House c.1840’. Instead, each space should be treated individually: This is the history of the room, this is what it looked like at different periods in its history, you see it today as it was known to James and Charlotte Kemp, c.1840, or to Charlotte and Gertrude Kemp c.1925, or to Ernest and Dory Kemp c.1955 (etc, as the case may be).

It is therefore imperative that high standards of interpretation are met, and that new material is researched, sought and displayed. It must be made a vitally interesting place for people to visit.

Along with the policy on contents (Policy 7), a display and interpretation policy should be developed; this will require the input of a specialist with knowledge of the operation of house museums.
6.3 Building Implications of the Policies

In addition to the regular maintenance and repair work required to the Mission House, there are one-off tasks that flow from the policies enunciated in the previous section. In summary, these are:

**Exterior**
Monitor the weatherproofness of the present verandah.

If for technical reasons it cannot be made weatherproof (and it is essential that it be made so), consideration be given to putting back James Kemp Jnr’s verandah of c.1895.

**Interior**
Fill in the rough door opening between the pantry and the dining room, and attend to linings on both sides.

Attend to the discontinuity in the door from the kitchen through to the lean-to, which opens half and half into two spaces; this might involve the relocation of the sprinkler valves and some pipework.

Partially stripped off wall linings in many rooms need attention. Some of the finishes upstairs could be put back as the Kemp family had them, scrim and paper in the main bedroom for instance; whether this is feasible would depend on the extent of the records.

Each of these jobs requires investigation and documentation; execution will depend on resources available to Heritage New Zealand.

‘Kemp House and St James’ Church, no date.
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ICOMOS New Zealand Charter
for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value
Revised 2010

Preamble

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose of conservation

1. The purpose of conservation

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

In general, such places:

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

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

2. Understanding cultural heritage value

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

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

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

3. Indigenous cultural heritage

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

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

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

4. Planning for conservation

Conservation should be subject to prior documented assessment and planning.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Minimum intervention

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

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

7. Physical investigation

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

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

8. Use

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

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

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

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

10. Relocation

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

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

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

11. Documentation and archiving

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

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

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

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

12. Recording

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

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

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

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

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

**Conservation processes and practice**

14. **Conservation plans**

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

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

15. **Conservation projects**

Conservation projects should include the following:

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

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

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

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

17. Degrees of intervention for conservation purposes

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

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

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

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

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

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

18. Preservation

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

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

i. Stabilisation

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

ii. Maintenance

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

iii. Repair

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

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

19. Restoration

The process of restoration typically involves reassembly and reinstatement, and may involve the removal of accretions that detract from the cultural heritage value of a place. Restoration is based on respect for existing fabric, and on the identification and analysis of all available evidence, so that the cultural heritage value of a place is recovered or revealed. Restoration should be carried out only if the cultural heritage value of the place is recovered or revealed by the process. Restoration does not involve conjecture.

i. Reassembly and reinstatement

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

ii. Removal

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

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

20. Reconstruction

Reconstruction is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material to replace material that has been lost. Reconstruction is appropriate if it is essential to the function, integrity, intangible value, or understanding of a place, if sufficient physical and documentary evidence exists to minimise conjecture, and if surviving cultural heritage value is preserved.

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

21. Adaptation

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

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

22. Non-intervention

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

23. Interpretation

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

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

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

24. Risk mitigation

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

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