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executive summary

Pompallier House Historic Reserve (the Reserve) is located in Russell. The Reserve is a distinguished cultural landscape. It encompasses not only the well known historic Pompallier Mission, but also its extensive gardens and grounds, neighbouring historic Clendon cottage and its garden and grounds and part of a significant pa. The Pompallier building was bought by the Crown in 1943 (see table page 13). New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT, now Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga) was appointed to control and manage the Reserve in 1967. The Reserve was formed in 1976, following purchase of the Clendon property. The Gazette in 1976 included Clendon cottage as part of the Reserve. It is one of the most visited historic sites in New Zealand, with over 20,000 visitors annually. The Reserve deserves to be interpreted as a pre-eminent cultural heritage landscape.

A Conservation Plan was prepared for Pompallier in 1990. This guided restoration works not only to the building, but also to the garden and grounds associated with it. Subsequently New Zealand Historic Places Trust identified a need for future restoration works to be guided by a conservation plan specific to the gardens and grounds.

The surviving Greenway/Stephenson gardens and grounds are significant for the survival of an early colonial New Zealand garden layout. This conservation plan also considers the way in which the site and its structures fit into a broader narrative of Maori and Pakeha New Zealand is socially and historically significant. The Pompallier and Clendon properties comprise a landscape that was at the centre of the intertwining contact period of Maori and European, particularly French and English, history.

A comprehensive statement of significance is included within the conservation plan setting out the overall significance of the site and more detailed significance of elements of the gardens and grounds.

The Conservation Plan includes as its vision

"to protect, and where possible, enhance the significance of the Reserve gardens and grounds as a pre-eminent cultural landscape and to respect the integrity of the character areas and many features within these that contribute to its heritage value".

Conservation policies to realise this vision and protect the significance of the Reserve’s gardens and grounds are established. The key direction of the policies that evolved from the development of this document are:

- The Greenway/Stephenson garden is currently well-maintained and most policies and procedures have been prepared to support existing, ongoing work.
- Stephenson’s hillside would benefit from a return to its parkland character through vegetation management.
- The Clendon Cottage gardens have undergone considerable change early in their development and the key features currently span a broad period of time. The gardens have significance but may accommodate further change within appropriate constraints.
- Clendon hillside should continue to be managed as an undeveloped landscape setting for the Printery, and Clendon Cottage as well as Kororareka Bay.
- The turn-around area does not currently complement its historic significance and would benefit from a change of use that is less focussed on vehicles.
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purpose of this conservation plan

This document is a conservation plan (Plan) for the gardens and grounds of both the Printery and Clendon Cottage, a property collectively legally known as Pompallier House Historic Reserve. For the purposes of this report, the whole site (as per legal gazette) is referred to as the ‘Pompallier House Historic Reserve’, the building on the Pompallier Mission property is referred to as ‘the Printery’, and the building on the Clendon property is referred to as ‘Clendon Cottage’.

This Plan sets out the significance of the Pompallier House Historic Reserve as a whole and its component parts and provides policies for the conservation and maintenance of the gardens and grounds.

This Plan will be treated as a living document with regular minor reviews.

the brief

A team led by Boffa Miskell Limited, including Rod Clough Associates, was commissioned to prepare this Plan in November 2010 by Gordon Hewston on behalf of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga (now Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga).

Heritage New Zealand has identified the need for a conservation plan for the gardens and grounds of Pompallier House Historic Reserve. Heritage New Zealand considers that the values of the Reserve are paramount and provide excellent opportunity to illustrate with integrity, an important part of the history of New Zealand. The brief therefore required a conservation plan to be professionally prepared to meet a standard acceptable to statutory authorities and Heritage New Zealand, and to provide guidance on the conservation and maintenance of the site.

The subject of this Plan is the gardens and grounds; it does not extend to the buildings on the Reserve. This Plan is concerned with the buildings only in terms of their relationship with the landscape, gardens and grounds and their central role in the site’s historic narrative. Conservation plans specific to the Printery and Clendon Cottage have been prepared (refer to Salmond, 1990 and Howard, 2010 respectively).

Plate 1 Russell/Kororareka taken from Flagstaff Hill
methodology

A conservation plan aims to understand why a place is culturally significant and sets out to identify how the various significant elements of the place will be managed. A conservation plan is a particularly useful tool for places that comprise more than one cultural asset or known layers of historical accounts.

Conservation plans complement management and restoration plans and form the assessment stage of a management plan. The purpose of the conservation plan is to:

• Help guide and prepare a detailed management plan;
• Provide a baseline from which to evaluate the impact of any new proposals or developments;
• Provide a framework within which to effectively assess the opportunities and constraints, values and issues associated with the site;
• Form part of a design brief for any development proposals or adaptive reuse of existing structures or areas;
• Inform decision making;
• Prioritise works, including a programme of regular maintenance; and
• Help to inform interpretation and education projects.

This conservation plan is modelled on The Conservation Plan; A Guide to the Preparation of Conservation Plans for Places of European Cultural Significance (Dr J. S. Kerr, 1996). The relevant national/international charters have also been taken into account including: the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (ICOMOS NZ, 2010), the Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (Australia: ICOMOS, 1988; referred to as the Burra Charter, Charter of Venice (1964); the UNESCO Recommendations (1976). The draft NZHPT guidance ‘Assessment Criteria to assist in the identification of Heritage Values and Significance’ (October 2010) and guidelines by NZHPT for preparing conservation plans were also consulted.

The Plan examines conservation issues that will affect the future of the Reserve. This is approached through an examination of the history of the site and an assessment of the significance identified cultural heritage features. The plan identifies specific actions to address issues and threats to the significance.

Statutory and District Plan requirements have been reviewed. This review has informed a set of policies for the conservation of the Reserve.

documenting the site

The Printery has been the subject of detailed research. There is a large quantity of primary and secondary source material relating to the history and development of the Pompallier property and, to a lesser extent, the Clendon property. Less is recorded about the history of the site prior to European settlement.

This Plan relies heavily on desktop research. Significant work has been previously undertaken in terms of historical and archaeological investigations and analysis. Additional material was sourced as part of a comprehensive desktop research exercise. General histories of the wider area including other mission properties were also consulted. Photographs have been collated to demonstrate landscape change including the impacts of land use and development trends.

The draft management plan for the Reserve, the Implementation Plans for the hillsides, the comprehensive draft history prepared on the Pompallier property and the draft Clendon Cottage Conservation Plan have been particularly invaluable. The 1990 Conservation Plan prepared by Salmond Architects for the Printery was also an important reference document and particularly its section devoted to the garden. Whilst not the subject of this Plan, it should be noted that the 1990 Conservation Plan for Pompallier Mission was prepared to guide conservation works undertaken during the 1990s. This is due for a review.

A full bibliography is provided at the end of the report.

In addition to the desktop analysis, compilation of a photographic and written record of landscape and heritage elements, features, patterns, qualities and condition that contribute to local distinctiveness or character was undertaken during two site visits, the first on December 17th 2010 and the second on February 25th 2011.
structure of the plan
This Conservation Plan follows a five-part structure:

Part I Identification of Property: provides a background to the current ownership status and key influences on the site. Three tables are provided summarising the history of the Pompallier and Clendon properties in terms of changing land use, time, and graphic evidence of change over time.

Part II Historical Narrative: the history of the Reserve is expanded with a comprehensive description of the site and its place in the wider New Zealand setting. This includes a chronological summary of the development and change of the components of the Reserve.

Part III Significance: Assesses the significance of the garden and grounds and their historical development. It identifies key phases of development and sets out the elements of significance for each of these and for the property’s overall significance. The general approach used for the assessment of significance of the Reserve and its components is adapted from the method proposed by J.S Kerr (1996).

Part IV Issues and Policies: Identifies the risks, conditions and vulnerabilities pertaining to the property and its elements. Establishes the framework for protecting and enhancing the elements of significance and sets out conservation policies together with more specific actions.

Part V Documentation: comprises a bibliography of all written documents consulted, and a reference list of all photographs examined.
understanding the property

status / ownership
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

The Printery, Clendon Cottage and the surrounding grounds and gardens are part of the 1.8379ha Crown owned 'Pompallier House Historic Reserve', the legal gazetted name for the property located on The Strand, Russell. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (Heritage New Zealand) is appointed under the Reserves Act 1977 to control and manage Pompallier House Historic Reserve. The role of Heritage New Zealand as defined by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 is "to promote the identification, protection, preservation and conservation of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand".

Legally, the Reserve is made up of the following three parcels of land:

- Allotment 13 Lot 13 Town of Russell, Block 1 Russell SD (4362m2)
- Part Allotment 14 Lot 13 Town of Russell, Block 1 Russell SD (8955m2)
- Part Lot 1 DP 29544, Block 1 Russell SD (5062m2)

Today, the Printery and Clendon Cottage sit within the same parcel of land, Allotment 13.
Far North District Council

The Far North District Council (FNDC) is the relevant controlling local body. The following items are scheduled in the Far North District Plan (FNDP):

**Schedule of Historic Sites, Buildings and Objects**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Strand, Russell</td>
<td>Pompallier (printery &amp; Clendon Bungalow)</td>
<td>I (#4) II (#420)</td>
<td>Allot 13 Sec 13 Town of Russell SD, Historic Gazette 84/4890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89 &amp; HP4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schedule of Notable Trees**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>The Strand, Russell</td>
<td>* Araucaria heterophylla (Norfolk Pine) ** Eugenia myrtifolia (Monkey Apple)</td>
<td>4608 2304</td>
<td>Allot 13, Town of Russell, Pompallier House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89 &amp; HP4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It should be noted that whilst the drip line of the Norfolk Pine is located within Part Allotment 14, the trunk is located within Council owned land.

The property was originally located within the Strand Heritage Precinct in Russell but the then NZHPT supported and submitted on a plan change (c. 2004) so that the site is now part of the Christ Church Heritage Precinct, as referenced on map HP4 of the FNDP. Pompallier House Historic Reserve is also located within a Conservation Zone.

The policies and objectives of the FNDP that are most relevant to Pompallier House Historic Reserve are outlined in part IV of this document. Key sections are Section 9.7 (Conservation Zone) and Section 12.5 (Heritage).
The 1995 Far North District Landscape Assessment did not assess larger urban settlements such as Russell, however the coastline on either side of Kororareka Bay (Unit C4) was rated as significant. Reasons cited include ‘A degree of containment and individual identity conveyed by units’ and ‘cultural patterns between historic coastal settlements such as Horeke, Rawene and Kohukohu and the sea.’
historical summary

The tables below provide a brief summary of key matters pertaining to the history of the site in terms of key phases of use of the property/ies, their development chronologically and finally a visual comparison of changes using available images. More detailed descriptions of the history and development of Pompallier House Historic Reserve are provided in part II of this document.

Table 1 – Phases of Past Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Pompallier</th>
<th>Clendon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre-1800s</td>
<td>Maori settlement of Kororareka beachfront. Chief Tupare’s pa, Te Ke Emua (Te Keemua), was a major pa complex situated on the hill behind the present-day Historic Reserve and extending south along the ridge that encircles Tahapuke Bay. In the 1700s, Nga Manu (Ngati Manu) received land on the Kororareka peninsula including the pa, from Chief Tupare (Ngare Raumati), in utu. There is evidence of continual Maori occupation of the Kororareka foreshore during this time however it seems that neither the pa nor its immediate environs were re-used. When Ngati Manu/Uri Taniwha chief Kiwikiwi made the first sale to a European in 1827 of the area now largely Allotment 13 Lot 13 and Part Lot 1 DP 29544, its southern boundary was marked with a pou to separate the pa and its environs. (Martin, 2008)</td>
<td>First recorded acquisition of land that was to incorporate the ‘Pompallier’ property by a European settler in 1827. There may have been sawyering activities on the site associated with the first European owner Johnson (Best, cited in Clough &amp; Associates, 2011). There are records of further buying and selling, suggesting speculative investment. Buildings are erected on the site by Ben Turner and were rented out and used for commercial purposes. (Draft Management Plan, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820s-30s</td>
<td>First recorded acquisition of land that included the ‘Clendon’ property by a European settler occurred in 1833. Further records of buying and selling suggest speculative investment. First record of a building on the site - likely that it was both a store and a dwelling. (Howard, May 2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830s-40s</td>
<td>Part of the ridge above the ‘Pompallier’ property was at this time known as Puketutu, chief Moka’s seat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830s-50s</td>
<td>In 1839, the southern part of Turner’s property (the boundaries that comprise the Pompallier property today) were sold to Pompallier – and became headquarters of the French Catholic Marist Mission. One of Turner’s buildings was used as the Bishop’s dwelling. (Draft Management Plan, 2003)</td>
<td>In 1835 Clendon acquires the land - at this time the property was much larger than it is today, extending south into Tahapuke Bay. A small rock face at the foot of Clendon Hillside is said to have been quarried by the missionaries at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s-50s</td>
<td>Property becomes a crowded compound. Printery built in 1841-42 - housed a printing press for dissemination of religious literature. Other buildings in the compound included a chapel, cookhouse, workshop, accommodation and other outhouses. (Salmond, 1990)</td>
<td>From 1840, Clendon may have been using the existing building primarily for trading rather than as a dwelling. The dates as to when today’s Clendon Cottage was built or when Clendon and his family actually occupied the building are uncertain. (Howard, May 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850s-1870s</td>
<td>The Callaghan era: the property incorporated a tannery and leatherworks until c1867. The printery/tannery is progressively converted into a dwelling. (Worsfold 1946; Maingay 1993)</td>
<td>Clendon’s debts resulted in his Russell property being issued in Reverend Frank Gould’s name. Frank Gould was husband to Clendon’s daughter Fanny. Cottage leased to Robert Barstow after Clendon’s move to Hokianga. (Howard, May 2010) Photographs show the property was well-treed around this period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870s-1900s</td>
<td>The <strong>Greenway era</strong>: Greenway finished the conversion of the printer/tannery into a <strong>grand home</strong>. Greenway buys neighbouring Turner property, significantly extending the northern boundary. Together with his sister Jane Mair, establishes the <strong>garden and orchard</strong> that largely survive today. (Salmond, 1990)</td>
<td><strong>Annie Mason</strong> buys property in 1876. Cottage may have been used by Mason and her mother Harriet Johnson as a <strong>boarding house</strong>. Mason <strong>subdivides</strong> land into three. (Howard, May 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900s-1940s</td>
<td>The <strong>Stephenson era</strong>: further renovations to the house and garden were undertaken. Key changes to the garden included the tennis court that was put in on the front lawn and the development of the hillside behind the house/former printery with plants and pathways. (Salmond, 1990)</td>
<td>The <strong>Bisset era</strong>: Clendon Cottage operates as a boarding house, named <strong>The Bungalow</strong>. A number of changes to the building are made and the two sections of adjoining land purchased, ‘reuniting’ some of the property. (Howard, 2010) The front gardens change considerably over this period , becoming increasingly simple and ‘low maintenance’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWII</td>
<td>1942-1943 The building was <strong>commandeered by the military</strong> as a residence for officers for six months during the Second World War. (Salmond, 1990; and draft Management Plan, 2003)</td>
<td>The Bungalow was not registered as a boarding house in Wises Auckland Directories between 1941-44. (Howard, May 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s-1960s</td>
<td>In 1943 the Pompallier property is bought by the State and extensive reconstruction undertaken. Property opened to the public as an ‘historic monument’. The garden’s unity of design is recognised but many changes are made based on incorrect assumptions and with an eye for serving a new function as a tourist destination. The hillside is divided off and placed with the Department of Lands and Survey and reverts to scrub. (Ross, 1970)</td>
<td>Lennox Bisset inherits The Bungalow. Successive tenants and owners run it as a <strong>guest house/hotel</strong>. (Howard, May 2010) <strong>Further garden elements are removed</strong>, opening views to beach and further simplifying layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s-1970s</td>
<td><strong>New Zealand Historic Places Trust appointed to control and manage in 1967</strong>. Research begins to reveal origins of building as housing a printing press rather than a Bishop’s residence and the true origins of the gardens. (Ross, 1970)</td>
<td>Property changes hands in the 60s but generally continues operating as guest house/motel (a four-unit motel block was built during this period). <strong>Pompallier Lodge Development Ltd draw up plans to develop property as apartments</strong>. (Howard, May 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s-1990s</td>
<td>In 1976 the Government completes compulsory purchase of Clendon Cottage. <strong>Pompallier House Historic Reserve formed</strong> comprising both the Pompallier property and Clendon Cottage. The property was opened to the public for some 15 years after the first period of closure post 1976, then closed again between 1990-1993 while major conservation work undertaken. The building was restored to its Marist history and the gardens returned to the Greenway/Stephenson era. <strong>Clendon property used as accommodation for curator/custodian</strong>. (Howard May 2010; draft ‘The Pompallier Garden’; and Kate Martin pers comm)</td>
<td>In 1976 the Government completes compulsory purchase of Clendon Cottage. <strong>Pompallier House Historic Reserve formed</strong> comprising both the Pompallier property and Clendon Cottage. The property was opened to the public for some 15 years after the first period of closure post 1976, then closed again between 1990-1993 while major conservation work undertaken. The building was restored to its Marist history and the gardens returned to the Greenway/Stephenson era. <strong>Clendon property used as accommodation for curator/custodian</strong>. (Howard May 2010; draft ‘The Pompallier Garden’; and Kate Martin pers comm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s-2010</td>
<td>In 1993, work is completed on the Printery building and property re-opened. The hillsides behind the Printery building and Clendon Cottage are both added to the Reserve. Clendon Hillside is cleared of most exotic weed species and work begins on revegetating with native plants in 2008. <strong>Curator moves out of Clendon Cottage in 2011</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 - Chronological Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Property P/C</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1800s</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Changing Maori occupation and control of Kororareka and its resources. Te Keemua pa was in disuse at the time of European arrival.</td>
<td>Farley &amp; Clough, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>First European visitor, Captain James Cook arrives in the Bay of Islands but does not enter the inner harbour or Kororareka.</td>
<td>Claudia Orange. ‘Northland places - Bay of Islands’, Te Ara, updated 2-Mar-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Church Missionary Society (CMS) arrive in NZ and establish mission station at Rangihoua</td>
<td>(Howard, May 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Wesleyan Missionary Society (WMS) arrive in NZ</td>
<td>Corder, Hallowed Treasures, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>29 December – John Johnson (sawyer, speculator, grog-seller) paid local chief Kiwikiwi, two muskets for a parcel of land near the south end of Kororareka Bay.</td>
<td>Salmond, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>‘Girls War’ – Ngati Manu ceded Kororareka peninsula to the Patukeha hapu and others</td>
<td>Howard, May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>13 rangatira, including Rewa of the Patukeha in Kororareka, send letter to King William IV to ask for assistance in protection of their lands, particularly from the French.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.treatyofwaitangi.net.nz">http://www.treatyofwaitangi.net.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Clendon was present at Maori Declaration of Independence at Waitangi. ‘Clendon’ land sold to James Harvey who left the title deeds with Clendon as surety for the Clendon ship Fortitude and its cargo.</td>
<td>Howard, May 2010. <a href="http://www.treatyofwaitangi.net.nz/Clendon%E2%80%99sDespatches.htm">http://www.treatyofwaitangi.net.nz/Clendon’sDespatches.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Rome officially recognised the Society of Mary (Marists) and Pompallier is made a Bishop.</td>
<td>E. R. Simmons. ‘Pompallier, Jean Baptiste François - Biography’, from Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, updated 1-Sep-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>8 December – Johnson sells Pompallier land to Gilbert Mair (ex CMS and trader).</td>
<td>Salmond, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>13 January - Bishop Pompallier and missionaries arrive in NZ, in the Hokianga and celebrates first mass.</td>
<td>J.R Cole, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>6 July - Turner sells southern part of land (70 feet wide by 600 feet deep) to Pompallier. There was a dwelling on the land which was partitioned and extended to become the bishops dwelling and resident and visiting priests. Catholic mission headquarters established.</td>
<td>Ibid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Property P/C</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>6 February - Treaty of Waitangi 1st signing. Pompallier, Clendon, Rewa and many others from Kororareka attend.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Construction of ‘surviving’ Clendon Cottage thought to have occurred.</td>
<td>Howard, May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>Mission compound crowded with buildings by this time – a tiny chapel, the printery and store and a pise and timber house for Maori pupils and canoemen, a cookhouse, carpenters workshop and well-house and on the hillside, overlooking the others, a small house for Maori visitors.</td>
<td>Salmond, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>The Printery is completed. Government shifts from the Bay of Islands to Auckland. A tannery was established to provide leather for book binding under an agreement with James Callaghan to operate it for his own use as well as mission purposes.</td>
<td>Salmond, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>James Clendon officially granted title to Clendon property (but confirmed in retrospect to 1835) following dispute with Harvey.</td>
<td>Howard, May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>11 March, 1845 - Northern War between disaffected Maori and British troops breaks out in Kororareka, on hillside behind mission. The southern end of the town including the mission survives intact, protected by Maori attackers. British Soldiers occupy Turner’s Row. French Catholic missionaries remain in Kororareka throughout although the printing plant is removed for safety and returned after the war in 1846.</td>
<td>‘Draft Management Plan for Pompallier House Historic Reserve,’ 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>The printer and most Marist personnel are withdrawn following disagreement between Pompallier and the Marist Society and due to increasing demand for priests in the main centres. NZ is divided from Western Oceanica and split into two dioceses. Pompallier moves to Auckland and the Marists to Wellington. Callaghan stays on as caretaker, moves in with his family and continues tanning business.</td>
<td>Taylor, August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Some work, possibly extensions, was undertaken on the cottage.</td>
<td>NZHPT comments, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>26 May – Pompallier sells mission compound to James Callaghan (tanner). He established a commercial tannery on the property, digging tanning pits behind and within at least the rear part of the building.</td>
<td>Maingay, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>At some time between 1844 and 1854 the Clendon cottage property was in the possession of James Stephenson Clendon (James Reddy Clendon’s son). James S. Clendon made the cottage property over to his parents in November 1854, in trust for Kate Erridge Clendon (who was 15 at the time). In 1858, it was agreed that Kate Clendon would receive 200 acres at Papakura in exchange for the Clendon Cottage land (presumed to be an exchange with her brother in law, Frank Gould whose name later appears on the Clendon property title.)</td>
<td>Northern Archaeology Research Limited, ‘Clendon Cottage Drainage Works’, April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Clendon moves away from Russell and eventually settles in Rawene where he builds Clendon House. Rev Frank Gould (Clendon’s son-in-law) takes ownership however the Clendon Cottage Conservation Plan suggests it’s unlikely the Goulds ever lived there. It is recorded that a tenant, Robert Barstow (resident magistrate at Russell) lived in the cottage from 1859.</td>
<td>Ibid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>This is recorded as the date that Gould sells Clendon property to Annie Mason. Mason eventually rents it out to Mrs Johnson to operate as a boarding house.</td>
<td>Howard, May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>November – James Hamlyn Greenway called in his debts and acquired the property from Mr and Mrs Callaghan’s heirs. Engaged Miller brothers to convert printery to a more comfortable dwelling. Remaining mission buildings are demolished except for the chapel.</td>
<td>Salmond, 1990 ‘draft Management Plan for Pompallier House Historic Reserve,’ 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>6 February. Greenway buys the neighbouring Turner property from the sons and heirs of Ben Turner. The remaining buildings were demolished and Greenway and his sister Jane Mair establish gardens and orchard.</td>
<td>Salmond, 1990 ‘draft Management Plan for Pompallier House Historic Reserve,’ 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>1 February. Greenway sells a strip in the northwest corner of the new (Turner) section to Thomas Hansen, making the Pompallier property the size it is today.</td>
<td>Best and Turner, July 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Clendon Cottage functioned as Mrs Johnson’s boarding house (Louisa Worsfold). Two early survey plans (1890 Wheeler Plan and 1907 survey) show the boarding house.</td>
<td>Howard, May 2010 Northern Archaeology Research Limited, ‘Clendon Cottage Drainage Works’, April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>4 December – Greenway sells the Pompallier property to his sister Maria Anne Greenway.</td>
<td>Salmond, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>12 October – JH Greenway sells the former Turner block to his sister.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>The house and grounds appear somewhat neglected or at least, overgrown, by this time. Maria Greenway moves out, apparently leasing the Pompallier property to Henry Stephenson. The Stephensons almost immediately establish tennis court on front lawn, formalise the garden and put up flagpole.</td>
<td>Table 3, Views of Printery (i) NZHPT, ‘draft: The Pompallier Garden’, undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1908</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>According to the title deeds (CT13/48), Annie Mason subdivided the Clendon property into three parcels between January 1907 and September 1908. Agnes Cecelia Fanny Burton purchased part of the property in January 1907. Hugh Gordon Seth Smith Esquire purchased the area outlined in land map SOS670A in March 1908. The third section on which Clendon Cottage stands was sold to Robert Bolor in September 1908.</td>
<td>Northern Archaeology Research Limited, ‘Clendon House Monitoring’, July 2009 Howard, May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Bisset family purchase the Clendon boarding house, naming it ‘The Bungalow’. It is from this period on that a number of outbuildings are erected and the garden layout begins a series of developments that see it evolve to a simple, functional style, with increasing expanses of lawn and more open to the Bay.</td>
<td>Howard, May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>12 August – Maria Greenway sells property to Henry Stephenson (harbourmaster) who develops the grounds further, and the hillside in particular.</td>
<td>Salmond, 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Property P/C</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914-1918</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>World War I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Isabel Bisset purchases the two former blocks of Clendon land – ‘reuniting’ the property.</td>
<td>Howard, May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-1945</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>World War II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>The Pompallier building was commandeered for the officer’s mess for 2 Battalion, Auckland (Countess of Ranfurly’s Own) Regiment. Dr Roy Lange, the former Prime Minister David Lange’s father, was among those stationed there.</td>
<td>NZHPT, ‘draft: The Pompallier Garden’, undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-1949</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>Pompallier building bought by Crown and extensive reconstruction undertaken – becomes ‘historic monument’. One of the first major reconstruction works carried out by the Ministry of Works. The hillside section of the property was divided off and placed with Lands &amp; Surveys Dept. for management.</td>
<td>Internal Affairs, letters between Knight and McPherson 1946/7 NZHPT, ‘draft: The Pompallier Garden’, undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-1968</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Clendon property changes hands from Lennox (Bruce) Bisset to Henry Ritchie and Charles and Phyliss Robb to Pompallier House Environments Limited operating as a guest house/motel.</td>
<td>Howard, May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c1950s</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>Removal of boundary hedge on the Pompallier, Clendon boundary.</td>
<td>Figure 24 (Whites Aerials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>National Historic Places Trust established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>NZHPT appointed to control and manage the Pompallier House Historic Reserve (NZ Gazette 1967/858). Subsequent research revealed previous assumptions about the use of the building had been misplaced.</td>
<td>‘draft Management Plan for Pompallier House Historic Reserve,’ 2003 Ross, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1976</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Ownership of the Clendon property moves from the Eaddys to a partnership with Roy Hayward (Pompallier Lodge Development). Plans are developed for an apartment block on the site.</td>
<td>Howard, May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Compulsory acquisition of Clendon Cottage property and management transferred to NZHPT. Ministry of Works removed all the additional structures on the Clendon property and substantially rebuild Clendon Cottage.</td>
<td>Howard, May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Added to Register of Historic Places (Category 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Pompallier</td>
<td>Added to Register of Historic Places (Category 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Northern Maori and Catholic Church returned Bishop Pompallier’s remains to Hokianga. Ceremony included a two day hui at the gardens of the Pompallier mission.</td>
<td>Taylor, August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Clendon</td>
<td>Clearance of weed species and storm damage, followed by revegetation of Clendon hillside.</td>
<td>Martin, November 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 - Chronological Viewpoint Analysis
The same views captured over time from:

Views of Pompallier House Historic Reserve from Flagstaff Hill

a. 1836, Polack: An early picture of Russell showing two buildings at the southern end of Kororareka Bay (that may be associated with Robert Cunningham) in the vicinity of the present Pompallier House Historic Reserve. (NAR, April 2009)
   (Alexander Turnbull Library, PUBL-0115-1-front)

b. 1843, Pharazyn (detail): Another early picture from Flagstaff Hill showing the development of this area - the Printery, Clendon Cottage and a number of other buildings have been erected in the vicinity of the present Historic Reserve.
   (Te Papa Tongarewa, 1992-0035-875)

c. 2011, Boffa Miskell Ltd: The Printery can still be seen at the southern end of the bay and Pompallier Historic Reserve now forms a key undeveloped area of open space with the expansion of the town of Russell.
Views of Pompallier House Historic Reserve from Kororareka Bay

d. 1844. Ashworth: this early image shows the Pompallier Mission compound already clustered with buildings including the Printery. (Alexander Turnbull Library, E-042-030-a/031-a)

e. 1851. Jones (detail): showing Clendon Cottage (centre) and the Printery (left, at back). (Alexander Turnbull Library, C-003-002-3)

f. 2011. Destination Northland: Today, the Printery and Clendon Cottage are the surviving buildings in this view, now surrounded by considerable vegetation growth.
Views of Pompallier House Historic Reserve from Clendon Hillside

g. 1904, photographer unknown: This photograph shows the well-planted front gardens at Clendon Cottage and the front path as a straight path between two yews, in the centre of the property. The wide, curving entrance path to the Printery (then the Greenway home) can also be seen.

(Te Papa Tongarewa, C.013312)

h. 1912, Godber: The front lawn of Clendon Cottage can clearly be seen, now with the entrance gate and pathway (mirroring the wide, white path at the Greenway property next door) at the northwest corner boundary. By now, the gardens have predominantly been put into lawn. The garden beds, hedges, path and flagpole next door can also be clearly seen.

(Alexander Turnbull Library, APG-0724-1/2-G)

i. 2010, Boffa Miskell Ltd: Today, an even more expansive front lawn at Clendon Cottage can be seen and the front path is once again straight up the centre of the property. The various elements of the Greenway-Stephenson garden remain.
Views of the Printery from front lawn

j. c1904. Unknown: Taken towards the end of the Greenway’s ownership, the garden in this photograph appears somewhat neglected and overgrown. The location of certain plants can be determined such as the Arundo donax in the centre of the image.

(Alexander Turnbull Library, 1/2-003090-G)

k. c1970s. Phillips: This photograph follows the appointment of NZHPT to manage the Pompallier property. The Arundo donax has been removed and the garden beds appear brightly coloured and under frequent maintenance.


l. 2011. Boffa Miskell Ltd: Extensive research done in the 1990s identified the species and location of many of the original plants. This photo shows the replacement of the Arundo donax for example, and the minor central pathway.
Views of Clendon Cottage from front lawn

m. c1904. Unknown: Garden beds of Alpinia species can be seen extending out from the Cottage. The front path can also be seen in the centre, flanked by the beds.

(Auckland Institute and Museum, DU 436.112 R96)

n. c1930s. Unknown: By this time, all the garden beds have disappeared. A small pergola has been erected in front of the verandah.

(Auckland Institute and Museum, C 20 840)

o. 2011. Boffa Miskell Limited: Today, a narrow strip of garden bed lies immediately against the front verandah and the central front path has been reinstated.
Surveys

p. Post 1859, SO920: The original long, narrow shape of the Pompallier property can be seen in this plan.

q. 1907, DP5670: The division of the Clendon property can be seen in this plan with two buildings present and the Printery is also shown at the top of the image.

r. 1971, DP66711: This plan also shows the edge of the Printery building at the top of the image. Below this boundary is the collection of buildings associated with Pompallier Lodge on the former Clendon property.
historical narrative

topography and setting

The Pompallier House Historic Reserve is located in Russell, originally named Kororareka. Russell is located at the end of a peninsula that extends in a northwest orientation into the Bay of Islands. The small town is centred on Kororareka Bay, a long, sandy bay between two rocky headlands. The west-facing bay has deep waters and a sheltered aspect.

The Far North District Landscape Assessment (1995) describes the coastal units around Russell as ‘Estuarine inlets and harbours’, and identifies the strong degree of shelter and enclosure and serene quality as key characteristics.

The Pompallier House Historic Reserve is situated on The Strand at the southern end of Kororareka Bay, between the beach and the slopes of the headland. Today, the Printery and Clendon Cottage are the southernmost buildings on Kororareka Bay and the grounds extend to the ridge of the hill behind. The sloping land which has a northerly and northwesterly aspect, occupies the south-eastern two-thirds of the area. All of the buildings and more intense development are on the balance of near-flat land.

The geology in the general Bay of Islands area, including in the vicinity of this site, is of very old weathering sandstone known as “Greywacke”. The soils at the site are predominantly made up of grey-brown gravels on the beachflats and red and yellow clays on the hillside slopes with thin topsoils. Land drainage from the sloping land is mostly as broad sheet flow with some piped and surface drains across the lower flat ground. A landslide was recorded in 1840 and covered the then part-built mission chapel. Other identified slip-prone areas are to the north and south sides of the quarry rock face. (Haigh Workman, 2008)

Historically, the Kororareka peninsula was bush-clad, including some kauri stands. (‘Natural Areas of Kerikeri Ecological District’, 1999 and ‘Hillside Implementation Plan’, 2008). However, Maori occupation over centuries followed by some of New Zealand’s earliest European settlement has meant that the Clendon Hillside has been clear of any significant vegetation for a very long time. Local memory and pictorial evidence indicate that most of today’s vegetation has only grown in the last 30-40 years (Martin, 2008).

The vegetation currently within the Historic Reserve is highly varied. The designed and planted gardens on the flat largely comprise exotic species including orchard trees, vegetables, roses, climbers and vines, shrubs and flower beds. The Stephenson hillside is also a designed landscape and includes a variety of mature native, exotic and introduced trees and under-plantings. Until recently, the Clendon hillside was covered with dense grasses and a mixture of mostly self-seeded, native and introduced trees, predominantly wattle. These weed species have recently been removed and work has begun on planting young native grasses, flaxes, shrubs and trees on the hillsides.

The area experiences seasonal weather extremes with heavy rainfall through winter then high temperatures and drought through summer and regular periods of very strong winds. All winds are salt-laden.

As well as the gardens and lawns surrounding the buildings on the flat, there is a turning area for vehicles accessing the end of The Strand. It also provides staff vehicle access to the rear of Clendon cottage.

The Strand is a narrow road that extends along Kororareka Bay. It passes immediately in front of the properties, between the beachfront berm and the picket fences that mark the boundaries of each garden. Early images (e.g. Figs 6-9 between 1836 and 1840) do not depict any formalised access along the waterfront however a rough track can be discerned above the foreshore in an 1858 Moresby photograph (Fig 10). The area between Mean High Water and the property boundaries is delineated in an 1876 Certificate of Title (Fig 5) and later in 1971 is also annotated as ‘Public Road Crown Grant’.

There are a number of properties that are immediately
adjacent the Historic Reserve. Tahapuke, borders the south boundary. It is a private property with right of way across the Pompallier Reserve at the foot of the Clendon Hillsides. It incorporates a mix of native and introduced trees and includes the main features of Te Ke Emua pa.

A number of private residential properties share the northern boundary of the Reserve, each with small, residential gardens.

The eastern boundary is shared with the Hanson property. This is also a private property. Much of it has recently been cleared of wattle and other weed species. This property also includes some features of the Te Ke Emua pa. Part of the eastern boundary is also shared with an area of Department of Conservation Reserve.

To the west of the property, it is bounded by The Strand and Kororareka Bay. The road and berm, which features two large listed Norfolk Island Pines, is managed by the Far North District Council. The foreshore is managed by Northland Regional Council.

Visually, the Printery is the most prominent feature of the Reserve, being slightly elevated from The Strand. It is two storey and has a distinctive form and material use. Tall boundary hedges restrict public views from The Strand so that the key viewpoint into the Pompallier property is through the gateway at the southern boundary. Views into the Clendon property are restricted to the central front gate and through the driveway accessed of the turn-around area. The Kororareka foreshore drops steeply away from The Strand, limiting views to the gardens of the Historic Reserve from the beach and from close water views.

In comparison, the hillsides above the buildings are not only visible from a wide area, but physically dominant and form the southern arm of, and backdrop to Kororareka Bay.

Historically, the most important views of the properties have been from Kororareka Bay, from the northern end of Kororareka Bay on Flagstaff Hill, and from Clendon Hillside. Many of the earliest images in which these properties appear have been captured from these viewpoints.
development of property

Sources
The summary of Maori history is drawn from a range of published and unpublished sources referenced in the text. The Heritage New Zealand review process for this Conservation Plan included consultation with iwi to help ensure the Plan provides an articulation of Maori values of the site and wider area; the historical narrative has been amended accordingly.

From the early years of European settlement, evidence is primarily based on panoramic photographs taken from the northern end of Kororareka at Flagstaff Hill or sketches from out at sea. These are helpful for resolving the spatial relationships between buildings and properties but details of the gardens cannot be distinguished. Few detailed images have been uncovered of either the Greenway’s garden or the garden at Clendon cottage prior to 1900. However, Louisa Worsfold, whose mother Jane Mair laid out the Greenway garden, recorded her memories in ‘A Social History of Russell and Much Also’ (1946) which includes some detailed accounts of their garden, though these are somewhat erratic and may not be entirely reliable.

This situation changed during the Stephenson era when a number of photographs were taken of their garden that have enabled a detailed analysis of the garden layout and plant species. Photographs of Clendon gardens also become more frequent from around the same time – 1912 onward.

Following the Government’s purchase of the Pompallier property, a site survey was drawn (1946) showing the main structure and elements of the garden at the time. A number of internal letters and documents from this time concerning the reconstruction of the gardens were made available to Susan Clunie in the 1990s. Other plans and proposals for future development were put forward for both the Clendon and Pompallier properties between the 1960s and 1980s.

Since the Heritage New Zealand administration of the property, in-depth research has left behind numerous resources including articles, maps and proposals for restoration. Ruth Ross in particular was involved in the restoration of the Waimate North Mission House and Clendon House in Rawene as well as the Printery, and she undertook considerable in-depth research for each. Recent curators of the Pompallier property have continued this research.

Maori History
The gardens and grounds at Pompallier and Clendon properties were created in a landscape that was already overlaid with a rich Maori narrative.

Before European settlers arrived, Kororareka was one of many small settlements in Pewhairangi/Bay of Islands region. During the 18th century, groups within the area included Ngati Kahu, Ngati Pou, Ngati Rehia, and Ngare Raumati (Belich 1996; 91). Ngapuhi appear to have emerged in the mid to late 1700s as an alliance of hapu. This alliance was opposed by similar alliances of related kin groups, located across the southern Bay of Islands and around the Hokianga. Alliances were based around marine resources and also competed for the inland garden areas. After 1815, the northern alliance grew in both political and economic power. When Hongi Hika returned from a visit to England in 1821, he brought with him a shipment of around 400 or 500 muskets, arming the northern alliance (Belich 1996: 160).

Originally home to the Ngare Raumati iwi, the Kororareka peninsula changed hands on more than one occasion. During the early 17th century, the pa Te Ke Emua on the southern boundary of the Pompallier Historic Reserve was occupied by Ngare Raumati and their chief, Tupare (Martin 2008 p.3). Later in the 17th century, Ngare Raumati withdrew from the Kororareka peninsula and Te Keemua, in favour of Nga Manu (today known as Ngati Manu). By 1825 Ngapuhi had sufficient power to defeat their previous allies, Muripaenga and Ngati Whatua. They then conquered Ngare Raumati (1826) and Ngati Pou (1827), gaining control of a number of trading posts, with control of Kororareka finally wrested from the southern alliance in 1830 (Sissons et al. 2001: 151). The final step of this process saw the name Ngapuhi extended to include the other related hapu within the southern alliance and those around the Hokianga (ibid.).
While there is evidence of continual Māori occupation of the Kororareka foreshore, no traditional Māori or early European record describes later occupation or reuse of the pa or its immediate environs (Martin 2008 p3). When the area was known largely as Allotment 13 Lot 13 and Part Lot 1 DP 29544 was first sold to a European in 1827 by the Ngati Manu/Uri Taniwha chief Kiwikiwicketi, its southern boundary was marked with a pou whenua to separate the pa from its surroundings (Martin, 2008 p 3). In the 1830s to early 1840s, chief Moka’s seat (Puketutu) was held further north along the ridge within part of the area that is now known as Stephenson’s hillside (NZHPT, 2003).

In the Clendon Cottage Conservation Plan, Martin has provided the following information:

‘Today, descendants of Ngare Raumati, Ngati Manu and Patukeha share Kororareka Marae on the site of Rewa’s kainga on The Strand. It is important to note that the boundary between the historic Catholic Mission & Clendon Cottage, first established in 1827, and the pa above remain significant to them today.’

**European Settlement**

*The first important European settlements in New Zealand – in the Bay of Islands on the east coast and the Hokianga on the west – were those that had come about naturally. Their kauri forests and neighbouring harbours, which were able to supply both spars and shelter for ships, answered the needs of the time and beckoned to the shores a surprisingly large sea-going population.* (Platts, 1971)

Kororareka was the first permanent European settlement in New Zealand, and prior to 1840, the largest. It served initially as a base for whalers and sealers and was an important trading centre and became a significant point of contact between Europeans and Māori.

‘... when Capt. Hobson, the first Governor, landed in the Bay of Islands, he found a considerable number of Europeans, Americans, and some of other nations, congregated in a little bay known as Kororareka (the present site of the town of Russell). There were also two Māori pās standing in the forefront, containing, as tolerably permanent occupants, about 100.’


Along with the whalers and sealers and numerous naval expeditions, Christian missionaries were also quick to arrive in the Bay of Islands. Compared with other Christian denominations however, the Catholic response to the publicity following Cook’s voyage was less immediate. Although the Church Missionary Society (CMS) had been in New Zealand since 1814, the first real Catholic planning for the Pacific only came in January 1830 when Rome approved the new mission territory of the South Sea Islands. On 10 January 1836, Rome established the Vicariate of Western Oceania which included New Zealand.

In the Lyons area of France a small group of priests had been seeking official recognition as the Society of Mary, its members called ‘Marists’. Rome invited the society to accept the new mission field of Western Oceania. Jean-Baptiste Pompallier was appointed Bishop. Pompallier arrived in New Zealand in 1836 and soon after, travelled to Kororareka, deciding to establish the headquarters of the mission there. In 1838, Bishop Pompallier purchased the land that was to become the Pompallier property from Benjamin E Turner. By this time there was a network of CMS and Wesleyan mission stations functioning across Northland.

Literacy, introduced by these Christian missionaries became an increasingly important feature of Māori culture in the 1830s. Trade, with its introduction of European technology influenced the shifting of Māori economic goals, while literacy introduced foreign political, social and religious ideas as well as opening doors to trading opportunities.

In 1835, thirty-four northern chiefs, including Moka and Rewa (who were directly connected to the Pompallier House Historic Reserve land), signed a declaration of independence, stating that all sovereign power and authority in the land resided with the chiefs and inviting King William IV of England to continue to be the ‘parent’ or ‘mua’ and Protector from attempts on its independence. There is also a historical connection between two of the witnesses to the declaration, James Clendon and Gilbert Mair. Likewise, the signing in 1840 of the Treaty of Waitangi, and the events leading to its preparation also has a multitude of strands connecting it with Pompallier House Historic Reserve; the people and the place.

Following the signing of the Treaty, the focus of the Bay of Islands as an important economic and political centre in New Zealand changed when government shifted to Auckland in 1842. The original Russell (Okiato) was virtually deserted as trade and shipping also transferred to the new capital. Kororareka gradually assumed the name Russell in its place. The drop in the price of whale oil, together with Government assumption of control of land and timber sales, anchorage fees and customs duties etc in the early 1840s, saw Kororareka’s prosperity decline.

In the winter of 1844, Hone Heke cut down the flagstaff on Maiki Hill (Flagstaff Hill) as a protest against Government treatment of Māori and the economic losses to the north as a result of the relocation of the capital. Hostilities eventually erupted in March 1845 with fighting between Heke’s forces and British troops throughout Kororareka. Much of the town was destroyed with the exception of buildings to the rear of the town and the southern part containing the mission compound, due in part to Kawiti and Heke’s orders to spare it and to their distance from the British naval frigate’s (HMS Hazard) bombs.

During the Northern War 1845-46, the British blockaded the Bay of Islands. Later, especially once the troops withdrew from the Bay in 1858, the township was gradually rebuilt with its main source of income once again coming from the
provisioning and refitting of whaling ships. Later, other industries such as manganese mining, fish canning and coal were also important to the area.

From the early 1900s Russell became known as a quiet historic town. Zane Grey, an American novelist and big game fisherman came fishing here in the mid-1920s and his enthusiasm helped develop an early tourism industry in the Bay of Islands.

The purchase of the Printery occurred in the context of a growing interest through the 1930s by the Crown in the preservation of New Zealand heritage—considered at this time to be represented by European buildings. Later, the addition of Clendon Cottage and creation of the Historic Reserve was part of a broadening awareness of national identity and what that comprises.

Russell is the earliest examples of a precinct being established in New Zealand to protect historic values. The Bay of Islands Operative District Scheme created two Russell Historic Protection Zones in the mid 1970s, to function temporarily until the final recommendations of the 1977 planning study could be incorporated (Denis Nugent et al cited in Howard, May 2010, p20). This was a direct result of the Russell community’s response to development plans at Clendon Cottage and the instigation of its compulsory purchase by the Crown. This Bay of Islands action in turn influenced the HPT Act 1980 that allowed for Historic Precincts. A number of historic precincts are in place in the current Far North District Plan and one of these incorporates the Pompallier House Historic Reserve.

Historical layout of Pompallier Mission Property

After generations of Maori occupation and use, the land for the Pompallier Mission was first acquired by a European in December 1827 (Martin 2008 pp 1-2; Clunie 1993 p 10). Ngati Manu chief Kiwikiwi, ceded the land to sawyer, John Johnston (sometimes spelt ‘Johnson’ but recorded as ‘Johnston’ in the Deed), in exchange for two muskets, its position and boundaries described as:

'bounded in manner following that is to say in length along the Beach at low water mark in a north and south direction (as measured by a line) of one hundred and sixty eight feet in length and drawn from a certain Jager post and passing the end of a certain saw pit to the low water mark for a distance of one hundred and eighty (180) feet: and the said land is also bounded in an east and west direction by a line drawn at right angles from the said low water mark and extending up the hill for a distance of six hundred feet: and the said land is further Bounded by the lands on the South side of Mai Anga commonly called King Charley, and on the North by the lands of Wareumu commonly called King George’

(Maori Deeds of Old Private Land Purchases in New Zealand, From the Year 1815 to 1840, with Pre-Emptive and Other Claims, accessed at URL http://www.nzetc.org/tm/scholarly/tei-TurOldP-t1-g1-g1-g2-g9-t1.html)

Johnston kept the land for approximately ten years, eventually selling it on to Gilbert Mair, a prominent trader in the Bay. Within months of his purchase, Mair sold the land to Benjamin Turner, described as a “transported felon, violent ruffian, notorious grog seller and natural businessman” (Clunie 1993 p 11). Turner proceeded to build a row of cottages, all of a similar appearance, along the waterfront of the property which came to be known as Turner’s Row (Best 1993 p 11).

Figs 8-9 are among the earliest pictures of Russell showing the study area (S. Polack c.1835/6 and A. Earle c.1838). Both images show the hillside clear of all vegetation and presumably under grass. The buildings on the beach flat (in the area of the current Clendon and Pompallier properties) are thought to be associated with Johnston and Turner however it is also possible that one of these buildings is associated with Robert Cunningham (NAR, February 2009).

On the 6th July 1839, Turner sold part of his land to Bishop Pompallier. The land purchased by Pompallier was a long narrow strip, approximately 21 metres wide and extended inland back up the hill for 134 metres. The property contained the southernmost of Turner’s cottages, a small house which

Fig 8, detail of drawing by J S Polack 1836
Alexander Turnbull Library, PUBL-0115-1-front

Fig 9, detail of ‘Kororareka Beach’ A Earle 1838
Alexander Turnbull Library, PUBL-0015-06
was subsequently used as the Bishop’s residence (Best 1993; Ruth Ross 1970; Salmond 1990).

By the end of 1841, a small chapel had been erected, a number of other buildings had been added to the property including accommodation, cookhouse, workshop and well-house structures, and the construction of the printery had begun. The Printery was completed in 1842 and the first printing began in October of that year (Best, 1993 p 11).

It is widely agreed that there is unlikely to have been any significant planting established by the Marists within the compound. The flat, beachside part of the property was crowded with buildings. An image from 1844 (refer to Table 3, image D) illustrates the tight cluster of buildings at the southern end of the Bay and the cleared hillside beyond. This part of the land was also mostly beach shingle and potentially unsuitable for gardening. One of the French priests wrote that the mud (a result of the landslide of March 1840) surrounding their chapel proved “most disagreeable to the English, who are so delicate on these matters” (Salmond, 1990 p7). Instead, the missionaries are said to have kept gardens elsewhere in Russell (Susan Clunie, 1991) and missionary Pierre-Marie reported back to France on their 1844 Kororareka vintage: “Our little vineyard has given us more than 120 bottles of white wine this year.” (Munro, 2005)

That early winemaking experience was later developed in other parts of New Zealand when, following the end of the Pompallier mission at Kororareka, Bishop Viard despatched the Marists to Hawke’s Bay to establish a mission and farm. After landing in Gisborne instead, due to a storm, they planted vines there in 1850 before returning to Hawke’s Bay, where they built their headquarters and planted another vineyard in 1851 at Pakowhai, now Mission Estate (Stewart, 2007). Some of the vines planted here had initially been grown and produced wine at Kororareka (Martin, 2011, comments on draft Conservation Plan).

This trading and sharing of seeds between missionaries, traders and other visitors led to the introduction of a wide range of plant species into the Bay of Islands and Russell during the early to mid 19th Century.

Many of the early settlers in Russell, irrespective of their social standing, relied upon their gardens for sustenance. With so many people trying to establish productive gardens at once, plants, seeds and cuttings were frequently exchanged or shared. This exchange and access to plant material was highlighted in a letter by Sarah Greenwood in 1843, who wrote:

“We are seldom without two or three vessels in the harbour, which keep the town supplied with most things, one from in port, has fruit trees and seeds of clover, lucerne etc. We have ordered 18 trees and intend buying some seeds. Mr Boddington kindly gave us a few seeds of various vegetables, and our inestimable Captain Wakefield says we shall be welcome to anything in his nice garden, particularly strawberries.” (Dawson, 2010)

An important source of plant material was from the passing sailors who would visit Russell and trade for provisions and building materials. This included the many whalers who both visited the Bay of Islands and established homes there. Whaling ships often brought new foods and plants into New Zealand, including different types of vegetables; for example in 1819 an American whaling ship introduced a larger and sweeter variety of kumara which was quickly adopted into both Maori and settlers gardens. As whalers themselves began to settle in the Bay of Islands, and establish their own gardens, they too would have traded with passing travellers and fellow traders.

Archaeological and architectural evidence indicates that tanning was being undertaken on the Pompallier property at the rear of the compound by Irishman James Callaghan from the 1840s (Maingay, 1993 and Salmond, 1990).

The mission was disestablished in 1850 when the Marists departed the Bay of Islands, and the printing press and related machinery soon followed. Callaghan and his family remained at the property until eventually purchasing it in May 1856 (Best 1993).
Fig 10 is the 1858 Moresby photograph. The two paddocks on the hillside shown in 1838 are not evident. The image shows the hillside still largely in grass. A few small pockets directly below the summit may be regenerating manuka. In the 1864 Kinder photograph (Fig 11) this regenerating manuka appears to have grown. A narrow strip paddock extends behind the Pompallier property up to the ridge with the paddock immediately to the south behind Clendon Cottage extending only half way up the hill. A photograph of the south end of Russell taken in 1868 (Fig 12, photographer unknown) shows the ‘Clendon’ paddock extending right up to the back ridge. It has been proposed that these enclosures may have been established by the Callaghans who had a few goats, sheep and a pig at another property in Kororareka and are likely to have moved the animal to the Pompallier property. The areas thought to be regenerating manuka have spread further (see NAR, 2009).

Apart from enclosing the hillside with a fence, there is no other evidence found to suggest that the Callaghans attempted to establish much in the way of a garden on the property.

By the mid-late 19th Century there was an established network of merchants and scientists operating between the Bay of Islands and the UK and Australia. This ‘network’ allowed plants to be traded, as well as knowledge and ideas to be shared. James Busby, an important figure in the establishment of plant exchanges at the time of Greenway, had close connections with the Royal Sydney Botanic Gardens, with whom he exchanged plant material and information regarding the economic value of New Zealand plants and trees. However, it wasn’t only the economic values of native New Zealand plants that were discussed and exchanged, the appreciation of flowers and plants for aesthetical reasons also drove the plant trade and exchanges.

This ‘network’ of people influenced the planting undertaken at Pompallier during the Stephenson Era. Both Greenway and Stephenson are likely to have known James Busby and Joel Polack who in turn knew Thomas McDonnell. Busby, Polack and McDonnell had close connections with the Royal Sydney Botanic Gardens and Kew Gardens in London. The relationship between these people and the sharing of plants within this ‘network’ of people is evident in the distribution of Norfolk Island pines in Northland, in 1836 via Thomas McDonnell:

“Mrs Stevenson planted Norfolk Pines at the same time as Mrs Busby planted hers [two] at Waitangi, Mrs Williams at Paihia and Mrs Mair at Wahapu.” (Dawson, 2010)

In 1877, following the deaths of the Callaghans, James Hamlyn Greenway called in his debts and took over the property. Greenway undertook considerable changes to the property, converting the former mission printery into a home and together with his sister Jane Mair, also laying out the gardens. The neighbouring Turner property was purchased, almost doubling the size of the original narrow strip of land, and the buildings that remained from the mission and Turner’s Row were demolished. In 1882, Greenway sold a small strip in the northwest corner of the new section to Thomas Hansen, making the Pompallier property the size it is today (Best and Turner 1997).

Jane Mair (nee Greenway) is attributed with the creation of the garden on the property, establishing the structure and key elements - the hedges, paths, flower borders and orchard that largely remain today. Jane Mair’s daughter, Louisa Worsfold writes

‘...I only remember after we came to the big house to live, and when the grounds were being laid out...’ (Worsfold, 1946, p11).

It seems that the focus of the Greenway’s gardening efforts was the flatter land immediately around their home. It appears likely that the hillside above remained largely in grazing. The photograph of Louisa Worsfold in the garden around 1904 (Table 3, Views of the Printery (j)) shows a grassed hillside behind the house and low growing scrub on the Clendon hillside. However it is noted in the draft history, ‘The Pompallier Garden’, that some orchard planting occurred on the hillside.
In the 1904 photograph the garden appears overgrown, indicating that it may have been run down. The 1880s and 1890s in New Zealand have come to be known as the ‘long depression’ and there has been some speculation that the rambling appearance of the gardens and the vegetable garden on the front lawn is related to these difficult times. In 1905, Maria Greenway and her family moved out and the Stephenson family took ownership of the property.

Further development of the grounds and gardens took place during this period with a refurbishment of the house occurring first. In the grounds, the key changes attributed to Henry Stephenson are the establishment of a lawn tennis/croquet court, erection of a flagpole, and development of the hillside which has been described as being ‘formalised into a park’ (‘The Pompallier Garden’) with a zig-zag path to the top of the ridge and an avenue of Totara trees.

Stephenson collected many plants for his gardens in Russell, both prior to and whilst living at Pompallier. His exposure to the trade industry as a consular official and as Inspector of Fisheries, gave him access to key people involved in plant exchange and trade. Upon moving to Pompallier it is likely that Stephenson transplanted some of his plant collection, and is likely to have continued adding to it while working as Inspector of Fisheries and living at Pompallier.

It is apparent that plant exchange and the network of people involved in developing the botanical trade between local settlers and distant institutions will certainly have influenced not only the plant material available to Greenway and Stephenson but also the ideas and reasoning behind some of their planting decisions.

The Stephenson family had moved out by 1942 when the house was commandeered by the army for six months.

In 1943 when the Government took ownership, a reconstruction of the house and garden was begun, some aspects of which were based on misunderstandings of the property’s past. The hillside section of the property was also divided off and placed with the Department of Lands & Surveys for management. Prior to the purchase, historian Dr J.C Beaglehole visited the property and in a report to the Secretary for Internal Affairs, he wrote

‘Under the army, the place reverted to jungle and the Clifford Joneses have made great strides in putting the place back into order again. There are, besides native growth, fruit-trees, some fine old hibiscus bushes, and an even finer old hedge planted in the early days of the house...’ (Internal Affairs letters, Beaglehole to JW Heenan 15/2/43)

Care and maintenance of the garden appears to have initially been haphazard and limited. The initial focus was on the restoration of the house, which was under the advisory of Professor Knight. Knight was the first Professor of Architecture at Auckland University and had a key role in the restoration of many ‘heritage’ buildings throughout New Zealand. Late in 1945, Professor Knight approached James McPherson (Auckland City Parks and Reserves Department) for guidance on planting and layout of the gardens and grounds.

McPherson (landscape architect and horticulturalist), prepared a report proposing the ‘restoration’ of the gardens of Pompallier House. He divided the grounds into sections and made recommendations for the planting of each area. The development plan was seemingly based partially on history and was specific to the garden but drew primarily on a general knowledge and experience of garden history and a particular focus on creating a ‘form attractive to the visitor’. A survey plan was undertaken by McPherson in 1946, identifying the layout and plants present at the property at the time (see Appendix 2).

By late 1947, approval was given to proceed with McPherson’s recommendations and some minor works were carried out. This included tree-felling and the introduction of new plants (some plants were donated, including a number of fruit trees from McPherson, others included cuttings such as the box hedge recorded as having come from Te Waimate, and others were purchased by the caretakers at the time). Also among these changes, was the removal of the hedge on the southern boundary and by removing and bulldozing the Greenway orchard, the construction of a formal garden to the north of the Printery.

Jane Mair’s curvaceous flower borders were straightened, the flagpole moved to the front lawn, additional flower borders were dug into the lawn inside the front hedge and all hedges were pruned to below shoulder height (Martin, 2011, comments on draft Conservation Plan).

When the New Zealand Historic Places Trust took over the property in 1967, comprehensive research began to be undertaken, initially by Ruth Ross and later, others regarding its history. By the 1980s the gardens were once again the subject of concern and another landscape plan submitted, the vision of which was explained as,

‘The house itself is the main reason for our being here at all and so the house must be the main focal point, enhanced by the garden, and not the garden enhanced by the house.’ (Cullinanes, 1982 cited in ‘draft: The Pompallier Garden’)

In the late 1980s it was suggested that the Pompallier Mission and Clendon Cottage properties should be presented as one unified context - ‘the whole area should flow and merge and read as Pompallier’ (Dashper, 1987 cited in ‘draft: The Pompallier Garden’) – representing a philosophical shift towards a more holistic, ‘landscape’ led view of the environment, but one that failed to understand the full historical narrative of the place.

Subsequently, it was decided to return the grounds as closely as feasible to the Victorian-Edwardian, Greenway-Stephenson condition and layout (Susan Clunie, quoted in Heritage New Zealand, Winter 2010). Management of the grounds has followed this objective as much as practicable,
though there have been differing perspectives on how this should best be achieved.

The key changes are briefly summarised below (further information is available in New Zealand Historic Places Trust (1993-2000) 'The Pompallier Garden.' Draft history in White Ringbinder):

- Removal of institutionally-introduced flower beds, plants and trees
- Return to original shape of flower borders and lawn
- Return of the flagpole to its original site
- Hedges allowed to grow to historically maintained height
- Sourcing and returning original plants to their historic layout
- Identifying original orchard layout and plantings and sourcing same or similar cultivars
- Return of Stephenson Hillside and addition of Clendon Hillside
- Removal of institutional plantings on the Stephenson Hillside and repair of Stephenson pathways and fencing

Curators/property managers such as the Clunies and more recently Kate Martin, have continued to delve into the history of the property to obtain as detailed and accurate a picture of the past as possible.

Today, the shape of the Greenway/Stephenson gardens and hillside has broadly survived, along with much of the hedging, the Totara avenue, the flagpole and a few other trees and shrubs.

**Historical layout of Clendon Property**

Clendon Cottage has also been known as ‘Clendon’s House’, ‘The Bungalow’ and ‘Pompallier Lodge’. After the NZHPT purchase, the Ministry of Works and the NZHPT opted to retain the earlier name of The Bungalow. (Howard, May 2010). In February 2010, the NZHPT board resolved to change the name in the NZHPT Register from Pompallier Lodge to Clendon Cottage.

In 1833, 4 acres including Te Ke Emua pa and the area now referred to as the Clendon Hillside was transferred by the Patukea chief Rewa to Robert Cunningham (Martin 2008 p 3).

Cunningham is thought to have built the first dwelling ‘on or near the site of Clendon Cottage’ (NAR, May 2009) but it is unclear whether this building as a whole or in part developed into Clendon Cottage during James Reddy Clendon’s ownership from the 1840s, or whether it was entirely replaced during Clendon’s ownership (Howard, May 2010).

Other early modifications to the site include the small rock face at the foot of the Clendon Hillside (in the area now occupied by the car-park) which is thought to have been quarried around 1839 to 1842 by Pompallier’s missionaries when building at their neighbouring mission (Martin, 2008). A small structure, possibly a small house or shed is shown above the quarry area on the Rev J. Kinder’s 1858 watercolour of Russell (Figure 13). However, no building can be seen in this area on the Moresby photograph also taken in 1858, but it is possible this photograph may predate the construction of the building (NAR, 2009).

![Fig 13, detail of watercolour by Kinder 1858 Auckland Art Gallery, 0/337, OCM 1455, 1937/15/8/A](image1)

Figs 14-15, ‘Brinds Claim’, a plan based on surveys undertaken in 1844 and 1857 and Survey plan SO 920, show the Clendon property incorporating Tahapuke Bay.

![Fig 14, ‘Brinds Claim’](image2)

![Fig 15, SO 920](image3)
James Reddy Clendon acquired the land from his former business partner James Harvey when Harvey absconded with Clendon’s vessel, the Fortitude. The deeds related to approximately 4 acres (although a later survey deemed it to be over 8 acres) of land and a building and were officially granted to Clendon in 1844 (but confirmed in retrospect to 1835).

Clendon did not take up full-time occupancy of his home at least until 1850 (Martin 2008 p 3). It appears that Clendon may have used the property as a “townhouse” from which he could conduct his various business enterprises, as his main residence was located at Te Wahapu (NAR 2009 p 10). It is also recorded that Clendon’s married daughter managed a boys’ boarding school out of the house during the period 1853-60 (NAR 2009 p 10). Photographs from around this time, at the end of the ‘Clendon’ era, show that the gardens were well-treed and private (Refer to Figs 10-12).

It is recorded on old land plans dated 1890 (SO5602, Fig 16) that a Mrs Johnson owned the house and grounds, while the house and property to the south was owned by a James Deary (NAR 2009 p 10). While it is known that both of these houses were still standing in 1907, it is not known for certain when the Deary house was demolished, but it is likely that it may have occurred some time prior to the 1970s (NAR 2009 p 10).

It was Annie Mason who subdivided the property into three. The sections were subsequently ‘reunited’ in 1932 when Isabel Bisset purchased the remaining two (this land remained part of the Clendon Cottage property until the compulsory acquisition in 1976).

During the lengthy ownership of the Bisset family some of the most fundamental changes to the property, both the building and the grounds, were undertaken. In terms of the garden, its character essentially changed to a functional, easily maintained, open area which is how it was managed until the 1980s and 90s.

Following the sale of the Clendon property by Lennox (Bruce) Bisset in 1953, it subsequently changed hands several times until Pompallier Lodge Development Ltd took it over in 1974 and developed plans for an apartment block on the site.

The Town and Country Planning Appeal Board concluded that the apartments would have an adverse effect on the enjoyment of Pompallier and when Clendon Cottage was acquired under the Public Works Act it was ‘to protect the setting of Pompallier next door’. (Howard, May 2010)

Eventually, all the additional structures on the Clendon property were removed and Clendon Cottage, substantially rebuilt. Pat Nicholls, was the first Pompallier curator/property manager to move into Clendon Cottage in September 1981. Prior to this, Nicholls and her predecessors had lived in a flat upstairs in the Printery. Clendon Cottage was used as staff offices and accommodation until February 2011. Plans are currently underway to change the use to staff...
and visitor facilities.

The scale of modifications to the Clendon gardens over many years means there is little sense of an original form to the grounds that can be easily traced. Nevertheless there are key characteristics and elements that have been retained over a lengthy period – such as the broad front lawn set back from The Strand, a central pathway, a few leafy specimen trees and flower/shrub beds generally close to the house.

In contrast, since the construction of the pa site, the hillside appears to largely have been ignored, perhaps because of its steep terrain. It has been grazed and fenced and there is some indication that a small hut may have been built there around the 1830s-40s. However there has been little else in the way of development or cultivation. ‘Local memory and pictorial evidence indicate that most of today’s vegetation has only grown in the last 30-40 years, seeded from the contemporary Russell environment and the Pompallier grounds’ (Martin, 2008 p4).

**key people associated with the place**

**Tupare**
During the 17th century, Tupare was the Ngare Raumati chief whose pa, Te Keemua (also known as Te Ke Emua) forms the ridge of Clendon hillside (and extends south into the Tahapuke property, encircling Tahapuke Bay). He was forced to relinquish his lands to Ngati Manu in utu.

**Kiwikiwi**
Kiwikiwi was a Ngati Manu chief, who made the first recorded transaction of the ‘Pompallier property’, to John Johnston. Kiwikiwi succeeded his better known brother, Te Whareumu when he was killed in 1828. Te Whareumu was considered the most important chief in Kororareka at the time and although Kiwikiwi was recognised as Te Whareumu’s heir, his influence was never as great. (Angela Ballara. ‘Pomare II - Biography’, from the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, updated 1-Sep-10)

**Rewa**
Ngai Tawake chief Rewa, sold the land (as part of a larger block) that was to become the Clendon property to the first Pakeha owner, Robert Cummingham. Rewa also sold land to the Church Missionary Society in Kerikeri.

Rewa was one of the many rangatira who attended the Treaty of Waitangi negotiations but he is recognised as one who spoke particularly forcefully about his concerns regarding the Treaty,

‘the principal chief of Kororareka, the famous Rewa, uttered these words: “Chase away this white chief; what has he come to do here? To take away the freedom which you now enjoy. Do not believe in his words, do you not see that henceforth you will be mere slaves? That soon he will be employing you to make roads and break stones on the highways?” The chief is Catholic and malevolence attributed his speech to the advice of Bishop Pompallier.’
(Taken from Pompallier’s account of the day in conversation with Captain Lavaud “The French and the Maori”, Peter Low, 1990)

**Moka**
Moka was a Ngapuhi (Ngai Tawake) chief and brother of Rewa. Moka was involved in the Declaration of Independence of New Zealand by Maori chiefs as well as the Treaty of Waitangi. Part of the hillside in the area of the Historic Reserve is said to have been Moka’s seat in the 1830s to early 1840s (NZHPT ‘draft Management Plan’, March 2003).

**Hone Heke**
Hone Heke was one of the first and most influential chiefs to sign the Treaty of Waitangi. The son of Kau (brother of the chief Pokai), and Tupanapana, he had himself baptised at Pathia by CMS missionary, Henry Williams.

The British flag was raised ceremoniously each morning on a flagstaff on Maiki Hill at Kororareka. Heke’s men cut down the flagstaff at daybreak on 8 July 1844 in a symbolic act of protest. It was cut down a further three times until an attack broke out in Kororareka in 1845. It was due to Heke’s orders that the Printery and southern area of the town remained unscathed.

Heke died in 1850.

**Thomas McDonnell (1788 – 1864)**
McDonnell formed an important contributor to the exchange and introduction of plants into Russell. Arriving in New Zealand from Great Britain with his family in 1831, he established a timber-trading business at Horeke on the Hokianga Harbour. He was later appointed ‘Additional British Resident’ (a diplomatic title) for New Zealand around 1834, only to resign a year later after several disputes with British Resident James Busby. During his time in New Zealand, McDonnell had close connections to Kew Gardens in London,
with whom he exchanged seed, plants and cuttings. It is likely that he may be a source of some of the plant material found in Russell and Pompallier during its development.

**Bishop Jean Baptiste Pompallier (1801-1871)**

Born in Lyons, France on 11 December 1802 Pompallier was ordained a priest in 1829. In 1836, his appointment as ‘Vicar Apostolic to Western Oceania’ put Pompallier at the head of the Roman Catholic mission to the whole of Western Oceania. He arrived in the Hokianga in 1838 where he established his first catholic mission station. He quickly set about learning Maori and travelled extensively by schooner around both the North and South Islands, setting up more mission stations.

In 1839, Pompallier established his headquarters in Kororareka, (the Pompallier property), quickly followed by the establishment of Whangaroa, Kaipara, Tauranga and Akaroa in 1840, Matamata, Opotiki and Maketu in 1841, Auckland in 1842, Wellington in 1843, and Otaki, Rotorua, Rangiaowhia and Whakatane in 1844. By 1843 the French missions claimed about 45,000 Maori converts however, with the exception of the north, most of the French missions failed.

Pompallier is often described as having been sympathetic to Maori concerns and culture. At Waitangi in 1840 when the Treaty was being debated, he made an important contribution, obtaining from the future Governor Hobson a guarantee of religious freedom for all beliefs in New Zealand; there was to be no established church, as there was in England.

One analysis of his role in the Treaty negotiations has concluded that ‘Pompallier had a bias which can be stated clearly: Maori spiritual interests can be best served by Catholicism, and Catholicism can be best served by French sovereignty’ (Peter Low, 1990). However as part of carrying out that role, he can also be attributed with ensuring that a number of Maori chiefs, of which Rewa (above) was one, were well informed about the possible implications of signing.

Pompallier’s marist missionaries set up a printing press, bookbindery and tannery at Kororareka (Russell) to provide prayer books and other translated books for Maori. By 1850, with the growing European population, particularly in the main centres, the Church was under pressure to remove priests from the Maori areas so that they could ‘attend to the spiritual needs’ of the Europeans. The Kororareka mission members were withdrawn to a new diocese set up with Bishop Philippe Viard, based in Wellington. Pompallier set up a new diocese in Auckland and New Zealand separated from the rest of the Western Oceania Vicariate. Pompallier left for New Zealand for the last time in 1869.

Pompallier died in France in 1871 while Acting Arch-Bishop of Paris. On April 20, 2002 a large gathering of bishops, clergy, religious and laity saw the re-interment of the Bishop’s remains beneath the altar in St Mary’s Church, Motuti (Taylor, August 2009).

**James. R. Clendon**

Clendon was born in Deal, Kent in 1800 and by the age of 26 was a qualified sea captain. He was trading to New Zealand by at least 1828 where he began to buy land in the Bay of Islands and developed farming interests and trading business. In partnership with Samuel Stephenson, Clendon became increasingly wealthy and influential in European and Maori affairs.

Clendon was a witness to the Declaration of Independence in 1835 and later was appointed Consul of the United States. He reported to Washington D.C., any significant political developments related to New Zealand. His friendship with Pomare, Nene, and other chiefs is said to have made him one of the most influential Europeans in northern New Zealand. He was one of the witnesses to the Treaty of Waitangi, elected to the first Legislative Council, and he served as police magistrate at the Bay of Islands during Hone Heke’s rebellion. He was in the thick of the earliest Maori and Pakeha interaction.

Clendon’s wife Sarah died in 1855. Five and a half months later, he married Jane Cochrane, daughter of Dennis Browne Cochrane and Takatowhai Te Whata. (NZHPT website – Clendon House, Rawene) He moved to Rawene with his new family in 1862 where he was magistrate until he retired in 1887. His house at Rawene, Clendon House, is also owned by Heritage New Zealand.
James Busby (1801-1871)

Busby, a British consular representative at Russell from 1833, was an important figure in the establishment of plant exchange in Russell at the time of Greenway and may have been a source of some of the plant material planted at Pompallier. Recognised as a pioneer of the New Zealand and Australian wine industry, Busby established vineyards at Waitangi Treaty House in addition to an arboretum, and vegetable garden. Busby had close connections with the Royal Sydney Botanic Gardens and with leading botanists throughout Europe. Like McDonnell he may have been a source of some of the plant material found in Russell and Pompallier during its development.

John Flatt

Flatt was a gardener who worked both at Paihia and under James Busby at Waitangi. Through his work at these properties and his connections with James Busby, he formed close links with the ‘network’ of people sharing plants and ideas exchanges in Russell during the mid 19th century. Flatt records the planting of exotic species in Russell, sourced from James Busby:

“...I have planted many Grape Vines at the different stations since I have been in the land. J Busby Esq. & Rev. S. Marsden have supplied me with cuttings - the fig and the vine is to be found now at every station. I have great reason to hope that the happy period is not far distant when these poor heathen shall learn war no more - but sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree and none shall make them afraid for the mouth of the Lord of Hosts hath spoken it...” (A quote from a letter CMS. Microfilm 79-336. Letter John Flatt, Matamata to Wm. Jowett, London, 24 September, 1836. page 3)

Joel Polack

Like James Busby, Polack formed an important contributor to the introduction and exchange of plants at Russell. Polack arrived initially at Hokianga in 1831 and moved to the Bay of Islands in 1832. Upon arriving in the Bay of Islands, he purchased a large area of land from Maori chiefs and built a house at Russell, calling his estate Parramatta. Polack had close connections with the Royal Sydney Botanic Gardens and its botanists, including the superintendent Richard Cunningham, whom stayed with Polack in 1832 and as quoted from his book, gave Polack some plants:

“And our garden at Parramatta, a sketch of which preceeds the title page of the volume II, olives, pomegranates, nectarines, plants bought from the botanical garden in Sydney, by the late Mr Cunningham, and presented to us, grew to great advantage...” (Polack, 1838)

James Callaghan

Callaghan was an Irish Catholic immigrant who arrived in New Zealand with his wife Mary and five children in 1840. He was a tanner and sometime currier by trade, who bought the printing building from the Marist mission in 1856. The Callaghan family lived in Queen Street in Auckland for a year following their evacuation from Russell during the Kororareka fighting in 1845.

During their ownership of the site, the Callaghans lived first in Bishop Pompallier’s former wooden dwelling elsewhere on the site. There is however, clear evidence in the printing building for a domestic use which preceded the Greenway residency suggesting that the Callaghans had made it their home, probably after the demise of his tanning business. Photographs around that time (1864) show the end verandahs already closed in.

Callaghan died in 1869 and his widow Mary, in 1873.

James Hamlyn Greenway

J H Greenway was clerk to the Resident Magistrate’s Court in Russell, and a licensed interpreter under the Native Lands Act. His niece, Louisa, also describes his duties as including ‘overseer of all the native schools’. (Worsfold, p82)

In November 1877, the Callaghan children sold the former mission buildings to Greenway who was the son of their father’s silent business partner, George Greenway.

George Greenway moved his household to Russell in the 1860s. Hamlyn had two sisters, Maria and Jane (Mair). He purchased the Pompallier property from James Callaghan’s heirs in 1877 but did not move in until 17 July 1879, following extensive alterations carried out for him by two Scottish brothers named Miller. By 1891, Greenway had sold the property to his sister Maria. He died in 1902.

Louisa Worsfold recalls her uncle Hamlyn taking her back to one of their family picnic places, a special place for Maori shark fishing expeditions;

‘...my Uncle Greenway took me to the same place during such a fishing time – he often went to a gathering of Maoris, because he could interview a lot of them in the one place, whereas he would have to take many journeys and not see all the people he wanted to see, or get signatures perhaps, and listen to complaints or suggestions, it was never on his private work – always for the tribe or the Government.’ (Worsfold, 1946)
Jane Mair

Jane Mair (1838–1919) was formerly Jane Norwood Greenway, James Hamlyn Greenway’s sister (Fig 19). She married Henry Abbot Mair in 1869 and had two children, one of whom was Louisa Worsfold whose memoirs have proved a useful source of information regarding the property. After her husband was killed “blackbirding” in the Pacific, she and her children moved in with her brother.

Henry and Mary Stephenson

Henry Stephenson was a retired businessman, ex-harbour master and former US consular agent. He bought the Pompallier property in 1913.

Stephenson was the son of one of the earliest traders in the Bay, Samuel Stephenson and his mother was Hira Moewaka of Te Kapotai. Samuel Stephenson was James Clendon’s business partner for their first years of trading in and around New Zealand. His wife, Mary Stephenson was the daughter of Horace Hanley and his Ngapuhi wife, Hape Waka. Together they had seven children (http://www.patuone.com/files_main/whakapapa.html, updated 13 July 2008).

When Horace Hanley died in 1855, his children were left in George and Elizabeth Greenway’s care, to be raised as Europeans. Mary Hanley grew up as a ward of the Greenways, taught by Jane’s sister Maria before being sent to board at a girls’ school in Auckland.

Stephenson’s descendents have recorded that his mother, Moewaka, was determined to instil in her children the richness of their Maori tradition and the importance of the genealogical links, commenting that ‘social and cultural contradictions were part of the lived reality for Moewaka and her children as they negotiated their way in and out of two epistemologically distinctive systems.’ (Stephenson and Stephenson, 2001)

Annie Livingstone Mason

Annie Mason was born on the 30th October 1854. She bought Clendon Cottage and the wider property on 17th July 1876 from Reverend Frank Gould. At the time she bought the property she was recorded as a resident in Russell, however she is not registered as living there until the late 1890s when she appears in the ‘Trades Directory’ as a ‘Boarding House Keeper in Russell’ (Howard, 2010). It was Mason who subdivided the Clendon property into three parcels in 1907-08. Mason died in Auckland in 1942.

Allan and Isabel Bisset

Allan Edward Bisset (1868-1944) was born in Hobart, Australia and arrived in New Zealand in 1887. Allan married Isabel Aldred (1879-1958) in 1887. It was the Bissets who named the building, ‘The Bungalow’. The advertisements for The Bungalow describe, ‘The ideal surroundings for a complete and refreshing change. On the beach front, secluded, in beautiful shaded grounds’ (Howard, May 2010).

Professor Knight (1893 – 1972)

Australian born, Knight was the lead architect advising on the ‘restoration’ of the building at Pompallier during the 1940s. Knight was the first Professor of Architecture at Auckland University and had a keen interest in the restoration of historic buildings. His work included advisory roles at Paihia Mission Station and The Elms at Tauranga.

Knight had a great deal of experience working and studying abroad as outlined in the NZIA Journal of 1925:

“Mr Knight studies in England and on the continent, chiefly in Paris, and then in the United States…….Mr Knights studies in America have been very extensive, and he has held a responsible position in the office of Mr Aymar Embury, a New York architect…….Mr Knight is conversant with the methods adopted in the teaching of this subject at the Princeton, Columbia, New York and Harvard Universities.”

James McPherson (1900-1980)

McPherson is considered to have been one of New Zealand’s eminent horticulturalists, and is particularly regarded for his work in the development of public gardens. He was curator of the Christchurch Botanic Gardens for several years before moving to Auckland as superintendent of parks and reserves, a position he held from 1945 to 1964. When the Government acquired the Pompallier property, McPherson was asked by Professor Knight to contribute his expertise in directing the way the gardens should be reconstructed.

Susan and Fergus Clunie

Susan Clunie was the NZHPT gardener at Pompallier in the 1990s at the time of the property’s restoration period. She was later the gardens advisor for a number of NZHPT properties. Clunie has written extensively about the history of the Pompallier property’s gardens and grounds. Her approach to maintaining the authenticity of the Greenway/Stephenson garden was focused on using research findings to strictly replicate the known layout and specific plants of...
Kate Martin
Kate Martin is the current property manager of the Pompallier Reserve. In 2010, Ms Martin received the Order of Arts and Letters from the French Government in recognition of her research about, and promotion of, Pompallier Mission in New Zealand and the Pacific.

Overview of Wider Environmental History
An awareness of the events and social developments that occurred both in New Zealand and abroad whilst Pompallier was being designed, altered and restored is key to understanding the possible influences for decisions made by Greenway, Stephenson and Knight/McPherson.

The following text provides an overview of the key events which influenced gardening ideas and styles in New Zealand and Australia during the 'Pompallier phases'. It also outlines an overview of the key developments in New Zealand’s heritage protection and the working life of Professor Knight to provide a context for the work he initiated. The environmental history offers many clues into the inspiration which guided the evolution of Pompallier.

New Zealand
There was a considerable rise in the number of European immigrants into New Zealand during the second half of the 19th Century. For almost all settlers, irrespective of their social status, there was an immediate need to set out a garden which would provide for the family. As outlined in the 'Development of Property' section, this collective need led to plants being swapped and traded. Nurserymen also played an important role in providing plant material. Early seed catalogues from the 1870s reflected the demand of the time, with large selections of staples such as potatoes, peas and carrots. Although plants for sustenance dominated the catalogues and gardens of many settlers, there was an increasing interest in ornamental plants.

Nursery catalogues during the ‘Greenway Era’ featured a range of exotic plant species, including many of the plants available in the northern hemisphere, Australia, southern Africa, Asia and the Pacific. The Montpellier Nursery’s Catalogue (Auckland) for the summer of 1891-92 included:

- 16 varieties of abutilon, 38 different fuchsias, 95 pelargoniums and 25 verbenas including the locally bred ‘Moa Hunter’. (Dawson, 2010)

There was no such thing as a ‘typical’ garden during the late 19th Century. Gardens ranged from a few rows of beans to extensive vegetable gardens; from small cottage gardens to the large picturesque gardens of wealthy land owners. However the larger estates were few and far between and generally it was the cottage gardens which continued to feature and characterise gardens across New Zealand throughout the 19th Century.

The layout and content of New Zealand gardens had become much more sophisticated leading up to the Greenway Era. Gardens became ‘designed’ with ordering of space to reflect not only the food requirements of the house but also the aesthetics of its setting. Productive areas were set to the rear of the property and well defined areas of shrubs, flowerbeds and lawns were laid out to the front. This was evident in the garden that developed at Paihia Mission Station during the mid 19th Century. Its design is likely to have influenced the layout of other gardens in the Bay of Islands; it included a kitchen garden at the rear, with large flower beds and a lawn at the front. Books which may have been used by early settlers, such as Henry Brett’s 1879 Colonists’ Guide and Encyclopaedia of Useful Knowledge, demonstrate an appreciation for garden design at the time of Greenway:

"The tasteful laying out of a flower garden is a task which demands considerable artistic skill. Most individuals make the mistake of planting too many flowerbeds. The beauty of a clean lawn is enhanced by a few tasty beds, while it is spoilt by too many." (Brett, 1879).

By the first decades of the 20th Century, many front gardens were decorated with flower beds and lawns; some of the more wealthy citizens had gardens which resembled those of the large country houses and required the skill of a garden designer and a team of full time maintenance staff. Although the front of the house was for decoration, for many the rear remained a place for domestic activity. As well as containing toilets, sheds and other domestic structures, the rear garden served as a vital source of vegetables and fruit. By 1943, with New Zealand’s involvement in the Second World War, the productive value of gardening became a matter of national importance with the launch of the governments ‘Dig for Victory’ campaign. The victory gardens and allotments of the War remained a notable feature of the New Zealand garden and urban landscape during the time at which Professor Knight and McPherson were employed at Pompallier (1945).
During the late 19th Century many domestic gardens, especially those in the cities suburbs, continued to demonstrate features of a gardenesque style. It is noted that during this time there was also ‘a renewed interest in picturesque design principles, primarily in the larger gardens in the towns and countryside’. (Aitken, 2010). With the development of cities came a growing interest in urban design and town planning and an increasing role for garden design professionals. Towards the end of the 19th Century, three distinctive yet interconnected design styles emerged at different ‘development’ levels, and included the “Arts and Crafts Movement in domestic gardens; the City Beautiful in institutional projects; and The Garden City at the wider level of town planning”. (Aitken, 2010)

During the mid 20th Century, ideas of ‘Modernism’ had gained appreciation and use amongst Australian architects and designers, as with designers across the globe. By the time that Professor Knight and McPherson were ‘restoring’ Pompallier, Australia was again in a phase of change. The Second World War had brought about concerns for the availability of building materials and of food. Design and planning ideas became very much focused on efficiency and functionality. This ‘modernist’ approach continued to have an impact on the design and architecture of post-war Australia, including in the design of the domestic garden. By the 1950s there was a growing popularity for ‘functional gardening’ which included the notion of garden planning in conjunction with house planning. Gardens became spaces for living with ideas about solar orientation and converting back gardens into outdoor living spaces.

**Heritage Protection**

There was a growing interest in heritage protection and the restoration of historic houses and gardens in New Zealand leading up to the 1940s ‘restoration’ of Pompallier.

In the 1930s, the Governor General Viscount Bledisloe and Lady Bledisloe purchased the Waitangi Treaty House grounds for the nation and set up a Trust Board which instigated a policy to retain an 1840s period landscape, including the kitchen garden, flower garden and shell pathway. This policy was one of the first examples of garden protection policy introduced in New Zealand. It is likely that the work undertaken in the U.S, restoring the grounds of many houses such as that at Colonial Williamsburg which was being ‘restored’ at the same time as the Waitangi policy was introduced, would have influenced thoughts and ideas about heritage protection in New Zealand.


In a lecture titled “Horticulture and Its Place in New Zealand” given by Professor Peren at Massey University in February 1945, during the Annual conference of the New Zealand Institute of Horticulture, the economic and social aspects of what he called the “cultural value of gardening” and “beautification” were discussed. Professor Peren ended his lecture with a discussion about the disappearance of old gardens which were an important connection to the early days of the colony:

“Magnificent trees and wonderful collections of shrubs which have taken years to grow are frequently slaughtered with no thought of their historic and cultural value. Surely it is time a nation bestirred itself to preserve these material beauty spots as has been done in Great Britain by the creation of a National Trust with the power to purchase and accept from donors historic and beauty spots for preservation for all to enjoy. I can name a number of beautiful old gardens whose loss would be a national calamity. With the post- war building programme still more lovely old grounds will be cut up and time, therefore, is the essence of the contract. Would it not be possible for the Institute to set up a committee to consider ways and means of raising funds for the purchase of these landmarks…”

(Peren, G. S., 1945)

Although Pompallier was not restored by a ‘historic trust’, the idea of heritage protection was clearly on the government’s agenda at the time, as evident in a letter from Professor Knight to Mr Bagnall of the then National Historic Places Trust (now Heritage New Zealand):

“…..your surprise that Pompallier appears to have had priority over Waimate has a simple explanation. Pompallier House was taken over by the government for war purposes and it was faced with either restoring the house to its original condition and handing it back to its owners or purchase and restore as an historic building. The government made several attempts to obtain Waimate has a simple explanation. Pompallier Mission House but the Vestry always refused to sell.” (Letter dated 27th January 1983).

The restoration of Pompallier formed an important part of the sequence of events which led to the formation of the NZHPT through an Act of Parliament in 1954, and its subsequent work restoring other historic grounds in New Zealand, much of which was under the advice of Professor Knight.

Professor Knight was employed in an advisory role for the restoration of Pompallier House during the 1940s. The decisions regarding the restoration of the house and to a
lesser extent the gardens, would have been influenced by his academic and working experience.

An important influence and interest of Knight's was the restoration of historic houses and their grounds. It is likely that Professor Knight would have been inspired by his many visits to the U.S and the work being undertaken there to restore historic places.

Many of the old houses in the eastern U.S, which were restored prior to Knight's work at Pompallier included 'restoration' works of the grounds to reflect the growing popularity of 'Colonial Revival Gardens'. Restoration projects which were undertaken which are likely to have been of particular relevance to Professor Knight includes the properties at Mount Vernon, Colonial Williamsburg and the Stevens-Coolidge Place.

Between 1914 and 1918, there was a considerable amount of restoration work undertaken at The Stevens-Coolidge Place, in North Andover, Massachusetts. The architect, Joseph Everett Chandler remodelled the farmhouses and 'enhanced' the grounds in a 'Colonial Revival style' including a perennial garden, flower garden, and a rose garden. At Mount Vernon, Charles Wall (assistant superintendent from 1929 to 1937, then resident superintendent for 39 years) oversaw the restoration of the house and garden to an 18th century style. Similarly restoration work, funded by the Rockefellers at Colonial Williamsburg during the 1930s, included the conservation of natural views and efforts to replicate a landscape of the late 18th Century.

Professor Knight's interest in the idea of heritage restoration and protection in the U.S, and the styles used in the restoration of these houses was evident in his communications with the NZHPT:

“... it is a pity that we cannot treat Paihia – Russell in the same way as the Americans are planning to restore Lahaina” (letter dated 14 January 1963)

As well as drawing inspiration from the restoration of houses in the U.S, Professor Knight also studied the many other historic houses in the Bay of Islands and elsewhere in New Zealand. In preparation for his work advising on the restoration of Waimate Mission House, Professor Knight received a letter from Ormond Wilson (chairman of the then National Historic Places Trust now Heritage New Zealand), which set out an itinerary for both himself and Professor Knight to visit several other historic houses and mentions:


Professor Knight was a great believer in the restoration and conservation of historic homes and grounds; in a letter to Mr Bagnall (of the Historic Places Trust) he outlined the connection between historic homes and the need for coherence and co-ordination in their restoration:

“I feel sure co-operation and possibly co-ordination between Waitangi, Pompallier and Waimate can be achieved, it is logical and indeed historically correct that it should be done. I have made many tentative contacts in the past to that end and feel strongly that the Trust is the proper body to accomplish it. I have received a cordial invitation from the custodian at Waitangi to call and discuss matters of common interest with him at any time” (Professor Knight Letter dated 27th January 1963)

However as with much of the work undertaken in the U.S, and the 'Colonial Revival Gardens' style, much of the earlier restoration work was without specific direction and focused primarily on creating an attractive form for visitors. In a letter to Ormond Wilson, it is possible to gauge the limited process and direction considered for the restoration projects, he writes with regard to Waimate:

“I have not received any instructions from the Trust as to any particular historical events they wish to commemorate in the house........I have proceeded on the assumption the building is being preserved as an important example of early Colonial Architecture in this country......the building is an excellent example of early colonial architecture, sometimes referred to as ‘colonial Georgian’ ....good examples of it are found in America and Australia, New Zealand work came later than the others but before Victorian influences became prevalent. Busby's house at Waitangi and ‘the elms’ at Tauranga are together with the Mission House are the best extant examples in the north” (Letter from Professor Knight, dated 18th July 1961 to the Chairman of The National Historic Places Trust).

In addition to his work at Pompallier, Knight went onto advise on the restoration of Waimate and ‘The Elms’ in Tauranga.
part III: significance

significance assessment

The cultural significance of a place comes from an appreciation of its physical character and from an understanding of its associations over time with persons and events. The nature and scope of this significance can be assessed on the basis of a number of characteristics. Such analysis will account not only for the overall significance of the place, but also for the contribution to that significance made by its constituent parts.

While age and longevity has been an important factor in evaluating significance, respect is given for a wide range of cultural heritage values. The significance of character areas and key features is considered in their own right but the primary focus is on their contribution to the values of Pompallier House Historic Reserve as a whole and the significance of the property in relation to a regional, national or international context.

The Pompallier House Historic Reserve has been examined through a combination of documentary research and observations in the field. The significance of the property is considered in terms of the following values:

- Aesthetic
- Archaeological
- Architectural/Design
- Historic
- Social
- Scientific
- Technical; and
- Traditional and Cultural

These values are further considered in terms of:

- Rarity and Representativeness
- Integrity
- Authenticity

The following statements of cultural heritage significance are based on the criteria drawn primarily from J.S Kerr’s guidelines on preparing a Conservation Plan (1996) and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Guidelines for Preparing Conservation Plans (2000). In addition the English Conservation Plan guidance (Natural England, 2008), and Australian guidelines for assessing heritage gardens and landscapes (Heritage Council of Western Australia, 2007 and Australian Garden History Society, 1983) have also been referred to.

The key questions asked as part of the assessment of significance were:

- Why is this an important element / feature / place and why should we single it out to honour it?
- What stories does it contain?

In the following sections, a summary statement of significance is made followed by an analysis of the site’s values using the assessment criteria. Finally, the site is broken down into its distinguishable character areas and key features to enable their individual assessment. In this inventory of character areas, levels of significance are attributed to each feature.

It is considered that three degrees of significance can be used to define the features. The degrees of significance are:

2 - Exceptional Significance – demonstrating a high level of original or early fabric (e.g. plants from the Greenway/Stephenson period) in original location

1 - Some significance - demonstrating a high level of original or early fabric (e.g. plants from the Greenway/Stephenson period) in a different location or, demonstrating a low level of original or early fabric, in the original style and location.

0 - Nil or Negative significance – fabric that has an unknown provenance or is not from original period (e.g. plants from the Government period of 1940s onwards) or is intrusive or historically inaccurate.
overall significance – summary statement

The Pompallier House Historic Reserve is a cultural heritage landscape of exceptional significance. The site is both regionally and nationally significant and elements of its story have international importance with connections to France and the Pacific.

The narrative of the site reveals important aspects of the following themes in the development of Russell, in New Zealand history and in a global context:

- People and places: including Maori occupation and the Maori concept of land ownership, European colonisation and settlement, conflict, demonstrations of people’s relationship to the environment.

- Shaping the political landscape: including associations with mana, rangatiratanga, leadership, government institutions and political ideas.

- Sense of place: Incorporates a landmark building, garden and landscape feature and has had an important presence in the community for a long period of time including holding important spiritual values for Maori.

- Expressing intellectual and cultural life: including architecture and garden design styles/fashion, popular culture/everyday events and education or learning.

- Social institutions and movements: includes stories of religious institutions/movements, national identity and associations with notable people in New Zealand history.

- Expanding science and technology: including technological applications, manufacturing and construction methods.

- Trade and commercial interests: including associations with land speculation, early commerce and industry.

The Pompallier House Historic Reserve landscape exhibits layers of the material culture of New Zealand’s heritage from Maori occupation, commercial endeavours at Turner’s Row, the Pompallier Mission, the Bungalow guest accommodation and the Callaghan, Greenway, Stevenson and Clendon households among others. It reveals aspects of the defensive pa, the mission and of colonisation and early tourism that are as much about daily life and everyday events as they are associated with ‘the grand historical dramas such as the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi’ (Middleton, 2005).

The Printery is the only building to survive from the Catholic mission at Kororareka and one of only two structures in the town to pre-date the destruction of Kororareka during the Flagstaff War. It is also the sole surviving building of all the equally crowded mission stations that were established around New Zealand and the Western Pacific at the time this was their Headquarters. Although the pre-1900 fabric of Clendon Cottage is limited to doors, French windows, shutters and some weatherboarding, (most of the fabric dates from 1978 to 1981) the property is one of a small number in Kororareka to survive as part of the townscape from the mid-nineteenth century (Howard, 2010).
The Pompallier property is linked to the early colonial introduction of printing and tanning, with the building being identified as the oldest existing industrial building in New Zealand. It is New Zealand’s sole surviving pioneer printer and tannery and the sole survivor of Kororareka’s frontier trading hey-day. Its French Provincial architecture and earthen structure also make it an exception amongst our early British colonial remnant buildings. Aside from this technical interest, the association of the Mission Compound with the development of a written Maori language and Maori literacy is of considerable significance.

The site enjoys high public recognition for its historical and social values including associations with people of historic interest. The Pompallier and Clendon properties comprise a landscape that was at the centre of the intertwining of Maori and European history so it is a place that has strong associations with the formative years of initial contact between Maori and Pakeha and the ongoing responses and adaption by each. The occupation and development of the Pompallier property by the Stephensons, a mixed Maori and European family, is a significant aspect of this landscape’s multicultural heritage values.

The landscape has a significant contribution to make in understanding early colonial settlement and this includes its expression of French colonial and missionary aspirations in the Pacific. The Printery is the oldest surviving building associated with the Roman Catholic Church in New Zealand and the Western Pacific and is more broadly connected with evangelical missionary activity in New Zealand and across the western Pacific in the 19th century. This property is worthy of consideration as a significant example of global ideas and practices relating to early missionary involvement in colonisation and as one of a network of similarly representative mission sites remaining around New Zealand.

The aesthetic setting of the Reserve and the Pompallier property’s longevity as a public monument are also of heritage value. The Pompallier property was one of first acquisitions of the Crown while the Clendon property is an unusual example of a compulsory acquisition to protect the setting of Pompallier. The conservation project of 1990-93 was also a key catalyst for the foundation of ICOMOS NZ while the re-opening ceremony in 1993 was used to publicly announce the creation of the NZHPT Maori Heritage Council.
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assessment of heritage values

aesthetic

The gardens and grounds are significant in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics.

A place or area included under this criterion will have characteristics of form, scale, composition, materials, texture and colour that are considered to have value for the site or contribute to the wider setting. Considerations may include:

• creative or design excellence
• landmark quality, strong sense of place
• contribution to important views.

The Pompallier grounds, particularly the gardens, demonstrate significant aesthetic value. They represent a Victorian/Edwardian colonial New Zealand garden in a publicly accessible property and provide a setting for a ‘nationally historic monument’.

The aesthetic characteristics of the Greenway/Stephenson garden style are highly significant. These gardens have a strong unity and a coherence of design that was first established under Mair and Greenway. They reflect the imported Victorian gardenesque elements of colour, eclecticism and exoticism, the informal Edwardian planting schemes mixed with formal, structured landscaping, all within New Zealand’s particular ecological and cultural context. The Greenway/Stephenson gardens are a fundamental part of the landmark quality associated with the Pompallier property.

The Printery building, the gardens and its wider setting have been represented in photographs, sketches and paintings from early times. One particularly important wider visual and historic connection is with the Treaty grounds at Waitangi which can be seen across the water.

Stephenson’s hillside has a pleasant larger scale, ‘treed parkland’ aesthetic that works well in contrast to the intimate and more formal layout of the gardens. It represents the Edwardian style planting which sought to capture the romance of the wider landscape of the countryside. The development of a pathway and avenue leading to a lookout point enables attractive (although today, somewhat restricted by the vegetation and neighbouring properties) views of Kororareka Bay. The treed hillside also provides a pleasant green backdrop to the Printery.

When opposition to apartments at the Clendon property was raised, this culminated in the property being acquired by the government. The Town and Country Planning Appeal concluded that the development would ‘adversely affect the scenic beauty of Russell in general and the public enjoyment of Pompallier next door’ (Northern Advocate article (11 June 1975) cited in Howard, May 2010 p37).

The Clendon property has local aesthetic value as part of the landform that encloses and provides the impressive backdrop to the southern end of Kororareka Bay. The hillside is currently cleared and in a transition process as part of a revegetation programme. Ultimately these slopes will be well planted in an appropriate selection of native species. The Clendon gardens have undergone considerable change in past years, however overall the property provides an important spacious, ‘undeveloped’ setting for the Category 1/ Category 2 historic buildings on the Reserve. The sizeable setback of Clendon Cottage from The Strand with its picket fence, broad front lawn and leafy surrounds is consistent with and reinforces the character of the historic waterfront township.

In contrast to the rarity of the Pompallier building, Clendon Cottage has value as being representative of the simple cottage form (Howard 2010).
archaeological

The gardens and grounds yield, or have demonstrable potential to yield, significant archaeological evidence.

A place or area included under this criterion will have important physical evidence of pre-1900 human activities. Considerations may include:

• ability to demonstrate the likelihood of providing important information and the potential for public interpretation and education
• condition of the site
• unusual or notable features
• contextual values

The gardens and grounds of Pompallier House Historic Reserve demonstrate the potential to provide significant archaeological evidence. Pompallier and its surrounds is a recorded archaeological site (Q05/1074) in the New Zealand Archaeological Association’s site recording scheme.

It is thought that Te Keemua pa, Q05/824, represents one of the major components of Maori settlement in Russell at or about contact and is integral to its early history. Other hilltop open sites, approaching defended settlements, occurred on the summit on the ridge between Russell and Long Beach. It is recommended that the site be seen as part of the continuum of Maori settlement at Russell (NAR, 2009).

The good degree of preservation of the pa site and its position above the township underlines its significant information and amenity potential. Apart from the normal association between many archaeological sites and descendant communities, the pa is not known to have any specific or significant cultural associations or to have been identified or managed as a wahi tapu. (NAR, 2009)

The archaeological assessment undertaken for this Conservation Plan (Appendix 4) identifies the archaeological features of the site as including large defensive ditches on the northern and southern ridges of the site, substantial pits and terraces, and associated shell midden in moderate to reasonable condition. The report also notes that greenstone artefacts were reported to have been recovered from the site by a previous landowner.

An assessment by Northern Archaeological Research (NAR 2009) concluded that due to the high level of erosion that has occurred in the past in this area, along with land disturbance related to tree felling, any potential structural remains of pre-contact Maori agriculture which would have occurred on the hillside are unlikely to have survived the successive centuries of erosion. This conclusion was based on research on the neighbouring Tahapuke property in Tahapuke Bay.

In relation to potential nineteenth-century remains on the hillside, the map regression exercise undertaken by NAR (2009) indicated that there is some potential for nineteenth-century settlement remains such as paddock fencing built in the 1830s and 1850s on the upper hill slopes. In addition, it is possible that postholes and structural remains related to the two houses or other structures shown on the hillside may have survived.

On the flats surrounding Pompallier House and Clendon Cottage, evidence from the early plans, recorded history, and archaeological investigations in combination indicates that there is potential for the survival of both early to mid nineteenth-century house structures such as the Turner’s Row Cottages and other structural remains such as sheds, outhouses and workshops, and associated features such as rubbish pits. The archaeological projects already undertaken have uncovered the mission tannery and chapel sites, and evidence of the conversion of the mission and Turner’s Row into a home and garden in the later nineteenth-century.

While the results indicate a concentration of such features in the former Pompallier property, this may be a result of sampling bias as similar investigations have not been carried out next to Clendon Cottage, or further south in the carpark/driveway area in which James Deary’s house was located, or on the northern extent of the property where it is evident that the two Turner’s Row Cottages were still located in 1907. Even in modified areas, there is some potential for deeper features to have survived.

Overall, the Reserve is considered to have exceptional archaeological values associated both with pre-European occupation of the area and the pre-1900 European use of the site. While these values are principally associated with the Marist years and earlier Turner period, archaeological remains relating to earlier and later periods of ownership and occupation are also recognised as having considerable heritage significance.
Plate 6:
Locations of archaeological investigations previously carried out at the Pompallier House Historic Reserve.
(Figure 6 in Archaeological Report, Appendix 4)
Plate 7:

Location of existing (light shading) and former buildings based on historic plans and on documentary evidence. Two additional structures located on the hillside behind Clendon Cottage and Pompallier House are illustrated in contemporary paintings but their exact locations are uncertain, as are those of additional buildings known to have been present in Turner’s Row.

(Figure 7 in Archaeological Report, Appendix 4)
architectural /design

The gardens and grounds are significant for their design.

A place or area included under this criterion will have attributes that may include:
- Representation of a significant design or designer, style, or period

The Greenway/Stephenson gardens display significant design attributes. The gardens represent an early New Zealand gardenesque design style from the late Victorian/Edwardian period. Stephenson hillside also represents a strong design framework and parkland elements typical of the Edwardian period in which the layout was established.

Within the gardens and grounds, the Printery building is a unique example of nineteenth-century French colonial architecture in New Zealand, the only surviving historic example of classic Lyonnais pise-de-terre construction forming another rich connection with France. The focus of this Conservation Plan is on the gardens and grounds. The latter provide the building with a setting which is of significance as a whole and within its own right.

More detail regarding the significance of the building is provided in the 1990 Pompallier House Conservation Plan.

As discussed on page 38, the early 1990s conservation work to the architecture contributed to the transformation of the landscape as did the landscape conservation work that took place during this time. The gardens from the Greenway/Stephenson period have provided an enduring design framework for the grounds, in particular the flatter land around the house developed progressively by first the Greenways and subsequently the Stephensons and the development of the hillside by the latter.

Clendon Cottage represents one of Russell’s earliest buildings. Further detail is provided in the 2010 Clendon Cottage Conservation Plan.

The creation of the terraces and ditches that are legible on the ridgeline of Clendon Hillside also have value in understanding the architecture of Maori pa design.

Plate 8  Pompallier printery set in the Greenway/Stephenson gardens
The gardens and grounds are significant in the evolution or pattern of the history of the local district, region or country. A place or area included under this criterion will have strong associations with historically important activities or people. Considerations may include the ability of the site to demonstrate associations with:

- events or cultural phases, tangible and intangible
- ideas or achievements from the past, or
- a person, group, iwi or an organisation of importance to New Zealand history.

The Pompallier House Historic Reserve has exceptional historic value. The ability of the site to continue to represent so many layers of its history of occupation is significant at a regional, national and international level. Historically, the Pompallier garden and grounds demonstrate the following significant associations:

- with a period when the capital of New Zealand was situated in the Bay of Islands,
- Treaty of Waitangi negotiations,
- the Northern war and sacking of Kororareka,
- use of the property as a tannery,
- its occupation as a residence and development of the gardens by the Greenways and Stephensons,
- military occupation of the grounds during World War II; and
- a growing self awareness of the value of New Zealand heritage demonstrated in the early acquisition of the site.

The land has high significance, incorporating part of a prominent pa at the southern headland of Kororareka Bay. The grounds are associated with a rich history of Maori occupation by a number of different tribes prior to European settlement. The changing ‘ownership’ of Te Keemua pa prior to European arrival and its association with the concept of utu has significance for our understanding of concepts of traditional Maori land ownership under which, exclusive boundaries were rare, and rights were constantly being renegotiated.

This is particularly interesting when viewed against the replacement of this philosophy with colonial surveys - grids of paddocks and fencelines as a symbol of European order and permanence in a new colony. The Pompallier gardens and grounds have been present as a distinct parcel of land in Kororareka Bay for over 180 years, the Clendon property just a few years less.

This landscape has exceptional value in its associations with key aspects of the political, religious and social landscape of New Zealand in the early nineteenth-century. The Pompallier House Historic Reserve has exceptionally significant associations with the beginnings of European interaction with Maori in this country. First European occupation of the beachfront dates from the 1820s. By the 1830s the southern corner of the Bay had developed into Turner’s Row of commercial buildings which, by 1841-42, included a bank and the offices of the Bay of Islands Gazette newspaper.

The gardens and grounds are significant for their association with the active French involvement in missionary work in New Zealand. The property is of exceptional historic significance as the grounds of the oldest Roman Catholic building in New Zealand and the Western Pacific and the only surviving building of the compound. The archaeological footprint of the chapel in the grounds is one of the oldest Catholic places of worship in New Zealand. This place was the Marist Order’s first headquarters in the field.

The Printery also stands as visible evidence of the French Catholic involvement in key events in New Zealand history including the negotiation of the Treaty of Waitangi 1840 and in the Northern Wars 1845-46.

The Greenway/Stephenson gardens display significant historical associations in terms of the physical evidence of nineteenth-century New Zealand residential garden design and plant fabric. A Norfolk Pine (Araucaria heterophylla) and Monkey apple (Eugenia myrtifolia) are identified as scheduled trees in the Far North District Plan. However there are numerous other individual plants in these gardens and grounds that contribute historic significance to the property due to their place in the original Greenway/Stephenson gardens. A plan and lists of these plants are provided in Appendix 1.

The Pompallier property is of national and international importance due to its association with a number of people and organisations/groups who figured prominently in early New Zealand history. These include chiefs Rewa, Tupare, Kiwikwi, and Hone Heke, as well as Bishop Pompallier, the Roman Catholic Church and the broader missionary movement into New Zealand and the Pacific. James Reddy Clendon, Professor Knight and James McPherson. When it was the mission headquarters, the property hosted many visitors. Bishop Pompallier had a close association with Ngapuhi chiefs at Kororareka including Rewa (Ngai Tawake/Patukeha), Moka (Ngai Tawake/Patukeha), Hakiro and Tareha (Ngati Rehia), as well as Maori who visited this place from further around Te Tai Tokerau and New Zealand.
social

The gardens and grounds are significant through association with a community or cultural group for social, political, cultural or spiritual reasons.

A place would be considered for inclusion under this criterion if it were one that the community, or a significant part of the community holds or has held in high regard. Considerations may include the extent to which the place:

• is distinctive in the local landscape and contributes to a ‘sense of place’ and identity.
• Is of importance to the development of New Zealand as a diverse, bi-cultural and multi-cultural society
• exhibits the notion of social, spiritual, traditional, political, national or any other cultural sentiment expressed by a group.

The Pompallier House Historic Reserve has exceptional social values. It is of significance to New Zealanders for its ability to demonstrate a range of social histories, contemporary and past, from religious to industrial to residential. It is a place at the centre of early New Zealand society and has significant capacity to explain early political, religious and multicultural history.

This practice of plant trading and exchanges with Britain and between colonies, and between public and private gardens throughout New Zealand was commonplace in the nineteenth-century. Gifting or swapping plant material was an effective, affordable and social way of establishing gardens – whether it was for survival, for business, for science and education or for pleasure. The Greenway/Stephenson gardens demonstrate aspects of this significant part of New Zealand’s social history. They continue to exhibit the role that the gardens and gardeners played in importing plant stock and exchanging plant material between friends and neighbours as well as from other mission gardens.

There is thought to be cultural significance vested in the boundary between Pompallier and Clendon Cottage and the pa above, for local Maori. When the first sale of the area was made to a European in 1827, its southern boundary is said to have been marked with a pou (Martin, 2008).

The Pompallier property is of exceptional significance for its role as the Marist mission compound and the introduction of the Roman Catholic Church to New Zealand, whose purpose was to convert the indigenous peoples of Western Oceania, including New Zealand Maori. In addition to this, the Printery is the only one that remains in New Zealand today to represent the important story of the enthusiastic introduction of literacy and printed texts to New Zealand.

The Pompallier House Historic Reserve also has some social/historical significance as a property open to the public as a museum and ‘national monument’. The Crown’s acquisition of the site and the transfer of control and management to the New Zealand Historic Places Trust reflects the evolving cultural values associated with Russell’s growing self-awareness and developing identity as an historic township, and growing national identity and appreciation of New Zealand’s heritage.

Plate 9 Garden detail from Pompallier grounds
scientific

The gardens and grounds are significant through their potential as a scientific resource.

A place would be considered for inclusion under this criterion if it incorporated features that have scientific interest, either individually or in combination. Considerations may include:

- Any ecological importance or diversity including habitat or species of interest.
- Any geological or geomorphological values.
- Capacity to demonstrate the advancement or history of science.

The gardens and grounds of the Pompallier House Historic Reserve have significant tangible botanical heritage. They contain specimens thought to be descended from stock planted during the occupancy of the Greenway and Stephenson families. The surviving plant fabric and the way it has been laid out and maintained, tells a significant story of late Victorian and Edwardian horticultural taste and custom in nineteenth-century New Zealand. Refer to Appendix 1 for the Greenway/Stephenson flower bed planting plan and plant lists.

Susan Clunie made the following comment in a Heritage New Zealand article (Sarah Beresford, Winter 2010):

“It is very important to use those plant varieties still available as a starting point....An example of this is the Arundo donax ‘Variegata’ which I re-established in the garden. I followed the advice of William Robinson (prominent late-19th century Canterbury pastoralist and horticulturist) and cut it down to the ground every year in autumn and, just as he described, got a wonderful plume of creamy foliage tinged with pink every spring just in time to complement Rosa ‘Anais Segales’.”

The grounds currently contain two scheduled trees, a Norfolk Pine (Araucaria heterophylla) and Monkey apple (Eugenia myrtifolia). Please refer to page 6 of this report.

While there are some indigenous plant species present on the hillside properties, the landscape is highly modified and ecological values are compromised. However a number of native birds are currently known to use the area, including tui, fantail and wood pigeon while Korora or Blue Penguin use the shelter under a building on the Reserve to provide for their nests during the breeding season. Pest control is currently undertaken in support of local community kiwi recovery programme.

Indigenous bush cover will improve greatly as the re-vegetation programme becomes established and, sited adjacent to a DOC Reserve, the area has potential to form a useful pocket of coastal habitat.

Set within the grounds, the Printery is identified in the New Zealand Geopreservation Inventory of Important Geological Sites and Landforms as the best example of nineteenth-century pise de terre construction in New Zealand.
technical

The gardens and grounds are significant in demonstrating a high degree of technical innovation or achievement.

A place would be considered for inclusion under this criterion if it demonstrated evidence of past technologies. Considerations may include:

- Evidence of past trade skills such as engineering, horticulture or construction.
- Unusual use of materials.

The gardens and grounds demonstrate some degree of technical achievement.

There are key associations between the grounds and the early tannery processes in the form of the tanning pits located to the rear of the building, and between the old quarry in the turn-around area. These associations give the grounds some technical significance, as does the ability of the Marists to build the Printery in pise (and pan de bois) with materials found on site.

Neither Clendon Cottage nor the surrounding gardens are particularly remarkable for their technological values however the pa site on Clendon Hillside demonstrates the sophisticated use of earthworks to create defensive ditches and terraces and soil conditioning.

Plate 11 Garden detail from Pompallier grounds

traditional and cultural

The site is considered taonga tuku iho, a treasured site, to tangata whenua, fundamental to their culture and identity.

A place would be considered for inclusion under this criterion for its:

- Meaning, symbolism, settings and associations (intangible values);
- Its cultural empowerment and tribal identity.

The Pompallier House Historic Reserve is a place of particular significance to Ngare Raumati and the iwi groups of Te Tai Tokerau. The significance of the cultural landscape of Pompallier Mission Historic Reserve is represented by a number of important features and wider contextual connections important to Maori and early European settlement history in New Zealand.

Te Keemua pa is one of the earliest recorded pa sites in the Bay of Islands; this site bears mute witness to waves of early Polynesian settlement history through to the arrival and establishment of European sovereignty in New Zealand. Ngare Raumati considers this site to be of particular cultural importance through its association with a number of significant tipuna (tribal ancestors). The tauranga waka at the base of the pa opposite Clendon House represents an important cultural/ancestral feature, although there are no remaining features associated with the waka landing site, its protection and recognition in association with Te Keemua pa is important. Thus, kaitiakitanga by the tangata whenua is of particular importance.

Within the Pompallier Mission Historic Reserve, the built structures reflect the later cultural values of European settlement. For many early settlers in the Bay of Islands, industry and its associated activities were a way of life which helped support the establishment of the settler economy. These buildings now act as a repository of cultural memory for the ancestors of European settlers.

The view shaft from Pompallier Mission Historic Reserve to the Treaty grounds in Paihia and towards Te Maiki Hill form significant visual connections, binding the history of activities associated with the Reserve to the establishment of European sovereignty in New Zealand. Thus, making this place and its associated tangible and intangible cultural heritage values unequivocally of local, national and international significance.
threshold criteria

The values of the Pompallier Reserve are also considered in terms of the following qualifying, or threshold criteria to assist in assessing the degree of significance and amplify our understanding of what is important about the property. (NZHPT 2010; Stovel 2007)

rarity and representativeness

The gardens and grounds demonstrate aspects of cultural heritage that are nationally rare and others that are notably representative.

A place would be considered to have rarity values or high degree of representativeness if it:

• Comprised or is associated with rare, uncommon or endangered events, processes or features.
• Demonstrated the characteristics of a type of cultural place, activity, period or environment

The gardens and grounds that comprise the Pompallier Historic House Reserve demonstrate a number of rare qualities.

They are the setting for the oldest Roman Catholic building in New Zealand and the Western Pacific, the only surviving building of the Mission compound, the oldest industrial building and only surviving pioneer mission printing house in New Zealand.

They also represent one of the earliest acquisitions by the New Zealand government for the purposes of protecting the building's heritage values.

The property demonstrates an uncommon shared Maori, Pakeha and French engagement with a landscape and is an interesting example of a number of places around New Zealand that are associated with missionaries and missionary works in the nineteenth-century.

The Greenway/Stephenson gardens and hillside are an excellent example of a surviving colonial New Zealand garden design and use of plant fabric from that time (refer to Appendix 1).

Clendon Cottage was the first registered boarding house in the town and is a good example of mid nineteenth-century vernacular architecture of the Russell townscape.

Both Pompallier and Clendon properties provide examples of evolving approaches to heritage conservation and New Zealand’s movement away from European cultural roots to an appreciation of ‘home’.

integrity

The gardens and grounds demonstrate wholeness and intactness of heritage and its attributes.

A place would be considered to have integrity if:

• the physical fabric of the property and/or its significant features is in good condition and deterioration controlled.
• a significant proportion of the elements and setting necessary to convey the totality of the property’s value is included.
• Relationships and dynamic functions essential to its distinctive character are maintained.

The Pompallier House Historic Reserve demonstrates wholeness and intactness of its heritage attributes.

The 1990-1993 conservation project during which a major restoration was undertaken, is recognised as a milestone in the professional care and interpretation of historic architecture in New Zealand.

The current boundaries of the Pompallier property represent the property from the period when James Greenway added the Turner block to the original narrow strip of Pompallier land then re-sold a small part of the northwest corner (between 1880-1882). Maintaining these boundaries ensures the maintenance of the integrity of the Greenway/Stephenson gardens.

The Pompallier property appears to generally be in a good physical state of repair and functioning. The primary historic functions of the site are split between the Printery, which represents the Marist period, and the nineteenth-century gardens established during the Greenway/Stephenson residential period. The continuity of these associations as character defining functions is maintained.

Growth of the plantings and weeds within the hillside area established by Henry Stephenson has reduced the open character of the original parkland style. The pathway and totara avenue remain legible features of the hillside design however views from the lookout area have been restricted due to vegetation growth and built development on the adjacent property. Stephenson’s hillside retains integrity however aspects of its elements and setting are diminished.

The Clendon property and hillside has been treated primarily as a buffer zone. This serves to protect the visual integrity of the relationship between the historic buildings and their wider setting, but is neglectful of this landscape’s wider values. The boundary of the Pompallier House Historic Reserve slices through Te Keemua pa so that only a small proportion sits within Heritage New Zealand management but it is important that consideration of the cultural heritage values of hillside do not stop at the fence.
authenticity

The gardens and grounds demonstrate a high degree of authenticity.

A place would be considered to be authentic if its cultural value (as recognized in the nomination criteria proposed) is truthfully and credibly expressed through a variety of attributes including:

- The extent to which the fabric is in its original state;
- form and design;
- materials and substance;
- use and function;
- traditions, techniques and management systems;
- location and setting;
- language, and other forms of intangible heritage;

Pompallier House Historic Reserve contains surviving material resources strongly associated with the values of the property. The legibility and substance of archaeological resources is high, exposed or otherwise.

Overall, the relationships between the Greenway/Stephenson garden, the Stephenson hillside, Clendon Cottage and Clendon hillside largely retains a genuine spatial association.

The gardens and grounds are a complex site as they underwent considerable change in early times. The gardens have been returned to a layout and combination of elements that represents a broad period around the late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century. The formal layout of the central entrance path and picket fence were present in a photograph taken in 1858 (Fig 10) however the garden is treed. The hedging behind the picket fence can be seen in a photograph from 1904 (Fig 31) however there are still large areas of plantings in the front garden. The expansive area of lawn present today was established by 1912 (Fig 33), however at this time the design of the path and entrance had changed. While the gardens of 2011 do not depict a precise moment in time, they authentically represent the gardens over the period that saw its evolution into an accommodation business at the same time as the evolution of the Pompallier property into a residential home and garden.

The Clendon hillside is undergoing a well-planned and implemented clearance and re-vegetation programme which will improve the site’s visual integrity and benefit the protection of the pa site as well as facilitate improved access to it.
inventory / analysis of character areas and features

The Pompallier Historic Reserve is made up of five areas that each have their own particular characteristics.

1. **The Greenway/Stephenson Garden**
   - Hedges, picket fence and gate
   - Pathways
   - Flower/garden beds and flag pole
   - Orchard/vegetable garden
   - Front Lawn
   - Chapel

2. **The Stephenson Hillside**
   - Hedges/fences
   - Pathways, totara avenue and look-out
   - Old hut site

3. **Clendon Garden**
   - Hedges/picket fence
   - Pathways
   - Flower/shrub beds

4. **Clendon Hillside**
   - Pa
   - Quarry

5. **Vehicle turn-around area**
part III: significance
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references:
• unpublished report in white folder, 'The Pompallier Garden', prepared by NZHPT staff, c1993-2000
• unpublished report 'draft: Management Plan for Pompallier House Historic Reserve', prepared by NZHPT staff, 2003
• Ross. R., A Guide to Pompallier House, 1970

inventory / analysis of character areas and features

1. Character Area: Greenway/Stephenson Garden

These gardens form the immediate setting for the impressive building but they also have high aesthetic, social, historic, design and scientific value in their own right.

The first gardens of any significance were the residential gardens laid out by Mair and Greenway in the late nineteenth-century. The following Stephenson period was relatively restrained and largely characterised by tidying and moderately developing the framework that had been implemented by Mair and Greenway. Most of the major modifications, particularly to the orchard area, were carried out during the 'Institutional' period under government ownership from the 1940s.

Consequently, this character area is currently maintained to ensure the main elements and framework of the late Victorian/Edwardian, colonial New Zealand garden created during the Greenway/Stephenson periods are retained and accurately displayed.

Overall, the gardens are considered remarkable for the coherence yet functionality of their original design as well their continuity over the years.

These gardens have aesthetic and historic significance because they reflect Victorian gardenesque elements of colour, eclecticism and exoticism, overlaid with a more informal Edwardian planting scheme and structured design, all within New Zealand's particular ecological and cultural context. They also have social and scientific significance because they represent a range of social histories including the social practice of plant importation, propagation, trading and exchanges in early New Zealand.

They are also considered significant for their proven subsurface archaeological potential. Archaeological investigations within the gardens have revealed archaeological remains relating to the mission and later periods, and have demonstrated the potential for subsurface archaeological remains throughout the garden (Maingay 1993; Eaves 1992, Best 1993, 2001, 2005; England 1994).

The key features of the Greenway/Stephenson garden are discussed in the following pages.

overall significance value: 2 (exceptional significance)
1. Greenway/Stephenson Garden

- **1a** Feature: Hedges
- **1b** Feature: Entrance pavilion
- **1c** Feature: Pathways
- **1d** Feature: Flower beds
- **1e** Feature: Orchard / Vegetable garden
- **1f** Feature: Front lawn
- **1g** Feature: Chapel site and well
part III: significance
1a. Feature: Hedges and picket fence

Tall hedges of Tecoma and Elaeagnus were planted first in the front garden in the Greenway period, before being continued up the hillside during the Stephenson’s ownership of the property.

The hedges were first established alongside the diagonal entrance path and along the front boundary of the property inside the picket fence. Photographs from c1912 show that the diagonal hedge was maintained to a tall height (estimated at approximately 2-2.5m), sufficient to create a strong framework as well as shelter for the garden (Fig 24). The hedge is currently maintained to a height of approximately 2m to reflect this tall height during the Greenway/Stephenson period.

A picket fence was constructed prior to the Greenway’s ownership (Refer to Fig 12 from 1868 which shows a picket fence extending along the front of both the Clendon and Pompallier properties). It is not known for certain when the original ‘kissing gate’ was first put in, however a photograph of Henry Stephenson behind the gate, with the name plate ‘Pompallier’ attached is clearly shown in Fig 23, from c1920. The kissing gate structure has been removed and while the large wooden columns remain, it is no longer a kissing gate. While these features are not entirely original, they accurately represent the Greenway or Stephenson period and consequently have significance to the heritage value of the property.

Hedge significance value: 2 (exceptional significance)
Picket fence significance value: 1 (some significance)
1b. Feature: Entrance pavilion

This structure is currently a prominent feature at the entrance to the property.

The entrance pavilion was built in 1993 at the northwest corner of the site, just inside the gate, to control public access to the property. The design of the octagonal building with its distinctive octagonal timber shingled roof is based on the French pigeon houses (pigeonnier or colombier) built largely in the 13th to late 18th centuries.

The French connection to the design and its pise de terre construction have been an attempt to acknowledge that aspect of the heritage values of the site. The pavilion performs a much-needed function, comprises sympathetic use of design and materials, and is well concealed by foliage in views from the Mission building. However, it visually clutters the entrance to the property and compromises the historic physical and visual connection between this corner of the Pompallier House Historic Reserve and the street/beach frontage.

The structure serves a useful purpose however it is intrusive on the heritage values of the property.

significance value: 0 (nil significance)
1c. Feature: Pathways

When Mair and Greenway set out their gardens, the main entrance was made in the northwest corner of the property and a curving path led diagonally from the entrance to the front of the house. A second gate at the southern boundary opened to another path leading straight towards the converted chapel (cowshed) before curving around towards the front of the house.

A third path dividing the main flower bed, dating from the Stephenson era, was revealed during the 1990s restoration period.

The 1946 site plan identifies the pathways as ‘metalled’ however archaeological evidence from the chapel excavation shows that cockle shell was probably used during much of the Greenway/Stephenson period as a path surface. The practice of using shell as a surface material on pathways has been used on similar properties such as Kemp House since the late nineteenth century and is also linked to pre-European New Zealand history. The archaeological report on the chapel excavation also suggests that prior to the use of shells, the Marists used beach shingle as a path surface. Worsfold’s memories also indicate that shingle was commonplace, ‘As was usual, the whole property, that was not a building, was ‘paved’ with the beach shingle put down thick, which made it very ‘crunchy’ to walk on.’ (Worsfold 1946, p40)

Staff observations indicate the shell surface quickly dissipates to the edges of the paths, and requires ongoing maintenance and replenishment to keep the shell layer at a consistent thickness across the paths.

**significance value: 2 (exceptional significance)**

**references:**
- Eaves M., Excavation of the Chapel Site, July 1992
- Worsfold, A Social History of Russell, 1946
1d. Feature: Flower Beds and Flagpole

The garden beds are aesthetically, socially, scientifically, architecturally (design) and historically significant and they continue to display a curvaceous, gardenesque style of mixed native and exotic species that was typical amongst both late Victorian and early Edwardian era gardens in New Zealand (Leach, 1996).

When Jane Mair laid out her garden in the 1880s, it included a long bed of mixed flowers and shrubs on the seaward side of the curving front path. The garden style attributed to Mair, captured in the photographs of the time, can be described as informal and gardenesque. The term ‘promiscuous’ was used to describe the characteristics of this style by contemporary garden writer David Thomson (in The Flower Garden, 1876).

The provenance of every plant in Jane Mair’s garden cannot be known but some have been recorded – the white Watsonia is attributed to Mrs Sophia Kemp of Kerikeri, and the gift to Mrs Stephenson of the Poor Knights Lily from Captain Bollons of the SS Tutukia, for example (as recalled by Louisa Worsfold).

In her June 1959 article, Nancy Steen wrote of a visit to Pompallier House:

“From our seat on the hilltop, we looked down a long pathway, bordered on either side with the pink China rose that Bishop Pompallier loved so much, and which has been planted there in his memory. To make room for the China roses, three old bushes had been chopped out; but in spite of this harsh treatment, they had shot away again and were once more in flower, with the pink blooms of the China roses poking through them. These three stalwarts were our old friends again, Rosa roxburghii, Félicité Perpétue and the white Multiflora. On one of his early visits to Akaroa, Bishop Pompallier must have carried with him cuttings of his little rose, for one old lady of just on a hundred had a plant in her garden which she cherished and called, The Bishop’s Rose.”

However, historian Ruth Ross regarded this association between Old Blush China and the bishop with reserve (Ross, 1967).

What is certain is that gifting and swapping plants, seeds, seedlings and cuttings, would have been commonplace among early European settlers and missionary families establishing gardens both for survival and for the pleasure of memories of ‘home’. Mail order nursery catalogues such as the United States magazine, ‘The Mayflower’ and New Zealand nurseries such as Montpellier (Auckland) and Coopers (Wellington) were also popular sources.

During the Stephensons time, the gardens are considered to have become more formal, orderly and well-kept. The Stephensons also installed the flagpole which was later re-sited by Professor Knight following the government’s acquisition of the property and then returned to its original position amongst the flower garden around the time of the building’s restoration in the early 1990s.

Research done in the 1990s by Susan Clunie, dated individual plants in the beds (Appendix 3). This work has been calibrated by the current gardener (Catrina Sutter, 2011) to verify the plants present today. Appendix 1 builds on this work. It includes a planting plan and accompanying plant lists that identify the known dates and locations of plant species in each bed. Those considered most significant are those identified as the original plant (1880-1940) in the original location. All the plants coloured red on the planting plan are considered to have exceptional significance.

Flower Beds significance value: 2 (exceptional significance)
Flagpole significance value: 2 (exceptional significance)

See Appendix 1 for individual plant significance.
Plate 18 Orchard

1e. Feature: Orchard / Vegetable garden

The orchard is situated on the old Turner block. The fruit trees were established during the Greenway period.

Vegetable gardens were inside the front hedge and inside the orchard area during the Greenway period but during the Stephenson's ownership the vegetable garden was limited to a square plot behind the diagonal hedge (NZHPT, 'The Vegetable Garden', c1998-2000).

By the 1940s there were 60 fruit trees on the property, thought to have been remnants of a much larger orchard during the Greenway period. Under the guardianship of Professor Knight with contributions from James McPherson, this part of the property underwent considerable modification and was recreated into a formal garden. Almost all the Greenway fruit trees and vegetable garden were removed at this time. In the 1960s, a metal drive crossed the lawn to access the caretaker's concrete block garage.

In the 1990s, the restoration/conservation process undertaken at the property included the reconstruction of the orchard area and vegetable garden to represent the Greenway/Stephenson period. The 1946 survey plan which identified all the fruit trees present at that time was used as the basis of the return of the orchard to its pre-institutional layout. Cultivars known to be popular in the 1880s and 1890s were selected from Redbluff's catalogues and Scott’s 'Orchardist' (1878).

The red shed was built at this time as a modern approximation of an historic shed constructed by the Greenway/Stephensons, and is currently used as a toilet and staff facilities. It serves as a reminder of the institutional changes that were made to this part of the garden at that time however it has no historic significance to the Greenway/Stephenson era. It does not significantly detract from the key values of the area due to its location against the boundary, away from key features and views.

During the Greenway period, there was a large vegetable garden (thought to be potatoes or kumara) where the front lawn is now located, and a small area in the orchard. Under the Stephenson’s ownership, the crops behind the front hedge were turned into the tennis court and only the garden within the orchard area remained.

The orchard area and trees present today are not original but represent an important component of the garden during the Greenway/Stephenson period and were recreated based on an authentic survey plan.

**Overall significance value:** 2 (exceptional significance)

**Individual trees significance value:** 1 (some significance)

**Vegetable garden significance value:** 1 (some significance)

**Red shed significance value:** 0 (no significance)

**Garage/garden shed significance value:** 0 (no significance)

The former caretaker’s garage is used for garden/
Initially, the front lawn had been the site of two of the Turner’s Row houses. Later, towards the end of the Greenway period, a photograph from c1904 (Fig 24) shows that this area had been developed as extensive vegetable gardens, a use of the garden which may have been related to the long economic depression of the late nineteenth-century.

The tennis court, including the benching and levels of the front lawn that remain today was established by the Stephensons. Oral history suggests it was also used as a croquet lawn. Originally the shape of the main flower bed where it met the top of the rise was a straight line determined by the wire netting fence. Court markings were applied, the corners marked out and wooden posts were set in the ground to support the net. New posts have been placed in the lawn to reference the location of the originals (NZHPT, unpublished, c1993).

Following the government acquisition of the property, the flower borders were extended into the tennis court area. During the research and restoration period of the 1990s, the beds were pushed back and the old lawn/court shape re-established.

Although this area has undergone modifications over the years, it maintains high aesthetic and historic significance including potential archaeological significance as result of the Turners Row Cottages located in this area.

**significance value:** 2 (exceptional significance)
1g. Feature: Chapel

In front of the Printery building, against the southern boundary with Clendon Cottage, lies the site of one of the other buildings that dates back to the property’s use as mission compound, the first Chapel. Approximately 8x3m, it was built by the Marists some time in 1840. The chapel site is considered highly significant as one of the oldest places of Catholic worship in New Zealand.

During the Greenways’ period, the chapel was used as a cow stall/livestock shed. It is shown on the 1946 site plan as a lavatory building. Worsfold also recalls,

‘...between it and the verandah we had a very fine fernery...’

The footprint of the chapel was revealed during a 1992 archaeological survey and is now interpreted with timber posts representing the position of the building’s original posts.

Refer to the Archaeological Assessment (Appendix 4) for further detail regarding archaeological matters.

**significance value:** 2 (exceptional significance)
2. Character Area: Stephenson Hillside

This area is part of the original narrow strip of land purchased by Pompallier though it was once separated off to Lands and Survey ownership. Prior to European subdivision of this landscape, the ridge was part of Moka’s seat during the 1830s-early 40s (NZHPT ‘draft Management Plan’, March 2003).

By 1904, photographs show re-vegetating manuka spreading across the hillside. It was around this time when the Stephensons moved in that the hillside began to be developed. It has regularly been described by researchers as having been turned into a ‘formalised parkland’ and the 1946 site plan and later photos (Fig 25) largely support this description.

The term ‘parkland’ is useful to describe the scale of the designed area and the elements put into it however, today it has grown into more of a woodland/bushland garden with little of the open space that a parkland style suggests.

The slope is now dominated by agapanthus, hydrangeas and coarse grasses at the lower levels. Upper parts are increasingly shaded by totara, kauri, conifers, tree ferns, oaks, pohutakawa, coprosma sp., and cabbage trees.

It has been suggested that there may have once been archaeological features on the ridge crest relating to WWII defence activities prior to the ridge being bulldozed (Jones, 2003) though this has not yet been substantiated. The likelihood of a defensive position on this hill is heightened by the fact of the officers’ mess being located immediately below.

This area is more than just the backdrop to Pompallier Mission House and gardens, it has significant heritage values in its own right. Stephenson’s hillside is critical to the integrity of the Pompallier property and makes an important contribution to the significance of the Reserve as a whole.

The key features of the Stephenson hillside are discussed in the following pages.

Significance value: 2 (exceptional significance)

references:
• c1868 photograph, Alexander Turnbull Library
• 1904 photograph, and refer to ‘Draft: The Pompallier Garden’, NZHPT for greater detail
• Clough report in Appendix 4, in particular page 7, for archaeological information on the hillside, in particular both Te Ke Emua and Puketutu, once the seat of Patukeha chief Moka.
2. Stephenson Hillside

2a Feature: Hedges / Fences
2b Feature: Pathways / Totara Avenue
2c Feature: Hut Site
part III: significance
2a. Feature: Hedges / Fences

The earliest historic features shown on the hillside pre-date the Printery building. Two fenced paddocks can be seen in that area in Mesnard’s 1838 watercolour painting of Russell (Refer Fig 6). The two paddocks appear as enclosures for stock as opposed to areas of cultivation.

The Callaghans may have been responsible for the full fencing of the property that first appears in an 1868 photograph (Fig 12). The fencing is thought to be post and rail and is presumed to have been for the purpose of keeping in small stock. However little is known of the Callaghan’s use of the site other than their tanning operations.

During the Greenway’s time, the hillside was bounded by tall mixed elaeagnus hedges. These were still present when the 1946 site plan was prepared (see Appendix 2), with the addition of post and wire fencing. The hillside was re-surveyed and fenced following its return from the Department of Conservation in 1993. Post and wire fencing continues to mark the approximate boundary (hedging wouldn’t be suitable under the current shaded conditions).

The northern boundary currently has a double fence-line marking both the Pompallier boundary and that of the neighbouring properties which, together with the proximity of the neighbouring buildings, detracts from the views and aesthetic appeal of the look-out area.

**significance value:** 1 (some significance)
2b. Feature: Pathways / Totara avenue and look-out

It was Henry Stephenson who created the zig-zag path up the steep hillside with an avenue of totara trees lining one of the switches. The original path is maintained today. Additional paths that are recorded on the 1946 plan are maintained as drainage swales. The Stephenson track is of considerable historic significance as the key structural element of this designed parkland landscape.

The avenue leads purposefully to a glade at the top of the hill where panoramic views would once have been enjoyed. Today, the extent of vegetation growth and the proximity of neighbouring houses limit the views from the look-out but it remains a pleasant area and is a significant component of the hillside garden’s layout.

Despite modifications, the ridge crest also has significance due to the potential archaeological features on the ridge crest relating to WWII defence activities (Jones, 2003) and for its association with Moka’s seat, Puketutu.

Pathway significance value: 2 (exceptional significance)
Totara Avenue significance value: 2 (exceptional significance)
Look-out significance value: 1 (some significance)
2c. Feature: Hut site

A small house or hut is depicted on the hillside, directly behind the Printery on both the 1843 C. Pharazyn painting (Fig 26) and the Edward Ashworth sketch of Russell in 1844 (Fig 27). It is possible that archaeological remains of this feature have survived, but further investigation would be required to confirm this.

The building dates to the Mission period and may have provided accommodation for Maori visitors (draft Management Plan, 2003).

The house or hut occurs somewhere in the immediate vicinity of the area below the sharp return in the zig-zag of the Stephenson Track and is not currently interpreted.

significance value: 1 (some significance)

Further investigation (e.g. through geophysical archaeological investigation) may result in findings that elevate significance value.

references:
3. Character Area: Clendon Gardens

A test pit for an archaeological assessment revealed fragments of charcoal in the beach flat layer that was considered could tentatively be interpreted as evidence of pre-contact Maori settlement and related activities, possibly associated with pa above (NAR, April 2009). There is also potential for subsurface archaeological remains relating to the early European use, although little investigation has been carried out to confirm this.

From early pictorial representations of this southern corner of Kororareka Bay it appears there was a building (presumably erected by Cunningham) on the site when James Clendon took ownership of the property (Clendon Cottage Conservation Plan, p24).

In photographs taken in 1858 and 1864 (Refer to Figs 10-11) the grounds appear to be well treed, certainly in comparison to neighbouring properties, but it is difficult to see any greater detail.

Louisa Worsfold remembers the oak tree in the garden which can be seen in Fig 24 (c1904), but was cut down c1950.

‘The feature about that house was the fine oak-tree there. I have never known who planted it...’ (Worsfold 1946 p17)

The grounds and particularly the front garden were extensively planted up until 1911, after which the number of plantings and beds were slowly reduced. The layout and plantings evolve to become less cluttered and more and more simple (see Figs 31-33). This appears likely to be related to the change from a more private residential use to that of an accommodation business which would have been seeking minimal maintenance while maximising views in and out of the property.

The existing mulberry and quince trees, with a rose and grapevine climbing through them, are said to have been part of the early 1980s planting. During the Pompallier Conservation project 1990-1993, new plantings included replacing the hedges, oak and cabbage trees that had previously been removed. The cypresses were replanted in the early 2000s (Howard, 2010). These features are no longer original however they demonstrate an accurate representation of early fabric and position and therefore have some heritage significance.

The Cottage and gardens have served as the Curator’s accommodation since 1981 and a staff gate has provided discreet access between properties.

These gardens do not have the dramatic historical associations of their neighbour and it appears from the evidence available that they have never had the sophisticated layout or complex garden plantings of the Greenway/Stephensons. Key characteristics of the garden retain continuity, from the sizeable nineteenth-century building setback to the low-maintenance layout of its lengthy boarding house era.

These gardens have heritage significance as a fluid, vernacular landscape that represents the wider changing history of Russell, and particularly the effects of the developing tourist industry.

**Overall significance value:** 1 (some significance)

---

**references:**

3. Clendon Gardens

Features:

- **3a**: Hedges / Picket fence
- **3b**: Pathways
- **3c**: Flower / Shrub beds
part III: significance
3a. Feature: Hedges / Picket fence

Photographs taken in 1858 and 1864 (Refer to Figs 10-11) clearly show a picket fence and a gate halfway along The Strand’s frontage, presumably aligned with the front path and door of Clendon Cottage at the time.

The northwest corner of the Clendon garden can be seen in an image from 1884 (Fig 28) which shows the white picket fence and oak tree. By approximately 1904 (Fig 24) there is hedging along the front boundary, a cabbage tree and two tall cypress trees on either side of the front gate. By 1912 (Table 3, (h)) the front entrance has been moved to the northwest corner of the property. The hedging has also been partially removed and the height of the section that remains, lowered. The cypress and cabbage trees are still standing at this time.

By 1948, (Fig 29) the front hedge had been removed. It is likely that the cabbage trees and cypresses were also removed at this time. By 1971 (Fig 30), the picket fence has also been removed and replaced with a post and chain fence. The shared hedge along the Pompallier boundary and the oak tree were also removed c1949-early 1950s (refer Fig 25).

During the restoration of the cottage (c1970s), NZHPT put in a gate between the Pompallier and Clendon properties, replaced the picket fence, and restored the alignment of the front path and gate.

significance value: 1 (some significance)

references:
3b. Feature: Pathways

A photograph taken in 1884 (Fig 28) shows the northwest corner of the Clendon garden — there is no gate in this corner at this time. Another image from c1904 shows clearly that the gate was at the centre of the property with a straight path to the front door of Clendon Cottage.

By 1912 (Refer to Table 3, (h)), the front gate had been shifted from the centre of the picket fence to the northwest corner of the garden with a new curving front path. The straight central path was removed. It wasn’t until after NZHPT took ownership that the layout of the front path was returned to a formal central axis (c1970s).

Although evidence indicates that the central path was the earlier alignment, the curving path from the northwest corner also has some historic precedence due to its early implementation and lengthy presence.

Photographic and archaeological evidence indicates that nineteenth-century paths in the garden area were likely to have been surfaced with shell.

**significance value:** 1 (some significance)
3c. Feature: Flower / Shrub Beds

A photograph thought to date from about 1904, taken from Clendon hillside (Refer to Fig 24), shows a well-planted garden with a mature oak in the northwest corner. Broad beds flanking the front path appear quite densely planted.

A second photograph thought to date from a similar period (Fig 31) provides a good illustration of the make-up of the front beds which appear to be predominantly in Alpinia sp. By 1912, the garden beds had shrunk to occupy a small area immediately in front the verandah and a small pergola had been constructed with climbing plants over it.

By the 1920s, under the Bisset family ownership, the garden beds had been removed completely though the pergola was rebuilt and made larger.

The pergola was removed c1950 and a narrow garden border was re-introduced along the front verandah around the 1960s-70s and remains today (see Fig 32 and Fig 33).

The potager garden between the Clendon Cottage and Pompallier boundary was established c1994 and is not a recreation of a previous garden in this position.

While the gardens of 2011 do not depict a precise moment in time, they authentically represent the gardens over the period that saw the property’s evolution into an accommodation business at the same time as the evolution of the Pompallier property into a residential home and garden.

significance value: 1 (some significance)

Potager Garden significance value: 0 (no significance)
4. Character Area: Clendon Hillside

The slopes of Clendon Hillside are a prominent feature containing the southern end of Kororareka Bay.

Early maps (a map showing Clendon’s ownership in 1844 (SO920, Fig 15) show that the Clendon property originally extended beyond the southern hillside to include Tahapuke Bay. The ridge encircling Tahapuke Bay had been formed into the large complex of Te Keemua pa but was apparently not occupied at the time of European arrival into the Bay.

A small structure, possibly a small house or shed, is shown on the Rev J. Kinder’s 1858 watercolour of Russell (Refer to Fig 13) but is not distinguishable in later images. Northern Archaeological Research have identified its approximate location in Plate 28 above. NAR note that it is possible that subsurface archaeological evidence of this structure has survived but further investigation would be required to confirm this.

This part of the property has been grazed at various stages over its history. A photo from 1868 (Refer to Fig 12) shows what appears to be post and rail fencing marking the boundary between the Clendon and Pompallier hillsides. There was also a second internal curving fenceline within the ‘Clendon’ property. There are likely to still be some subsurface archaeological remains of this nineteenth-century paddock fencing.

The wattle and other well-established weed species that had occupied the hillside in recent years have been cleared and the slopes are in the process of being progressively revegetated under Martin’s Hillside Management Plan.

The Clendon Hillside is highly significant for its prominent landform and undeveloped setting for Pompallier Mission House and Clendon Cottage, as well as its exceptional pre-European contribution to this property’s historic narrative. It places the Reserve in an older, wider context.

significance value: 2 (exceptional significance)

references:
Character Area: Clendon Hillside

4a Feature: Pa
4c Feature: Quarry

5 Character Area: Turn around

NOTE 1: Indicative, proposed pathways as identified in NAB Pompallier Logging Survey
part III: significance
4a. Feature: Pa

The most dominant Maori archaeological site in the vicinity is the pa Q05/824. The southern boundary of the Clendon hillside is marked by a fence that follows the ridgeline on which the pa is located. Most of the pa site lies within the neighbouring property but its northernmost features extend partly into the Historic Reserve.

The name ‘Te Ke Emua’ (also referred to as Te Keemua) was attributed to the pa site in an 1984 archaeology report by G. Niven, but its source wasn’t referenced. In the early 17th century this was the pa of Chief Tupare and Ngare Raumati however at some time during the 17th century Ngati Manu received the pa and other land on the Kororareka peninsula, from Tupare, in utu.

Not a great deal seems to be recorded about the role of the pa and the complex is not shown in historical sketches or paintings of Russell from the late 1820s.

The site is considered a little unusual in that it appears to represent two separate defended headlands at either end of Tahapuke Bay and that there appears to have been no attempt to defend the ridge descending to the north into Russell on the boundary between Pompallier Mission and the Matauwhi Bay Recreation Reserve.

The well-preserved pa site is significant in that it represents a major component of Maori settlement in Russell and the Bay of Islands and is integral to its early history.

**significance value:** 2 (exceptional significance)

**references:**
- Archaelogical Survey Fladgate Renovations
- Clough Report in Appendix 4
4b. Feature: Quarry

There is a small rock face visible at the foot of the Clendon Hillside which is thought to have been quarried 1839-42 by missionaries from the nearby Pompallier mission, to obtain material for the building’s construction.

The ability to build in pisé (and pan de bois) with material found on site provided an alternative to purchasing timber for an impoverished mission. Consequently the association between the quarry and the Printery is of exceptional significance for technical reasons.

significance value: 2 (exceptional significance)
5. Character Area: Turn-around Area

Early photos and surveys (refer to Table 3) show that there were two buildings to the right of Clendon Cottage in the area where the vehicle turn-around area is today - the building on the far right is likely to be the Simon and Weston store and the other next to Clendon Cottage is presumed to be the building later owned by James Deary. It is not known for certain when the Deary house was demolished though it was still standing in 1907.

Louisa Worsfold writes of her memories of the house from around 1875, describing it as being set among the many large Norfolk Island pines near the beach:

‘...no garden except belladonna lilies in a corner - so someone had had a garden at some time – also periwinkles and sarsaparilla vines crawled up the hill at the back.’

Worsfold remembers the people who lived there at the time as the family of Captain Gregory Norris (cousin of the Clarkes at the Waimate North mission station), then later, the Salmons, whom she describes as great friends of the Greenways, before a succession of other occupants including James Deary.

A four-unit motel block was constructed in the 1960s in the turn-around area, and demolished in 1977 (Fig 34).

At present, this part of Pompallier House Historic Reserve that adjoins the end of the Strand is used as a vehicle turning area and parking area by the public. This is useful for some but is not directly related to the heritage values and purpose of the Reserve.

significance value: 0 (nil significance)
influences on conservation policy

A number of factors have been taken into account in developing conservation policy relating to the heritage values of the Reserve. These include the considerable heritage significance of the property, its role as a historic site open to the public, management constraints, threats to the site, and relevant legislation and policy. Identified constraints to the site are outlined below.

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014

Pompallier is registered as a Category I Historic Place under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA), and Clendon Cottage and its surrounds as a Category 1 and Category 2 Historic Place.

In achieving the purpose of the HNZPTA, Heritage New Zealand is required to recognise the following in all of its work section 4 of the HNZPTA:

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

The principle that the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of New Zealand’s historical and cultural heritage should

- Take account of all relevant cultural values, knowledge and disciplines; and
- Take account of material of cultural heritage value and involve the least possible alteration or loss of it; and
- Safeguard the options of present and future generations; and
- Be fully researched, documented and recorded, where culturally appropriate; and

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

The relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.

Pompallier and its surrounds is also a recorded archaeological site (Q05/074) in the New Zealand Archaeological Association’s Site Recording Scheme. This site, together with Te Keemua pa and any other unrecorded archaeological remains within the Reserve, are protected by the archaeological provisions of the HNZPTA. Under section 6 of the HNZPTA, an archaeological site is defined as:

‘Any place in New Zealand that:

Either

Was associated with human activity that occurred before 1900; or

Is the site of the wreck of any vessel where the wreck occurred before 1900; and

Is or may be able through investigation by archaeological methods to provide evidence relating to the history of New Zealand.’

Section 42 of the HNZPTA provides that, except pursuant to an authority from the Trust, modification, damage or destruction of any part of an archaeological site is unlawful if done with knowledge or having reasonable cause to suspect that the site is an archaeological site.

Section 16 of the HNZPTA requires Heritage New Zealand to confirm the statements of policy adopted by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust under section 57 of the Historic Places Act 1993 for the management, administration, control and use of the historic places owned or controlled by, or vested in, Heritage New Zealand. In accordance with the HNZPTA every statement of general policy shall be prepared in draft form by Heritage New Zealand and shall both identify the historic place or historic places to which the policy applies and state policies and objectives for the management and use of such historic places.

The draft statement of general policy developed by NZHPT in accordance with section 57 of the HPA includes 16 objectives and an array of policies. In relation to Pompallier gardens and grounds, the following policy is of particular relevance:

heritage landscapes, gardens and parks owned or managed by the NZHPT should be protected, interpreted, maintained and renewed so that their historic, ecological and aesthetic values are retained and recognised.

The statement of general policy applies to the gardens and grounds in so far as these form part of a greater heritage landscape that needs to be protected, interpreted and managed for public access.
Resource Management Act 1991

The purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and amendments is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources (section 5(1)). Sustainable management is defined as (section 5(2)):

“...managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety while—

a) Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and

b) Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and

c) Avoiding,remedying,or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.”

In 2003, historic heritage was elevated to section 6, making it a matter of national importance so its protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development has to be recognised and provided for (section 6(f)).

The Act defines historic heritage as:

‘a. …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:

i. archaeological:

ii. architectural:

iii. cultural:

iv. historic:

v. scientific:

vi. technological, and

b. includes—

i. historic sites, structures, places, and areas, and

ii. archaeological sites, and

iii. sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu, and

iv. surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources.’

The Reserve is located in a coastal environment so the preservation of its natural character also has to be recognised and provided for (section 6(a)).

Under section 8 of the RMA, ‘all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi):’

Reserves Act 1977

The property is a Historic Reserve subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977. Reserves are classified Historic “for the purpose of protecting and preserving in perpetuity such places, objects, and natural features, and such things therein or therein contained as are of historic, archaeological, cultural, educational, and other special interest.” (Section 19(1)). The Section continues:

(2) It is hereby further declared that, having regard to the general purposes specified in subsection (1) of this section, every historic reserve shall be so administered and maintained that—

a) The structures, objects, and sites illustrate with integrity the history of New Zealand:

b) The public shall have freedom of entry and access to the reserve, subject to the specific powers conferred on the administering body by sections 58 and 58A of this Act, to any bylaws under this Act applying to the reserve, and to such conditions and restrictions as the administering body considers to be necessary for the protection and general well-being of the reserve and for the protection and control of the public using it:

c) Where scenic, archaeological, geological, biological, or other scientific features, or indigenous flora or fauna, or wildlife are present on the reserve, those features or that flora or fauna or wildlife shall be managed and protected to the extent compatible with the principal or primary purpose of the reserve:

d) To the extent compatible with the principal or primary purpose of the reserve, its value as a soil, water, and forest conservation area shall be maintained:

e) Except where the Minister otherwise determines, the indigenous flora and fauna and natural environment shall as far as possible be preserved:

Provided that nothing in paragraph (c) of this subsection shall authorise the doing of anything with respect to fauna or wildlife that would contravene any provision of the Wildlife Act 1953 or any regulations or Proclamation or notification under that Act, and nothing in this subsection shall authorise the doing of anything with respect to archaeological features in any reserve that would contravene any provision of the Historic Places Act 1993.

Building Act 2004

The Building Act covers access to and within places of public assembly for people with disabilities (sections 117-120 of the Act). Under the Act, 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.’ In making alterations to Clendon Cottage, Heritage New Zealand will need to provide disabled access to the building. This will not be the case for the whole property, however improving disabled access is a priority.

Protected Objects Act 1975

The purpose of the Protected Objects Act is to protect New Zealand’s heritage objects through regulating their export, sale, trade and ownership. It also sets out the processes that must be followed when a taonga or Maori artefact is found.
Heritage Precincts. Relevant policies are:

Christ Church Precinct are dealt with in Section 12.5A – The heritage values of Russell and rules specific to the schedules contained within the District Plan: Section 12.5 of the District Plan. Rule 12.5.5.1 refers to the Heritage objectives, policies and rules are provided in archaeological site.

The adjacent area of The Strand is identified as an Conservation Zone (Map 89, section 9, FNDP) and entirely located within an area identified as a Christ Church Heritage Precinct (Map HP4, section 12.5A, FNDP) and entirely located within an area identified as a Conservation Zone (Map 89, section 9, FNDP).

The Reserve is zoned as a Conservation area on Plan 89 of the FNDP. Objectives, policies and rules relevant to a Conservation Zone are provided in Section 9.7 of the District Plan. The policies are:

- 9.7.4.1 That the existing conservation values of areas be maintained or enhanced.
- 9.7.4.2 That existing conservation areas are used and developed in a way which will avoid adverse effects on the conservation values of the site and which will avoid adverse effects on the surrounding area.
- 9.7.4.3 That land zoned Conservation is permanently protected through the use of protective mechanisms (including acquisition as an esplanade reserve where appropriate as a financial contribution arising from subdivision or land use activities). See Chapter 14 for the implementation of this policy.
- 9.7.4.4 That areas worthy of conservation are identified and provided permanent protection.
- 9.7.4.5 That the net effect of activities within the Conservation Zone should not degrade or diminish the total biodiversity and ecological functioning of the values contained within it.

Chapter 10 of the FNDP sets out provisions for the Coastal Environment. Key relevant matters provided for in the policies and rules include visual amenity, landscape qualities, recognising and providing for the relationship of Maori to their culture and traditions, indigenous vegetation and protection of historic heritage. Section 10.9 of the Plan relates specifically to Russell.

ICOMOS New Zealand Charter

The ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (Appendix 5) sets out principles to guide the conservation of such places in New Zealand. All conservation work carried out at the Pompallier Historic Reserve should be consistent with these principles.

Occupiers Liability Act 1962

The Occupier’s Liability Act 1962 outlines the obligations of an ‘occupier’ of land and buildings with regard to protecting any persons (including visitors) who enter any land or building under the occupier’s control.

Heritage New Zealand is the occupier of Pompallier. As such it has a duty of care to ensure that all reasonable steps are taken to keep visitors to the Reserve safe for the activities or purposes for which they have been invited or permitted by Heritage New Zealand to be there.

Far North District Plan

The Printery and Clendon Cottage are listed together on the Far North District Council’s schedule of Historic Sites, Buildings and Objects. Two trees, Araucaria heterophylla (Norfolk Pine) and Eugenia myrtifolia (Monkey Apple) are also listed (see page 6).

Pompallier House Historic Reserve is located within the Christ Church Heritage Precinct (Map HP4, section 12.5A, FNDP) and entirely located within an area identified as a Conservation Zone (Map 89, section 9, FNDP).

The adjacent area of The Strand is identified as an archaeological site.

Heritage objectives, policies and rules are provided in Section 12.5 of the District Plan. Rule 12.5.5.1 refers to the schedules contained within the District Plan:

- 12.5.5.1 The Plan includes schedules of notable trees, historic buildings and objects, Sites of Cultural Significance to Maori, and registered archaeological sites and the items listed in these schedules (refer to Appendices 1D – 1G in Part 4) are shown on the District Plan Maps. While activities that will have minor effects, or, in certain circumstances, emergency works and in the case of notable trees trimming, maintenance and, in limited circumstances felling, will be permitted, an application for resource consent will be required for significant modifications to those items/places that are scheduled and/or mapped.

The heritage values of Russell and rules specific to the Christ Church Precinct are dealt with in Section 12.5A – Heritage Precincts. Relevant policies are:

- 12.5A.4.1 That the type, scale and nature of alterations to existing buildings be limited so as to ensure the retention of the heritage character of the various heritage precincts and of buildings of historic significance within those heritage precincts.
- 12.5A.4.2 That the removal or demolition of buildings be restricted to those of little or no historic significance which do not contribute significantly to the streetscape values of the various heritage precincts.
- 12.5A.4.3 That the location, scale and nature of new buildings and structures be controlled so as to not adversely affect the historic character, streetscape or landscape values of the various heritage precincts and of buildings of historic significance within those heritage precincts.
- 12.5A.4.4 That archaeological sites are protected from damage or destruction, and that archaeological information is retrieved whenever appropriate.
- 12.5A.4.5 That the heritage values of The Strand and Kerikeri Basin Heritage Precincts are not adversely affected by inappropriate outdoor advertising.
- 12.5A.4.6 That activities which conflict with pedestrian use of The Strand be restricted.

Section 12.5A.6 sets out rules in relation to activities within the Heritage Precincts.

The Reserve is zoned as a Conservation area on Plan 89 of the FNDP. Objectives, policies and rules relevant to a Conservation Zone are provided in Section 9.7 of the District Plan. The policies are:

- 9.7.4.1 That the existing conservation values of areas be maintained or enhanced.
- 9.7.4.2 That existing conservation areas are used and developed in a way which will avoid adverse effects on the conservation values of the site and which will avoid adverse effects on the surrounding area.
- 9.7.4.3 That land zoned Conservation is permanently protected through the use of protective mechanisms (including acquisition as an esplanade reserve where appropriate as a financial contribution arising from subdivision or land use activities). See Chapter 14 for the implementation of this policy.
- 9.7.4.4 That areas worthy of conservation are identified and provided permanent protection.
- 9.7.4.5 That the net effect of activities within the Conservation Zone should not degrade or diminish the total biodiversity and ecological functioning of the values contained within it.

The ICOMOS New Zealand Charter sets out principles to guide the conservation of such places in New Zealand. All conservation work carried out at the Pompallier Historic Reserve should be consistent with these principles.
Neighbouring Properties
The property is neighboured by Department of Conservation reserve land and private land owners, including residential properties. The way that these neighbouring properties are managed can have an influence on the site, in terms of fencing, views, self-seeding weeds, tree management, pest control, fire control, and the management of the integrity of the pa.

Likewise, the way in which the site is managed, particularly the hillsides, can have an influence on the neighbouring properties, and also in terms of visitor movements in the area. The Reserve must be managed in a way that it is a ‘good neighbour’ to the surrounding properties.

Incompatible use:
The gardens and grounds are vulnerable to unsympathetic change over time. There is potential for any changes to impact on the physical fabric, the visual character and other heritage values of the property.

The present use of the Pompallier house, gardens and hillside as a museum, historic gardens and interpretive facility is an appropriate and compatible use.

Subsurface archaeological remains are also highly vulnerable. Remains relating to the Marist period (and therefore potentially any earlier 19th-century evidence) were found to be at least 1m below the surface in the Ervée, England and Best excavations, sealed by a clay layer probably resulting from a major landslip. This layer, however, was not present in the Clendon garden sewer trench. Also, evidence of later 19th-century settlement is closer to the surface, and has the potential to be impacted on by any works extending to c.30-40cm below the surface (although exact depths are likely to vary across the property).

The erection of temporary structures such as marquees can be a threat to any subsurface archaeological remains. While there is less subsurface impact from temporary structures, damage can still occur if subsurface remains are present.

Currently, the erection of marquees is confined to the front lawn, formerly modified to create tennis courts. At this modified location, such structures should pose little threat to subsurface archaeological remains.

Any subsurface works such as drainage, new structures, new garden layouts and new planting (with the exception of planting in established beds) have the potential to disturb or expose subsurface archaeological remains.

Influence of Neighbours
One of the most important values of these grounds is the largely undeveloped setting/landscape. Inappropriate development of adjacent properties has the potential to compromise the integrity and character of the site. Visual intrusion, damage to the integrity of the pa, and introduced weeds can also impact on the site from neighbouring area.

Ongoing relationship building and involvement of neighbours as key stakeholder group can assist in managing these issues. Threats from neighbouring development such as visual intrusion, damage to the integrity of the pa, and introduced weeds can also be managed in part through the Far North District Plan and statutory processes around the Plan. Ongoing involvement of neighbours as part of key stakeholder group can also assist in managing these issues, if necessary.
Visitor impacts
In recent years Pompallier has received between 21,000 and 22,000 visitors a year (Martin, 2011, pers.comm.). Staff observations suggest that the greatest proportion of visitors is currently concentrated on the building, with a smaller but significant number spending time in the gardens while considerably fewer venture up the pathway on Stephenson’s hillside. Clendon Cottage and grounds are not currently open to public visitors.

There should be capacity to accommodate greater numbers within the grounds of this sizeable property. The plants and structures that form the heritage fabric of the property are vulnerable to visitor impacts however, general wear and tear is an ongoing but manageable threat.

Visitor control and ticketing is currently managed through the use of the entrance kiosk. Should access to the property be changed, visitor circulation may become an issue.

Visitor management should have special consideration for the vulnerability of the pa site, the form of which will be less recognisable to some. Interpretation would assist in ensuring that visitors are informed about this feature.

Vandalism
Vandalism, in the form of unauthorised excavations by ‘fossickers’, is a threat to subsurface archaeological remains. To date this has not been a problem at the Reserve.

Interpretation and public access
Although Pompallier is well known and promoted, there is currently a lesser perception of the significance of the gardens in their own right and a lack of awareness in general of the features of the rest of the Reserve. Much of the Reserve is currently not easily accessible by the public. The gardens and grounds would benefit from more in-depth explanation, albeit modest in scale and location.

Conservation standards and operational management needs
Neglect of maintenance, poorly specified works, poor risk management and works undertaken by people without appropriate skills, qualifications or experience in historic restoration or conservation could all undermine the heritage values of this property.

Because of the considerable cultural significance of the place, all conservation works within the site should be consistent with accepted international conservation practice, particularly as expressed in the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter (Appendix 5). These principles underpin the conservation policies recommended in this document, and all decisions relation to the conservation of the site should be made according to those outlined in the Charter.

The conservation of historic places requires special skills and training. All conservation work on the Reserve gardens and grounds should be carried out under the direction of a landscape architect with recognised training, specialist skills and proven experience in historic restoration.

Fire
Fire is a major threat to the vegetation and buildings. Wattle is particularly flammable. The property, and the steep hillsides in particular, suffer from summer drought and are at risk seasonally from fireworks and flares. In the last decade, the local Fire Brigade has had two call-outs to the hillside itself and two to neighbouring properties: two caused by cigarettes, one by a power tool and one by vandals.

Clendon hillside has recently been cleared of wattle species and is being revegetated with the low fire-risk native coastal plants of the local ecological area Whangaruru.

Natural Hazards
Severe weather conditions, particularly flooding, extreme tides, tsunami and drought at this coastal location are a threat to the property – the buildings and the gardens and grounds.

Establishing a regular survey/monitoring process of the condition of the site in addition to inspecting and recording effects on the grounds as soon as possible after a severe event will assist in managing the extent and repair of damage.

Climate change
The Reserve is located on the beach front, placing the low level parts of the site at risk from sea level rise. Inundation by salt water would soon have a damaging impact on the historic gardens. There is little that can be done at a micro scale to protect the property from the consequences of climate change however planning could include the collection of seeds and transplanting of cuttings to ensure particularly special varieties associated with the site remain viable. Careful, ongoing records/information management is also a critical consideration in managing potential loss of heritage fabric.

Gaps in Understanding/Information loss
The potential loss of archival material is a serious threat to the heritage values of the site. The loss of old documents, photographs and oral histories is a threat to our understanding of the heritage values of the site as well as the ability to manage the site to maintain those values. Similarly, it is essential that gaps in our understanding of the site’s past are pursued to prevent misinformation and ensure its accurate conservation, restoration and interpretation.
Information on the Reserve currently appears to be widely dispersed which greatly increases the risk of loss – this Conservation Plan is a first step towards collating references and improving accessibility to material however considerably more should be done to mitigate this threat. Holding copies of key documents, photos, and other information together in one place would assist.

Failure to keep ongoing adequate records including any works undertaken, their location, or any archaeological remains or artefacts exposed, hinders planning of works and may threaten the conservation of archaeological remains.

Conservation Vision

To protect, and where possible, enhance the significance of the Reserve gardens and grounds as a pre-eminent cultural landscape and to respect the integrity of the character areas and many features within these that contribute to its heritage value:

- The setting of the Printery within the Greenway/Stephenson garden; and
- The Stephenson hillside;
- Clendon cottage garden;
- Clendon hillside, including the pa and quarry.

Conservation Policies

Policy Aims

The underlying objective is to ensure that what is significant and valuable about the Reserve survives for present and future generations of New Zealanders to experience and enjoy. In implementing the policies, it is important that they address the issues and threats raised in the previous section while integrating conservation and public expectation from the site.

It is intended that these policies be adopted as the basis for future decision-making. The proposed policies act on two levels: some are for long-term or ongoing development while others identify actions that aim to meet more specific, immediate needs.

The recommended policies have the following principal objectives:

- The conservation and enhancement of the intrinsic character of the site and its component parts;
- The recovery of the essential character and appearance of the site in order to retain its most significant developed form (particularly in the case of Clendon gardens);
- The discrete incorporation of necessary new works or elements that will enable the site to continue to be used in such a way as to cause no (or minimal) loss of cultural significance;
- The establishment and implementation of a conservation process that will manage the ongoing maintenance and restoration of damaged or missing features.

1. General

a. Ensure all statutory requirements are met.

b. Administer the Pompallier House Historic Reserve in a manner that supports tangata whenua involvement as kaitiaki of the pa site on the Reserve. Seek involvement from local iwi and hapu representatives in contributing to identification and recognition of Maori values and their sustainable management.

c. Treat this Plan as a living document and undergo regular minor reviews.

2. Conservation, Repair and Maintenance

The Pompallier House Historic Reserve is a site of national significance as well as being a popular tourist destination. Regular scheduled and professional maintenance is an intrinsic part of the conservation process of a landscape.

A regular programme of maintenance will ensure that the heritage significance and amenity of the Pompallier House Historic Reserve is sustained and prevent decisions that are reactive or inconsistent with the Conservation Plan.

General

a. Systematic maintenance programme and audit instigated specific to each character area.

b. Plant husbandry should seek longevity of all original remaining plant material and maintain all vegetation to achieve its design intent as well as continuing good health, vigour and where appropriate, indigenous biodiversity values.

C. People with appropriate recognised training and specialist skills should be involved in any aspect of repair or maintenance works in the garden and grounds.
d. Work closely with neighbours to address weed control issues.

e. Inspection of the tree stock is recommended to be undertaken by a suitably experienced and qualified arborist. Inspection to be undertaken on an annual basis and all trees to be pruned for dead and diseased branches and for maintaining views. Views to the buildings such as those from The Strand, as well as views from Stephenson Hillside and from the Printery that enable an overview of the gardens and their structure should be maintained to the extent that the good health and heritage values of vegetation are not adversely impacted. In particular, examine possibility of:

• pruning the Pohutakawa on the front lawn of the Pompallier property to reveal views of the Printery.
• pruning the Jacaranda on the Clendon/Pompallier boundary with regard to maintaining views
• possibility of pruning the Acmena on the front lawn of the Pompallier property for health reasons.

f. Liaise with Far North District Council arborist to prepare list of other significant trees on the Pompallier House Historic Reserve for scheduling e.g. the Totara avenue.

Greenway/Stephenson Garden

The Greenway/Stephenson gardens form the immediate setting to the historic Printery building and are the most visited of the character areas. They are well maintained and should continue to be well maintained in order to protect their significance and the significance of the Pompallier House Historic Reserve.

g. All plants identified as part of the Greenway/Stephenson garden should be used as source material for propagation so that their genetic stock is retained.

h. Dead or diseased plants in the flower beds are to be replaced where possible and practicable with stock (seeds, cuttings, seedlings) propagated by staff from original plant stock. The planting plan and lists provided in Appendix 1 are to be referred to with regard to identifying and positioning plants in their appropriate locations.

i. Should any trees in the Greenway/Stephenson garden be considered in need of replacement, it is considered appropriate to plant young trees rather than mature replacements. This will temporarily alter the character of the gardens but in the longer term younger trees will generally be healthier and more vigorous and extend the life of the gardens.

j. Where plants need to be replaced in the Greenway/Stephenson garden and cannot be sourced from existing on-site plant material, 19th- and early 20th-century NZ nursery catalogues should be used in the first instance to identify appropriate varieties/cultivars as replacements. Scott’s Orchardist, Redbluffs and Montpellier are preferred references. The Koanga (Kaiwaka) Gardens Catalogue, Kings Seeds, and Hort+Research are useful contemporary references for heritage plants. Plants may be also be sourced from other Mission gardens in the region.

k. Those plants in the Greenway/Stephenson gardens that are part of the heritage ‘fabric’ of the site but are considered noxious weeds (e.g. the Arundo donax ‘Variegata’) must be managed to prevent risk of seed dispersal.

l. The diagonal hedge in the Greenway/Stephenson garden should continue to be maintained to a height (approximately 2m) that creates shelter, a strong garden framework and a sense of enclosure (as evident in Figures 24 and 28).

m. There should be no change to the current layout of the Greenway/Stephenson gardens unless any new evidence is revealed that supports change.

n. Inspection and pruning of fruit trees to be undertaken regularly by a suitably experienced and qualified horticulturalist/orchardist;
Stephenson’s Hillside

Stephenson’s Hillside is currently maintained as a semi-bushland area with most available time and resources required to focus on weed control. This area and the views available from it are of historic and aesthetic importance and would benefit from a return to a more ‘managed’ parkland appearance.

o. Improve drainage to minimise erosion damage to pathway.

p. Continue to focus on weed management and work closely with DOC to ensure weeds are controlled on both properties to avoid re-infestation;

• Recommend intensify focus on agapanthus to control their spread;

q. Inspection of the tree stock be undertaken by a suitably experienced and qualified Arborist. Provision of tree-care programme and comment on pruning or thinning that may be possible to achieve some lightening in canopy without compromising health or other heritage values - i.e. programme maintenance works to maintain trees and lower plantings but restrict middle storey.

Clendon Gardens

The current layout and elements of the Clendon gardens are a restoration based on a broad period over the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth-century. The gardens are not original but they have some significance and therefore their conservation is desirable but they have capacity to accommodate some change.

The current master-planning exercise is reviewing potential new uses for Clendon Cottage, including its gardens and grounds. Policies regarding the conservation and maintenance of these gardens should be reviewed once this exercise is complete and final design and uses are in place.

r. The gardens should continue to represent their evolution to low-maintenance commercial accommodation gardens.

s. While a much simpler garden, its maintenance should be undertaken to the same horticultural standards and tidiness as the neighbouring Greenway/Stephenson garden to demonstrate consistency.

t. Inspection of the tree stock be undertaken by a suitably experienced and qualified Arborist. Provision of tree-care programme including comment on pruning that may be beneficial for health and tidy appearance without compromising heritage values. Inspection to include front hedge.

Clendon Hillside

Clendon Hillside has historically formed an important backdrop to the end of Kororareka Bay and as part of the wider undeveloped setting for the Pompallier and Clendon Cottage properties.

u. Maintain area as a semi-wilderness, bushland setting.

v. Continue to focus on weed management and work closely with DOC to ensure weeds are controlled on both properties to avoid re-infestation;

Turn-around Area

w. The quarry feature should be kept free of weeds and other vegetation growth and in a general orderly appearance.

x. The wider area should also be maintained to a general tidy standard. It is recommended that the way in which the area is currently used for the disposal of waste vegetation and with a focus on vehicle use be re-assessed with consideration for its heritage significance, functionality and aesthetic appeal.

3. Restoration and Enhancement

a. Enhance the historic character and visual qualities of the Reserve, where appropriate, by removing or reducing the impact of modern, intrusive elements or restoring eroded or lost elements.

b. New works or elements should only be carefully incorporated where they are deemed to be necessary and to enhance understanding and experience of the heritage landscape and so long as they are not inconsistent with the objectives and policies of this Conservation Plan.

Stephenson’s Hillside

The post and wire fencing along the northern and southern boundaries of Stephenson’s hillside represent post and wire fencing that was present in the 1946 survey of the hillside alongside the hedging. Earlier photographs (e.g. Fig 12, from 1868) also show these boundaries fenced but in a style that appears more like that of post and rail. A detail from a 1904 photograph (Fig 35) shows a boarded post and rail fence on the lower slopes of the hill.

Plate 35 Front lawn area has potential for archaeological remains
c. Recommend further research into the fencing and hedging of this area to confirm which fencing type and/or hedging most appropriately represents the Stephenson period.

d. The double fence-line at the northern boundary of the look-out area detracts from this area’s aesthetic appeal. Recommend restoration of this area according to research findings however should research confirm current fencing as most representative, recommend continuation of clumps of low plantings (see Plate 20) at points along fenceline to soften appearance and minimise distraction from view.

Clendon Gardens

The current layout and elements of the Clendon gardens are based on a broad period over the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century. The gardens are not original but they have some significance and therefore their conservation is desirable but they have capacity to accommodate some change.

The current master-planning exercise is reviewing potential new uses for Clendon Cottage, including its gardens and grounds. It is recommended that:

 e. The final design of layout and plantings represent the gardens at the time the property evolved into an accommodation business which was the same time as the evolution of the Pompallier property into a residential home and garden during the Greenway/Stephenson period.

Clendon Hillside

f. Develop planting plan to maintain hillside in indigenous, coastal vegetation that will assist with erosion issues as recommended in the Replanting and Hillside Implementation Management Plans and assist in reducing fire risk particularly in drier summer months.

g. Use lower growing, shallow rooting plants e.g. grasses and groundcovers around the pa site features to minimise disturbance to archaeological features.

Turn-around Area

h. The turn-around area detracts from the values of the Pompallier House Historic Reserve and therefore its use and design need to be reassessed as part of the Master Planning process and Reserve Management Plan.

i. Recommend minimising this area’s current focus on vehicle use and maximising aesthetic appeal and interpretation potential of historic values - particularly with regards to the quarry feature.

4. Subsurface Archaeological Remains

The whole Reserve is an archaeological site within the meaning of the Historic Places Act 1993. A map of known areas of archaeological significance is included within this Plan. Any work involving ground disturbance has the potential to impact on subsurface archaeological deposits.

a. No management activities involving ground disturbance should be carried out within the Reserve unless either an Authority to Modify, Damage or Destroy an archaeological site has been obtained from the NZHPT, or the NZHPT Regional Archaeologist has confirmed that one will not be required (note that this excludes normal garden maintenance activities).

b. Procedures are required to ensure that archaeological deposits, features and materials are not inadvertently damaged by site maintenance or enhancement activities.

• Management activities with the potential for disturbing subsurface archaeological remains should be located away from known areas of archaeological significance wherever possible.

• Any work involving ground disturbance should be supervised by an appropriately qualified and experienced archaeologist. (Note that this excludes normal garden maintenance activities).

• Garden maintenance activities that involve ground disturbance outside existing flower beds should be assessed for their potential impact on archaeological features and deposits.

c. All archaeological investigation work will require an Authority to Modify, Damage or Destroy an archaeological site from the NZHPT.

d. Archaeological investigation (geophysical followed...
by physical investigation), to expose and preserve archaeological remains within the Reserve and provide further information on the physical history of the site, may be desirable (such as the ‘Maori visitor’s hut’).

e. Consultation with tangata whenua is required if any investigations are proposed, e.g. search for potential Maori hut, or future works which have the potential to affect subsurface remains.

f. Any potential archaeological remains exposed through visitor impacts or natural processes such as erosion should be promptly assessed by an archaeologist so that remedial action or archaeological investigation can be undertaken, as appropriate.

5. Interpretation and Access

a. In order to heighten visitor awareness of the layers of significance of the site, on-site interpretation should be developed and enhanced (without intruding on the amenity or heritage values of the site) and should include:

   • The richness of the historical development of the Reserve as a whole;
   • The relationship of the buildings to their setting and to the development of Russell and New Zealand;
   • Connections with the persons who lived at Pompallier House and Clendon Cottage and the social development of the area;
   • The significance of the property as part of a wider network of mission sites across New Zealand and the Pacific that tell similar stories covering key developments in the early contact/missionary story in New Zealand. Collectively, the surviving landscapes demonstrate the relationship between missionary endeavours and Maori and secular pakeha responses.

b. Public access to and within the Reserve should ensure that appreciation of the site is maintained or enhanced while the integrity of the properties that make up the Reserve is maintained.

c. Seek involvement from tangata whenua on appropriate interpretation of Te Keemua pa and the Reserve in its entirety.

d. Seek involvement from tangata whenua on Pouwhenua to mark the site.

e. Interpretative information should be provided in English and Maori.

f. The design, placement and content of interpretation material should be carefully planned and designed to respond to and reflect the significance of place as set out in this Plan.

g. Continue to distinguish the Marist occupation by maintaining the visual isolation of the immediate surrounds of the 1840s Printery.

h. Continue to conserve the Greenway/Stephenson gardens and hillside to reflect the period of residential occupancy during the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century.

i. Promote the significance of the gardens and grounds in their own right. The gardens and grounds deserve a high level of presentation and promotion. Besides the material culture that remains, the gardens and grounds allow for the telling of the social, cultural and environmental history of this place.

6. Records and Research

a. Research and write up specific history of Pompallier Conservation Project, 1990-1993, particularly in regards to the gardens and grounds.

b. Adhere to the Heritage New Zealand Collections Policy and best practice collection and records management standards.

c. Investigate ways of improving collection and records management for material associated with the Pompallier House Historic Reserve to ensure their preservation, in an accessible form, within a comprehensive archive.

d. All archaeological investigations, repair and stabilisation work must be fully recorded by appropriately qualified heritage professionals while the work is in progress, and in accordance with any Authority conditions set by Heritage New Zealand.

e. The record of archaeological investigation, repair and stabilisation work should be placed in an appropriate archive and should be available to the public for consultation.

f. All changes to the cultural heritage landscape, including new paths, tree plantings or static interpretation must be fully recorded using annotated plans, photographs and written records.

g. Photographic records of the garden across the seasons together with monthly notes of new plantings should be maintained by on-site staff.

h. The scale and complexity of this heritage landscape requires that ongoing research be pursued. Some specific areas of enquiry which are recommended, but not to the exclusion of others, include:

   • Investigation into history of fencing and hedging on Stephenson’s Hillside;
• Research into Maori occupation and use of the area incorporating Pompallier House Historic Reserve;
• Further research into key Maori associated with the site such as Chiefs Kiwikiwi and Rewa;
• Research into the involvement of Maori in the Mission and in the wider work and influence of the mission in the north;
• Further investigation into Jane Mair and Greenway family history;
• Further research into the Stephenson family history;
• Further investigation into the era of Clendon ownership of the Clendon property and the nature of the Clendon gardens at the time;
• A public appeal for any additional photographic evidence or other documentary records whose existence is so far unknown;
• Archaeological investigation (geophysical in advance of physical) of the site thought to be the Maori visitor’s hut and all other known house sites within the Pompallier House Historic Reserve;
• Continue research to identify and date plant replacements/changes/additions to the Greenway/Stephenson garden including lists of plant varieties imported and when they were imported to the site.

7. Standards and Procedures

It is important that all conservation, investigation and management work carried out is undertaken in a way that is appropriate to the heritage values of the Reserve. The ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (Appendix 5) sets out principles to guide conservation work in New Zealand that are recognised and accepted by all heritage protection agencies. In addition, conservation of historic sites and structures requires specialist skills, such as those of a conservation architect, archaeologist, and arborist or other tradesperson with experience on heritage sites.

a. All work should be carried out in accordance with the principles of the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value and the ICOMOS ICAHM Charter for Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage (Appendices 5 and 6).

b. Exemplary standards of conservation practice should be observed in all instances.

c. Coordinate all design and maintenance decisions for the gardens and grounds to ensure that they are based on sound conservation practices and on consistent professional advice.

d. All conservation work and archaeological investigation should be carried out under the direction of suitably qualified professionals, with recognised training, specialist skills and proven experience in historic restoration.

8. Community Resource

Pompallier Reserve is located within a small coastal town and popular tourist destination. While most visitors to the site are tourists from elsewhere in New Zealand or are international, locals regularly participate in activities and events that are held at the site and view the Reserve with pride and no doubt a sense of ownership. It is a key part of the Russell community.

a. Actively seek and develop ongoing relationships with those who have a specific interest in maintaining and protecting the cultural or spiritual values associated with the place.

b. Continue to maintain relationships with the community and different groups who have a special interest in the Reserve and encouraging their...
part IV: issues, policies and management recommendations

9. Access to water supply and reduction of fire risk
Ensure the site is able to withstand periods of drought and associated fire risk.

a. Commission a survey identifying the existing outside plumbing and drainage systems and any additional water supplies available to the site to enable maintenance and irrigation of gardens to appropriate standards.

b. Ensure external water supply/piping systems at both Pompallier and Clendon properties are maintained

c. Secure confirmation of access to additional/emergency water supplies such as the bore in Matauwhi Bay in the event of a fire.

Further Recommendations

1. Greenway/Stephenson Garden
The Greenway/Stephenson gardens are currently well-maintained. There are no further recommendations in addition to those set out in the Policy section.

2. Stephenson Hillside
Stephenson’s Hillside is an under utilised area within the Reserve’s grounds. It is currently maintained as a semi-bushland area with most available time and resources required to focus on weed control. This area and the views available from it are of historic and aesthetic importance. Improvements to this area could encourage a greater level of overall visitor use.

Recommend:
• Replacement of park bench at lookout point with sturdy timber furniture to enable appreciation of view;
• Research into fencing and hedging of Stephenson’s Hillside;
• Management of middle story of plant growth and/or thinning of canopy (as per arborist recommendations) to greater reflect parkland character of original design.

3. Clendon Cottage Gardens
The layout and elements of the Clendon gardens currently reflect a range of periods – such as the pre-1912 location of the central gate and path and location of re-planted oak tree (which may also date to the property’s use as a residence) and the narrow garden borders along the verandah of the 1960s-70s. While the gardens of 2011 do not depict a precise moment in time, most of the elements represent the gardens over the period that saw the property’s evolution into an accommodation business at the same time as the evolution of the Pompallier property into a residential home and garden. The narrow borders are a more recent development.

While the current master planning exercise will determine the final use and layout of the Clendon gardens, it is recommended that these be determined within the following framework:
• The central path alignment has some historic significance however the curving pathway from the northwest corner also has historic precedence and therefore there was some flexibility with this alignment;
• The picket fence and hedging should be retained;
• The oak tree, cabbage tree and cypresses should be retained;
• The flower/garden beds may be moderately extended into the front lawn (refer to Fig 22 from 1912)
• The potager garden may be removed.
4. Clendon Hillside
Clendon Hillside has historically formed an important backdrop to the end of Kororareka Bay and as part of the wider undeveloped setting for the Pompallier and Clendon Cottage properties.

Recommend:
- Continuing to maintain area as undeveloped landscape setting while restoring in indigenous, coastal vegetation as per Replanting and Hillside Implementation Management Plans to reduce risk of both erosion and devastation by fire.
- Development of interpretation strategy for Te Keemua pa.

5. Turn-around area
Recommend considering alternative uses and design of the turn-around area that complements historic values – i.e. that maintains a focus on its residential setting and as a setting for the quarry’s historic values. This may require:
- Collaboration with Far North District Council to investigate closing the turn-around area to public vehicle access while maintaining vehicle access to the Tahapuke property;
- Uses may include but not be limited to, some parking for staff, interpretation of quarry, function/event space (potentially related to changing use of Clendon Cottage and gardens).

Plate 39 Current fence and hedge between turn-around area and Clendon gardens
## Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Ensure all statutory requirements are met.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Administer the Pompallier House Historic Reserve in a manner that supports tangata whenua involvement as kaitiaki of the pa site on the Reserve. Seek involvement from local iwi and hapu representatives in contributing to identification and recognition of Maori values and their sustainable management.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Treat this Plan as a living document and undergo regular minor reviews.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Systematic maintenance programme and audit instigated specific to each character area. Audit existing plants and their positions in relation to the research already undertaken (including plant list, Appendix 1)</td>
<td>URGENT &amp; ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Plant husbandry should seek longevity of all original remaining plant material and maintain all vegetation to achieve its design intent as well as continuing good health, vigour and where appropriate, indigenous biodiversity values.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>People with appropriate recognised training and specialist skills should be involved in any aspect of repair or maintenance works in the garden and grounds.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Work closely with neighbours to address weed control issues.</td>
<td>URGENT &amp; ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>Inspection of the tree stock is recommended to be undertaken by a suitably experienced and qualified Arborist. Inspection to be undertaken on an annual basis and all trees to be pruned for dead and diseased branches and for maintaining views. Views to the buildings such as those from The Strand, as well as views from Stephenson Hillside and from Pompallier House that enable an overview of the gardens and their structure should be maintained to the extent that the good health and heritage values of vegetation are not adversely impacted.</td>
<td>NECESSARY/ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In particular, examine possibility of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• pruning the Pohutukawa on the front lawn of the Pompallier property to reveal views of the Printery, improve road access, use of lawn and improve safety;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• pruning the Jacaranda on the Clendon/Pompallier boundary with regard to maintaining views;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• possibility of pruning the Acmena on the front lawn of the Pompallier property for health reasons and to prevent damage to the gatehouse and enhance light to the plants below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>Liaise with Far North District Council arborist to prepare list of other significant trees on the Pompallier House Historic Reserve for scheduling e.g. the Totara avenue.</td>
<td>DESIRABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g</td>
<td>All plants identified as part of the Greenway/Stephenson garden should be used as source material for propagation so that their genetic stock is retained.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h</td>
<td>Dead or diseased plants in the flower beds are to be replaced where possible and practicable with stock (seeds, cuttings, seedlings) propagated by staff from original plant stock. The planting plan and lists provided in Appendix 1 are to be referred to with regard to identifying and positioning plants in their appropriate locations.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i</td>
<td>Should any trees in the Greenway/Stephenson garden be considered in need of replacement, it is considered appropriate to plant young trees rather than mature replacements. This will temporarily alter the character of the gardens but in the longer term younger trees will generally be healthier and more vigorous and extend the life of the gardens.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Action required</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2j</td>
<td>Where plants need to be replaced in the Greenway/Stephenson garden, and cannot be sourced from existing on-site plant material, 19th- and early 20th-century NZ nursery catalogues should be used in the first instance to identify appropriate varieties/cultivars as replacements. Scott’s Orchardist, Redbluffs and Montpellier are preferred references. The Koanga (Kaiwaka) Gardens Catalogue, Kings Seeds, and Hort+Research are useful contemporary references for heritage plants. Plants may also be sourced from other Mission gardens in the region.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2k</td>
<td>Those plants in the Greenway/Stephenson gardens that are part of the heritage ‘fabric’ of the site but are considered noxious weeds (e.g. the Arundo donax ‘Variegata’) must be managed to prevent risk of seed dispersal.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2l</td>
<td>The diagonal hedge in the Greenway/Stephenson garden should continue to be maintained to a height (approximately 2m) that creates shelter, a strong garden framework and a sense of enclosure (as evident in Figures 24 and 28).</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
<td>There should be no change to the current layout of the Greenway/Stephenson gardens unless any new evidence is revealed that supports change.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2n</td>
<td>Inspection and pruning of fruit trees to be undertaken regularly by a suitably experienced and qualified horticulturalist/orchardist.</td>
<td>NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2o</td>
<td>Improve drainage to minimise erosion damage to pathway on Stephenson hillside</td>
<td>NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>Continue to focus on weed management and work closely with DOC to ensure weeds are controlled on both properties to avoid re-infestation. Recommend intensify focus on agapanthus to control their spread.</td>
<td>ONGOING/NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2q</td>
<td>Inspection of the tree stock on Stephenson’s Hillside be undertaken by a suitably experienced and qualified Arborist. Provision of tree-care programme and comment on any pruning or thinning that may be possible to achieve some lightening in the canopy on Stephenson’s Hillside without compromising health or other heritage values - i.e. programme maintenance works to maintain trees and lower plantings but restrict middle storey.</td>
<td>NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r</td>
<td>The Clendon gardens should continue to represent their evolution to a low-maintenance commercial accommodation gardens.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>While a much simpler garden, its maintenance should be undertaken to the same horticultural standards and tidiness as the neighbouring Greenway/Stephenson garden to demonstrate consistency.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2t</td>
<td>Inspection of the tree stock be undertaken by a suitably experienced and qualified Arborist. Provision of tree-care programme including comment on pruning that may be beneficial for health and tidy appearance without compromising heritage values. Inspection to include front hedge</td>
<td>NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2u</td>
<td>Maintain Clendon Hillside area as a semi-wilderness, bushland setting.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v</td>
<td>Continue to focus on weed management and work closely with DOC to ensure weeds are controlled on both properties to avoid re-infestation.</td>
<td>ONGOING/NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2w</td>
<td>The quarry feature should be kept free of weeds and other vegetation growth and in a general orderly appearance.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x</td>
<td>The wider area should also be maintained to a general tidy standard. It is recommended that the way in which the area is currently used for the disposal of waste vegetation and with a focus on vehicle use be re-assessed with consideration for its heritage significance, functionality and aesthetic appeal.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Action required</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Enhance the historic character and visual qualities of the Reserve, where appropriate, by removing intrusive elements, restoring eroded or lost elements, and seeking to create new elements.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>New works or elements should only be carefully incorporated where they are deemed to be necessary and to enhance understanding of the heritage landscape and so long as they are not inconsistent with the objectives and policies of this Conservation Plan.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Recommend further research into the fencing and hedging of this area to confirm which fencing type and/or hedging most appropriately represents the Stephenson period.</td>
<td>DESIRABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>The double fence-line at the northern boundary of the look-out area detracts from this area’s aesthetic appeal. Recommend restoration of this area according to research findings however should research confirm current fencing as most representative, recommend continuation of clumps of low plantings (see Plate 20) at points along fenceline to soften appearance and minimise distraction from view.</td>
<td>DESIRABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>The final design of layout and plantings represent the gardens at the time the property evolved into an accommodation business which was the same time as the evolution of the Pompallier property into a residential home and garden during the Greenway/Stephenson period.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>Develop planting plan to maintain hillside in indigenous, coastal vegetation that will assist with erosion issues as recommended in the Replanting and Hillside Implementation Management Plans.</td>
<td>NECESSARY/ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g</td>
<td>Use lower growing, shallow rooting plants e.g. grasses and groundcovers around the Pa site features to minimise disturbance to archaeological features.</td>
<td>NECESSARY/ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h</td>
<td>The turn-around area detracts from the values of the Pompallier House Historic Reserve and therefore its use and design need to be reassessed as part of the Master Planning process and Reserve Management Plan.</td>
<td>NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3i</td>
<td>Recommend minimising this area’s current focus on vehicle use and maximising aesthetic appeal and interpretation potential of historic values - particularly with regards to the quarry feature.</td>
<td>NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>No management activities involving ground disturbance should be carried out within the Reserve unless either an Authority to Modify, Damage or Destroy an archaeological site has been obtained from Heritage New Zealand, or the Heritage New Zealand Regional Archaeologist has confirmed that one will not be required. (Note that this excludes normal garden maintenance activities.)</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Procedures are required to ensure that archaeological deposits, features and materials are not inadvertently damaged by site maintenance or enhancement activities.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>All archaeological investigation work will require an Authority to investigate an archaeological site from the NZHPT.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Archaeological investigation (geophysical followed by physical investigation), to expose and preserve archaeological remains within the Reserve and provide further information on the physical history of the site, may be desirable (such as the ‘Maori visitors hut’).</td>
<td>DESIRABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>Consultation with tangata whenu is required if any investigations are proposed, e.g. search for potential Maori hut, or future works which have the potential to affect subsurface remains.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>Any potential archaeological remains exposed through visitor impacts or natural processes such as erosion should be promptly assessed by an archaeologist so that remedial action or archaeological investigation can be undertaken, as appropriate</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Action required</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>In order to heighten visitor awareness of the layers of significance of the site, on-site interpretation should be maintained and enhanced (without intruding on the amenity or heritage values of the site).</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>Public access to and within the Reserve should ensure that appreciation of the site is maintained or enhanced while the integrity of the properties that make up the Reserve is maintained.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d</td>
<td>Seek involvement from tangata whenua on appropriate interpretation of Te Keemua pa and the Reserve in its entirety.</td>
<td>NECESSARY/ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e</td>
<td>Interpretative information should be provided in English and Maori.</td>
<td>DESIRABLE/ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5f</td>
<td>The design, placement and content of interpretation material should be carefully planned and designed to respond to and reflect the significance of place as set out in this Plan.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5g</td>
<td>Continue to distinguish the Marist occupation by maintaining the visual isolation of the immediate surrounds of the 1840s Printery.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5h</td>
<td>Continue to conserve the Greenway/Stephenson gardens and hillside to reflect the period of residential occupancy during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5i</td>
<td>Promote the significance of the gardens and grounds in their own right. The gardens and grounds deserve a high level of presentation and promotion. Besides the material culture that remains, the gardens and grounds allows for the telling of the social, cultural and environmental history of this place</td>
<td>NECESSARY/ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Research and write up specific history of Pompallier Conservation Project, 1990-1993, particularly in regards to the gardens and grounds.</td>
<td>NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>Adhere to the Heritage New Zealand Collections Policy and best practice collection and records management standards.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Investigate ways of improving collection and records management for material associated with the Pompallier House Historic Reserve to ensure their preservation, in an accessible form, within a comprehensive archive.</td>
<td>NECESSARY. ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d</td>
<td>All archaeological investigations, repair and stabilisation work must be fully recorded by appropriately qualified heritage professionals while the work is in progress, and in accordance with any Authority conditions set by Heritage New Zealand.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e</td>
<td>The record of archaeological investigation, repair and stabilisation work should be placed in an appropriate archive and should be available to the public for consultation.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f</td>
<td>All changes to the cultural heritage landscape, including new paths, tree plantings or static interpretation must be fully recorded using annotated plans, photographs and written records.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g</td>
<td>Photographic records of the garden across the seasons together with monthly notes of new plantings should be maintained by on-site staff.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h</td>
<td>The scale and complexity of this heritage landscape requires that ongoing research be pursued.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>All work should be carried out in accordance with the principles of the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value and the ICOMOS ICAHM Charter for Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage (Appendices 5 and 6).</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>Exemplary standards of conservation practice should be observed in all instances.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>Coordinate all design and maintenance decisions for the gardens and grounds to ensure that they are based on sound conservation practices and on consistent professional advice</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Action required</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d</td>
<td>All conservation work and archaeological investigation should be carried out under the direction of suitably qualified professionals, with recognised training, specialist skills and proven experience in historic restoration</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Actively seek and develop ongoing relationships with those who have a specific interest in maintaining and protecting the cultural or spiritual values associated with the place.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>Continue to maintain relationships with the community and different groups who have a special interest in the Reserve and encouraging their involvement where appropriate.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>Continue to foster relationship with tangata whenua which will also benefit visitors to the site i.e. through their interpretation of the grounds.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d</td>
<td>Continue to promote Pompallier House Historic Reserve as an educational resource, utilising its wide range of heritage values</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>Commission a survey identifying the existing outside plumbing and drainage systems and any additional water supplies available to the site to enable maintenance of gardens to appropriate standards.</td>
<td>URGENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>Ensure external water supply/piping systems at both Pompallier and Clendon properties are maintained.</td>
<td>ONGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c</td>
<td>Secure confirmation of access to additional/emergency water supplies such as the bore in Matauwhi Bay in the event of a fire</td>
<td>URGENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2003 Plant Key
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed A</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>1980 - 1964</th>
<th>1944 - 1940</th>
<th>1940 - 1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Xemonema callistemon</td>
<td>Raupo-ta-ranga</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Agapanthus praecox</td>
<td>African lily</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Crassula multicava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Viola odorata</td>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Acanthus mollis</td>
<td>Acanthus, Bear’s breeches</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Chimonanthus praecox</td>
<td>Winter sweet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Camellia sinensis</td>
<td>Johnson’s Red Waratah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Camellia sinensis</td>
<td>White nun</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Camellia sinensis</td>
<td>Pillida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Rhododendron arboreum</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Camellia sinensis</td>
<td>Catherine Lochlan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Ophelia miniata</td>
<td>Kaffir lily</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Buxus sempervirens “suffictosa”</td>
<td>Box</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Arum italicum</td>
<td>Arum lily NOT FOUND</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa macrantha</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Centurea montana</td>
<td>Perennial cornflower</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa polyantha</td>
<td>Anna Maria de Montraveal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Lobelia laxifolia</td>
<td>Perennial lobelia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hypericum sp.</td>
<td>St John’s wort</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Amaryllis belladonna</td>
<td>Pink naked lady</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Exochorda racemosa</td>
<td>String of pearl bush</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa polyantha</td>
<td>Cecile Brunner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Fuchsia boliviana</td>
<td>Fuchsia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sparaxis tricolor</td>
<td>Sparaxis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Salvia leucantha</td>
<td>Salvia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Narcissus sp.</td>
<td>Daffodil</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canna x hybrida</td>
<td>Tall orange canna</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canna x hybrida</td>
<td>Short red canna</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dahlia</td>
<td>Tall white dahlia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa roxburgii</td>
<td>Chestnut rose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOT FOUND**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>1880 - 1904</th>
<th>1904 - 1940</th>
<th>1940 - 1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mirabilis jalapa</td>
<td>Four o’clock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Alstromeria pulchella</td>
<td>Peruvian lily</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Kniphofia praecox</td>
<td>Red hot poker</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Romenya coulteri</td>
<td>Tree poppy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Canna x hybrida</td>
<td>Tall pink canna</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa chinensis</td>
<td>Parsons pink rose</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa Hybrid Tea</td>
<td>Mme Caroline Testout?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Plumbago capensis</td>
<td>Leadwort</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Zephranthes cadida</td>
<td>Autumn crocus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Kerria japonica</td>
<td>Kerria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Crocosmia x crocosmiiflora</td>
<td>Monbretia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Plectranthus mahonii</td>
<td>Plectranthus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dianthus cv</td>
<td>Mrs Sinkins dianthus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Heliotrope peruviana</td>
<td>Cherry pie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Bergenia cordifolia</td>
<td>Bergenia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Fuchsia cv</td>
<td>Fuchsia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Chaenomeles japonica</td>
<td>Japonica</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tetradena riparia</td>
<td>Ibozo</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spatium junceum</td>
<td>Spanish broom Died 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Amaryllis belladonna</td>
<td>White naked lady</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Gerbera jamesonii</td>
<td>Gerbera</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pelargonium cv</td>
<td>Old cerise pelargonium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Narcissus tarseta cv</td>
<td>Erlicheer narcissus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Iris x dutch</td>
<td>Blue Dutch iris</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sprekelia formosissima</td>
<td>Jacobean lily</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dianthus x cv</td>
<td>Napoleon 111, dianthus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dianthus</td>
<td>Earle of Essex, dianthus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tritonia crocata</td>
<td>Tritonia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Crinium moorei</td>
<td>Crinium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Artemesia arborea</td>
<td>Southern wood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Viburnum opulus sterile</td>
<td>Snowball bush</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed March 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Spiraea cantonensis florepleno</td>
<td>Double may</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed A</td>
<td>Plant Type</td>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>1880-1904</td>
<td>1904-1940</td>
<td>1940-1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dahlia</td>
<td>Pink dahlia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Watsonia spp ardernei</td>
<td>White watsonia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Gruss an Teplitz rose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Leuconjum aestivum</td>
<td>Snow flake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Eucomis comosa</td>
<td>Pineapple plant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tulbaglia fragrans</td>
<td>Ornamental garlic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Iris sp.</td>
<td>Tall yellow iris</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dracunculus vulgar</td>
<td>Dead horse lily,</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rotting horseflesh lily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Euphorbia pulcherrima</td>
<td>Pointsettia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dahlia</td>
<td>Tall dark red dahlia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Scilla peruviana</td>
<td>Peruvian lily</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa polyantha</td>
<td>Perle d’Or rose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Fuchsia</td>
<td>Fuchsia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ornithogalum</td>
<td>Turk’s head</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dahlia cv</td>
<td>Tall orange dahlia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following plants were not included in the 1998 garden plan, but have been in Bed A since at least November 1998:

<p>| A     | P          | Japanese anenome               |                             |           | X         |           |
|       | B          | Lilium lonclifolium            | Tiger lily                  |           |           |           |
|       | C          | Echinacea purpurea             | Echinacea                   |           |           |           |
|       | D          | Achillea                       |                             |           |           |           |
|       | E          | Penstemon                      | Penstemon                   |           |           |           |
|       | F          | Osteospermum                   |                             |           |           |           |
|       | G          | Dahlia                         | Bishop of Llandorff dahlia  |           |           |           |
|       | GG         | Campanula glomerata            | Canterbury bells            |           |           |           |
|       | H          | Dahlia                         | Dahlia                      |           |           |           |
|       | I          | Narcissus tazetta              | Paperwhites                 |           |           |           |
|       | In         | Rosa                           | Rose                        |           | X         |           |
|       | J          | Fuchsia cv2                    | Fuchsia                      |           |           |           |
|       | K          | Aquilegia                      | Granny’s bonnet             |           |           |           |
|       | L          |                                | Forget-me-nots              |           |           |           |
|       | M          | Bulbs, not identified          |                             |           |           |           |
|       | N          | Bulbs, not identified          |                             |           |           |           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed Type</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bulbs, not identified</td>
<td>1890-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cordyline terminalis</td>
<td>1890-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phlox paniculata</td>
<td>Phlox</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed Type</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Muscari latifolium</td>
<td>Grape hyacinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Narcissus bulbocodium</td>
<td>Hoop petticoat daffodil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Euphorbia pulcherrima</td>
<td>Pointsettia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Narcissus tazetta</td>
<td>Paperwhites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerbera jamesonii</td>
<td>Gerbera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alstromeria pulchella</td>
<td>Peruvian lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Leonurus leonotis</td>
<td>Lion’s tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Stachyurus praecox</td>
<td>Lily of the Valley tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Phlomis fructicans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Liculia grandiflora</td>
<td>Liculia Died 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Cestrum nocturne</td>
<td>Queen of the Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Agapanthus praecox</td>
<td>Afircan lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Watsonia spp ardernei</td>
<td>White watsonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rosa gallica</td>
<td>Annais segalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Arundo donax “Versicolor”</td>
<td>Noble reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crinimum moorei</td>
<td>Crinimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moraea bicolour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arum italicum</td>
<td>Arum lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freesia x refracta</td>
<td>Freesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iris florentina</td>
<td>Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prunus am</td>
<td>Flowering almond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed</td>
<td>Plant Type</td>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Cuphea macropetala(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Amaryllis belladonna</td>
<td>Pink naked lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Hemerocallis fluva “Flore Pleno”</td>
<td>Day lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Bilbergia nutans</td>
<td>Friendship plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Kniphofia praecox</td>
<td>Red hot pokers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Clivia miniata</td>
<td>Kaffir lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Lachenalia aloides</td>
<td>Lachenalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Haemanthus sanguineus</td>
<td>Blood lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Hibiscus syriacus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Crassula multicava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa hybrid tea</td>
<td>Hybrid tea rose (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa x</td>
<td>Captain Christy, rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Red Letter Day, rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>General Gallenii, rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Grus an Teplitz, rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Cecile Brunner, rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Jacaranda mimosafolia</td>
<td>Jacaranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canna</td>
<td>Short red canna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Plectranthus (previously described as a salvia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Phildephus coronaria</td>
<td>Mock orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Trachecarpus fortuneii</td>
<td>Windmill palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Viburnum opulus sterile</td>
<td>Snow ball tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Iris foetidissima</td>
<td>Stinking iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Iris japonica</td>
<td>Japanese iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Justicia carnea</td>
<td>Jacobinia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Arum aethopoeia</td>
<td>Arum lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Anenome x hybrida</td>
<td>Japanese anenome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Arum palestinum</td>
<td>Black Arum lily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following plants were not included in the 1998 garden plan, but have been in Bed since at least November 1998:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>1880-1904</th>
<th>1904-1940</th>
<th>1940-1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>T Tree  F Fern S Shrub P Perennial Su Succulent Cl Clump B Bulb C Climber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>de la Griffierae, rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red dahlia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chlorophytum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bromileads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>1880-1904</th>
<th>1904-1940</th>
<th>1940-1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>T Tree  F Fern S Shrub P Perennial Su Succulent Cl Clump B Bulb C Climber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Echeveria x imibriata</td>
<td>Echeveria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ayastasia bella</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Amaryllis belladonna</td>
<td>Pink Naked Lily</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Alstroemeria pulchella</td>
<td>Alstromeria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>de la Griffierae, rose (taken from the rose at Purakau)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa rugosa</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa HP</td>
<td>Shot Silk (?), rose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Red rose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Erigeron karvinskainus</td>
<td>Mexican daisy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Type</td>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>1880 - 1904</td>
<td>1904 - 1940</td>
<td>1940 - 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tecoma capensis</td>
<td>Tecoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Metrosideros excelsa</td>
<td>Pohutukawa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Syzygium jambos (?)</td>
<td>Lily pilly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Corynocarpus laevigata</td>
<td>Karaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Elaeagnus pungens</td>
<td>Russian olive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Trachycarpus fortunei</td>
<td>Windmill palm</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Euonymus japonicus</td>
<td>Japanese spindlewood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Malus x domestica</td>
<td>Gravenstein apple</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
germ plasm collection. These were grafted onto mm106 stock by Heritage Horticulture in Hamilton.

The trees planted were:

**Apple**
Worchester pearmain, Scarlet pearmain, Colonel Vaughan, Ribston Pippin, Api Rose, Peasgood Nonesuch, Twenty Ounce, Devonshire Quarrenden.

**Plum**
Italian, Sugar, Victoria, D’Argen, Coe’s Golden Drop, Reineclaudie du Bavay, Greengage, Damson; and the early Japanese plums, Satsuma and Burbank

**Pear**
Vicar of Winkfield, Clapps Favourite, Brockworth Park and Long Pear donated by the Reti family of Waikare Inlet.

**Quince**
Smyrna

The re-establishment of the orchard was based on the 1946 survey plan which showed orchard remnants, the position and type of tree, although not the cultivar. The 1946 plan was analysed to establish likely patterns of planting and to guide tree selection. The tree spacings were extrapolated to give a planting plan for the rest of the orchard and to accord with the extensive plantings shown in historic photos.

### Extant Fruit trees 1946

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Flat</th>
<th>Hill</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quince</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loquat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Guava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree tomato</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historic photographs confirmed that the 1946 survey recorded the remnant of more extensive plantings, including a row immediately behind the diagonal hedge. The trees were originally mainly spaced at 3m, although some were planted at 4m, and this spacing was replicated in the restoration. Some trees were planted on the hillside but these were eaten by sheep, and the attempt was abandoned until resources become available to focus on this area.
Appendix 3b

1999 Vegetable Planting List
## Pompallier Vegetable Garden Planting Plan
### Winter/ Spring 1999

### Winter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vegetable cultivar</th>
<th>Sow</th>
<th>Space depth x intra row x rows</th>
<th>Harvest</th>
<th>Success/notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Okra</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cauliflower ‘Autumn Giant’</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>20' x 30'</td>
<td>120-180 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cabbage ‘Wheeler’s Imperial’</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>30' x 36'</td>
<td>80-110 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turnip ‘Snowball’</td>
<td>April in situ</td>
<td>.5' x 4' x 16'</td>
<td>65 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Raddish ‘Black Spanish’</td>
<td>April in situ</td>
<td>.5 x thin as required</td>
<td>60 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Broad Beans ‘Exhibition Long Pod’ 1</td>
<td>April in situ</td>
<td>3' x 5' x 16'</td>
<td>120 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lettuce ‘All Year Round’</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>15' x 16'</td>
<td>90 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parsley</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vegetable cultivar</th>
<th>Sow</th>
<th>Space depth x intra row x rows</th>
<th>Harvest</th>
<th>Success/notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Okra</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peas ‘Green feast’ 2</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>2' x (3' x 12') x 16'</td>
<td>90 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Raddish ‘French Breakfast’</td>
<td>Late August</td>
<td>thin as required</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lettuce ‘White Paris Cos’</td>
<td>Late August</td>
<td>16' x 16'</td>
<td>70 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Carrot ‘James Intermediate Scarlett’</td>
<td>Late August</td>
<td>.5' x 4' x 12'</td>
<td>80 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Onion “Bedfordshire Champion” 4</td>
<td>June in situ</td>
<td>.5' x 6' x 16'</td>
<td>140 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tomato ‘Garden Peach’ 5</td>
<td>plant late October</td>
<td>1yard</td>
<td>85 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parsnip ‘Hollow crown’ 6</td>
<td>August in situ</td>
<td>1' x 12' x 16'</td>
<td>120 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Parsley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Requires substantial staking, purchase hardwood stakes form ‘The Warehouse’
2. ie 3 double rows -need support
3. Thin twice one to 3cm then again to 10 cm
4. Sow direct then thin
5. French Heirloom cv
6. Sow direct thin to space
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THE POMPALLIER HOUSE HISTORIC RESERVE

Pompallier House is a Crown property classified as a Historic Reserve under Section 18 of the Reserves Act 1977 comprising 1,8319 hectares (Figure 1). The New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) is the administering body responsible for its control and management (NZ Gazette 1984/4890).

The legal descriptions of the property are as follows (see NZ Gazettes 1967 page 858; 1976 page 415; 1983 page 1326; 1984 page 4890):

1. Allotment 13 Lot 13 Town of Russell, Block 1 Russell SD (4362m²)
2. Part Allotment 14 Lot 13 Town of Russell, Block 1 Russell SD (8955 m²)
3. Part Lot 1 DP 29544, Block 1 Russell SD (5062 m²)

These three properties collectively make up the Pompallier House Historic Reserve.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Pompallier Mission

After generations of Maori occupation and use, most of the land now known as Pompallier Mission was first acquired by a European in December 1827 (Martin 2008: 1-2; Clunie 1993: 10). The first European owner was John Johnson, a sawyer to whom the land was ceded by his Ngati Manu patron Kiwikiwi in exchange for two muskets (Clunie 1993: 10). Johnson was already well-established here when the written deed of “sale” was made in 1827. Significantly, this deed is the first written deed of sale in the Bay of Islands and probably only the second in New Zealand to a Pakeha who was not a missionary (Martin, pers. comm.). Johnson operated here for about another 10 years and subsequently sold the land on to Gilbert Mair for the sum of £40 (Best 2005:11; Clunie 1993: 10).

The property acquired extended from what is now the boundary between Clendon Cottage and Pompallier to Pitt Street, and from the beach to the hilltop behind. Within months of this purchase, Mair sold on the land to Benjamin Turner for a £5 profit (Clunie 1993:11). Turner is described as a “transported felon, violent ruffian, notorious grog seller and natural businessman” (Clunie 1993: 11). Turner proceeded to build a row of cottages along the waterfront of the property, which was known as Turner’s Row (later Turner’s Terrace) and subsequently he rented these out (Best 2005: 11). They were used for a number of commercial enterprises that included the Commercial Hotel, Wilson’s Auction Rooms, the newspaper New Zealand Advertiser and Bay of Islands Gazette (proprietors G.A. Edgar & Co.), a bank (The New Zealand Banking Company, of which Clendon was the first president), and others; part of Turner’s Row became known as Bank Square, indicating that the layout of the building was more than a “Row” (Martin, pers. comm.).
Figure 1. Topographic map of Pompallier House Historic Reserve
Turner’s investment was indicative of the 1830s growth of Kororareka and turned out to be a very lucrative investment for Turner, as the French Catholic Bishop Jean-Baptiste Pompallier, the Vicar Apostolic for Western Oceania, purchased only a small part of the land from him for £370 in 1839 (Clunie 1993: 11). This was a section with one small house already built on it, which he developed into the headquarters for his pioneer mission to Western Oceania (Martin 2008: 2).

The land purchased by Pompallier comprised a strip approximately 21m wide and extending inland back up the hill for 134m and contained the southernmost of Turner’s cottages which subsequently served as a presbytery (Best 2005: 11). Later a small chapel was erected and was in use by May 1840; by the end of 1841 a number of buildings had been added to the property and the construction of the printery had begun (Best 2005: 11). By now the compound had become crowded with various workshops, outhouses, picket fences, a well, and a rammed earth house for pupils and “natives” (Clunie 1993: 12). By the middle of 1842 the printery had been completed and the first printing began in October of that year (Best 2005: 11). An 1843 watercolour (Figure 2) illustrates the scattering of buildings at the southern end of the Bay, and a cleared hillside.

By 1843 tanning was being undertaken on the site at the rear of the compound by the Irishman James Callaghan who, along with his family, was living in Russell (Best 2005: 12). In 1845 the adjacent Turner’s Row property was requisitioned by British troops fighting the northern war against Nga Puhi (Clunie 1993: 24 cited in Best 2005: 11).

The mission was disestablished in 1850 when the Marists departed the Bay of Islands, and the printing press and related machinery followed in 1851 (Best 2005: 11). James Callaghan remained as caretaker, and then on 28 May 1856, with financial assistance from the trader George Greenway, Callaghan purchased the land and buildings from Bishop Pompallier (Best 1993: 11). Callaghan continued to run his tanning business from the place, later converting the printery to a home as opposed to a factory, with the tanning operations ceasing around 1863-64 (Best 2005: 11).

James Callaghan died in 1869 followed by his widow Mary in 1873 (Clunie 1993: 19). In 1879 James Hamlyn Greenway, the son of James Callaghan’s “silent partner” George Greenway, who after his father’s death had called in his debts, took over the property from the Callaghan children (Clunie 1993: 19; Martin pers. comm.). Hamlyn Greenway also purchased the neighbouring northern property (part of the original Turner’s Row), almost doubling the size of the Pompallier grounds, and undertook vast changes to the property, converting the former mission printery into a home for his family, while his sister, the widow Jane Mair, also laid out gardens after Greenway demolished additional buildings on the site that had been constructed in the 1830s (Clunie 1993: 21; NZHPT). At this time the grounds were laid out in the form that is seen today (Clunie 1993: 21).
By the beginning of the 20th century Hamlyn Greenway had retired and departed Russell, after first having sold the property to his sister Maria (Clunie 1993: 21). In 1905 the Stephenson family took ownership of the property, on which further development of the grounds and gardens took place, with a refurbishment of the “big house” occurring first (Clunie 1993: 24). The shingle roof was replaced with corrugated iron and the old small paned Marist dormer windows were replaced with large paned ones (Clunie 1993: 24).

It was not until 1943 that the New Zealand government took ownership of the property, and undertook extensive reconstruction before opening it to the public. The hillside section of the property was divided off and placed under the management of the Department of Lands & Survey Department (later Department of Conservation). In 1967 it was vested in the NZHPT, under whose management the Pompallier House Historic Reserve was created, and in the early 1990s the Pompallier Mission building was restored and taken back to the Marist period when the printery was operating. Clendon Cottage was acquired in 1976, and in the early 1990s the hillsides behind Pompallier and Clendon Cottage (the Stephenson and Clendon Hillsides) were added to the Reserve.

**The Clendon Hillside**

The Clendon Hillside rises from the flat land to the south and east of Clendon Cottage. The southern boundary is marked by a fence that runs right through the ridgeline upon which is located a pa, thought to have been named Te Ke Emua, and its associated terracing and ditches (Martin 2008: 3, and see below). During the early 17th century, this was the pa of...
Ngare Raumati and their chief, Tupare (Martin 2008: 3). However, as a result of the slaying of a significant Nga Manu woman Waipahihi, Ngare Raumati withdrew from the Kororareka peninsula in favour of Nga Manu, today known as Ngati Manu (Martin 2008: 3; Far North District Council 2008 webpage quoted in Johnson & Callaghan Feb 2009a: 9). The Nga Manu people received land on the Kororareka Peninsula comprising Orongo Bay to Tapeka from Ngare Raumati in utu for the killing of their kinswoman (ibid.). The lands relinquished by Tupare included his pa Te Ke Emua, situated on the hill behind the present-day Pompallier House (ibid.).

While there is evidence of continual Maori occupation of the Kororareka foreshore, no traditional Maori or early European record describes later occupation or reuse of the pa or its immediate environs (Martin 2008: 3). When the area now known largely as Allotment 13 Lot 13 and Part Lot 1 DP 29544 was first sold to a European in 1827 by the Ngati Manu/Uri Taniwha chief Kiwikiwi, its southern boundary was marked with a pou whenua to separate the pa from its surroundings (Martin 2008: 3).

In 1830 a dispute between the daughters of the chiefs Kiwikiwi and Hongi Hika led to a battle which concluded with possession of the Kororareka peninsula changing hands again. In 1833, 4 acres including Te Ke Emua and the area now referred to as the Clendon Hillside was transferred by the Patukeha chief Rewa to Robert Cunningham (Martin 2008: 3). Cunningham erected the first dwelling on or near to the land upon which Clendon Cottage is still located today (Martin 2008: 3). The property then changed hands several times over the next few years and by 1835, the title deeds were held by James Reddy Clendon as surety for his schooner the Fortitude and its cargo (Martin 2008: 3). Some years later, in 1844, his claim for sole rights was granted retrospectively to 1835 by Governor Fitzroy (Martin 2008: 3). Clendon, however, did not take up residency full time until 1850 (Martin 2008: 3).

There are no early records or images of the Clendon hillside covered with vegetation, and it was most likely cleared when the pa was built. There is a small rock face visible at the foot of the Clendon Hillside which is thought to have been quarried in 1839-42 by missionaries from the nearby Pompallier Mission during its construction.

**Clendon Cottage**

From 1850 it appears that J.R. Clendon, a shipowner, trader and magistrate, used the property as a “townhouse” from which he could conduct his various business enterprises, as his main residence was located at Okiato (Johnson & Callaghan Feb. 2009a: 10; Martin 2008 and pers. comm.). Clendon lived there with his wife Elizabeth and unmarried children, and after Elizabeth’s death in 1855 with his second wife Jane Cochrane, daughter of Dennis Cochrane of Hokianga and his wife Takotowi Te Whata (ibid. and Lee 2010). Clendon moved to Kerikeri in 1859 and thence shortly after to Rawene (Martin 2008: 3). From the period 1860
to the turn of the century, the house was a private residence, later becoming a boarding house known as “The Bungalow” (Marchant 1977: 2, quoted in Johnson & Callaghan Feb. 2009a).

It is recorded on old land plans dated 1890 (SO5602, Figure 4) that a Mrs Johnson owned the house and grounds, while a house and property to the south was owned by a James Deary (ibid.). While it is known that both of these houses were still standing in 1907 as they are shown on a plan of that date (DP5670), it is not known for certain when the Deary house was demolished, but according to K. Martin (pers. comm. quoted in Johnson & Callaghan Feb. 2009a: 10) many buildings were demolished in the 1970s. However, it is likely that this house may have been demolished some time prior to that (ibid.). It should also be stated that while the Clendon property has been in continual use ever since, it is yet to be discovered when the original 4 acre property was subdivided into the various lots that are seen today (Martin 2008: 4).

**ARCHAEOLOGY**

**Introduction**

Many archaeological sites have been recorded in Russell on the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) site recording scheme, relating both to pre- and early Contact period Maori occupation and to early European settlement. Two of these sites are recorded within the Pompallier Mission Historic Reserve, the first being Pompallier Mission itself, which is recorded as site Q05/1074. The second is a major pa site (Te Ke Emua) recorded as Q05/824 on the ridge above Clendon Cottage, largely in the neighbouring property but extending partly into the reserve. These sites are discussed below.

Other sites are recorded in the near vicinity. To the north of the reserve are the possible remains of a historic period pa or settlement (Kororareka) in the vicinity of York and Pitt Streets (Q05/1178 and Q05/1179). In other areas close to the reserve recent works have exposed historic rubbish dumps, demonstrating the potential for subsurface archaeological remains to be present in areas of early European settlement: Q05/1200 immediately north of the reserve along the beachfront – see Best & Turner 1997; and Q05/1389 between York and Church St.

There is also potential for unrecorded archaeological remains to be present in areas where pre-1900 occupation and other activities have been recorded, especially where there has been little subsequent landscape modification. Early maps often provide a useful indication of

---

1 The Conservation Plan for Clendon Cottage can provide further details, see Howard 2010.
2 It was previously recorded as Q05/1321 and also Q05/50 (NZAA ArchSite)
3 In addition to Te Ke Emua, a map compiled recently by M. Shortland and displayed in the Russell Museum, based on his research into places of significance to Maori, identifies Puketutu, once the seat of Patukeha chief Moka, on or near the Stephenson Hillside. However, no archaeological evidence appears to have survived in this location.
where subsurface archaeological remains might be expected. Two early maps are of particular interest in illustrating the location of structures on the Pompallier Mission Historic Reserve. The first is derived from 1844 and 1857 surveys, and illustrates the location of several buildings along the front of the property (Figure 3). The second is a segment of the 1890 Wheeler map which illustrates the later Printery, Clendon Cottage and Deary’s house (Figure 4). Both maps also illustrate the location of boundaries and fencelines. Additional information relating to early structures is also shown on the 1843 Pharazyn watercolour, which appears to show a small house on the Stephenson hillside to the rear of Pompallier (Figure 2), thought to have been used as accommodation for Maori visitors (Martin, pers. comm.). There is also an 1858 Kinder watercolour which shows a small house or other structure on the Clendon hillside between Clendon Cottage and the southern headland on which pa Q05/824 is located (Figure 5).

Figure 3. Brinds Claim (OLC-128) which is derived from surveys undertaken in 1844 and 1857
Figure 4. Detail of the 1890 Wheeler plan illustrating the location of Greenways (the former Pompallier Printery), Mrs Johnson’s house (Clendon Cottage), and James Deary’s house (which is currently the area of the carpark), along with fencelines (SO 5602)

Figure 5. Detail from Reverend J. Kinder’s 1858 watercolour showing buildings including the former Mission Printery, Clendon’s Cottage, and a house/structure on the hillside between Clendon Cottage and the southern headland
Pompallier Mission (Site Q05/1074)

Several periods of settlement and use of the Pompallier Mission site (which does not include the Turner’s Row area or Clendon property) have been identified which might be distinguishable archaeologically (Best 2005:7, amended by Martin, pers. comm.):

1. Prehistoric/Maori
2. Sawyering activities associated with the first European owner Johnson
3. Marist (Pompallier) 1839-50
4. Tanning 1843-1863
5. Callaghan family residential occupation
6. Greenway alterations (demolition, extensions and gardens from 1879)
7. Stephenson (demolition, extensions and gardens from 1905)
8. 1942 Military
9. Ministry of Works activities from 1943
10. Historic Places Trust activities from 1967

The final three phases relate to modern government and NZHPT activities, and are considered to be recent disturbance of or alterations to the archaeological site. So far no Maori remains have been recorded on the Mission site (the pa is located on the ridge to the south), nor evidence of sawyering activities. However, evidence of other periods has been documented archaeologically.

Several excavation and monitoring projects have taken place across the Pompallier site (and Clendon property) over the last 30 years, and these are illustrated in Figure 6. Figure 7 illustrates the location of property boundaries and building/structure locations, based on the historical records and early plans.

The first archaeological investigation at Pompallier was by Maingay in 1987 (Maingay 1993), and was located to the east of Pompallier House (Figure 6). Two tanning pits were uncovered during service installation, and a further few pits were recorded in 1988 during similar works, uncovering 6 in total. Their preservation was due to the fact that they had been covered by c.80cm of clay landslip from the hillside above. Other features included drains related to the pits, postholes, a sumphole and brick fireplaces, with artefacts including hides, and domestic items dating to the 1860s to 1870s. The location of the pits was consistent with the early records and plans placing the tanning activities to the east of Pompallier House (Figure 7). Best excavated 4 test pits next to the northern side of Pompallier House in 1993 (Figure 6). Here, he investigated the tannery drains revealed by Maingay, which he found to be wood lined (Best 2005).

---

4 With the exception of two artefacts found out of context in the fill of a barrel pit (Maingay 1993: 88).
Various remains related to 19th century settlement have been recorded elsewhere across the reserve. Eaves (1992) carried out excavations to locate the chapel constructed in 1840. This involved the opening of a trench to the west of Pompallier House (Figure 6) measuring 9.7m x 1m wide to 6.6m x 0.5m wide, by 1m to 0.6m deep, along with several additional excavation units (see Eaves 1992). Fourteen layers were identified, the lower of which related to the use and demolition of early buildings in this area, and structural remains such as postholes and drains were exposed which very probably related to the Chapel and to another smaller structure. Layer 13 was a thick clay layer thought to have resulted from one of the landslips to which the hillside was prone. Below this the Marist layer was located dating to the 1830s-1840s, defined in part by the grey shingle ground surface. Artefacts dating to this period, including two medallions and a rosary, were recovered. Above the mudslide deposit was evidence for a path constructed of beach shingle laid on clay which was thought likely to relate to the Marist period, and above this were several layers, with evidence for later 19th century use and activities. Layer 8 clearly illustrated the effect of gardening works on the property, with artefacts (glass, clay pipes, ceramics) comprising a mix of 19th and early 20th century items. In Area M, located closer to the house, a remnant drain was recorded, and in Area K, closer to the foreshore, a rubbish pit was uncovered along with concrete steps likely to be related to the Stephenson period of ownership. The results of these excavations are consistent with the documentary information, as it is clear from Figure 7 that this area of the property had a complex history spanning all periods of activities.

Slightly further west but in the same general area, a 1.5m by 0.7m test pit excavated by England and Best in 1993 (England 1994) was excavated to a depth of 1.7m, with a smaller test pit located to a depth of 2.5mbs (Figure 6). Two layers dating to the Marist era of settlement were recorded, separated by a similar clay layer to that recorded by Eaves. Artefacts recovered included a copper alloy cross with INRI (Jesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum – Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews). While only the Marist period was well documented, there was also evidence for gardening and demolition in the upper layers above the clay, indicating changes to the site since the mid-19th century (see Figure 7).

Monitoring of a sewer trench through the Pompallier grounds in 1993 exposed similar stratigraphy – Marist period artefacts mixed with grey shingle in the lowest layer, which was overlaid by clay landslide; above that were a succession of layers including evidence for later path surfaces consisting of red grit, shingle or shell (Best 2005). The excavations exposed 5 rubbish pits near the Clendon/Pompallier property boundary to the west of Pompallier House. One pit was notable due to the high number of artefacts recovered – 948 in total, with metal artefacts dominating, although glass, ceramic and faunal remains were also present. The majority dated to the Greenway or Stephenson period, but there were artefacts from earlier periods including the Marist, and it appeared that the pit had been filled in one episode with material discarded around the property from a range of periods. Three of the pits were thought to date to pre-1840 but contained few artefacts, while one had been dug to bury a stove. The pits were located in the area of the Pompallier grounds that saw many changes in activities (see Figure 7), and this is reflected in part by the varying dates of the rubbish pits.
There was evidence across the projects discussed above for disturbance, both by works by the Greenways and Stephensons, and more modern disturbance by the Ministry of Works.

**Investigations within the Clendon property**

The 1993 sewer trench continued into the Clendon Cottage property, running across the front lawn (Best 2005; see Figure 6). Three layers were identified, one of which contained flecks of shell and charcoal, but no artefacts or structural remains were apparent, nor was there any evidence of the clay landslip (Best 2005). Other works monitored within the Clendon property included a cable trench and sewage connection to the south of Clendon Cottage in which artefacts related to the early 20th century extension were recovered (Best 2001; see Figure 6). Again, there was no definitive stratigraphic information relating to the earliest periods of occupation.

Vogel (2006) placed a small testpit (only 30cm deep) 3.8m south of the boundary hedge between Clendon Cottage and Pompallier as part of an assessment for a fire hydrant. Vogel noted that the potential for the survival of archaeological deposits across the Clendon Cottage property had been affected in places by restoration works that took place in the 1970s (Marchant 1977), due to the removal of a concrete path and the installation of a picket fence and Tecoma hedge along the front of the property.

Stormwater drainage works carried out on the western and northern sides of Clendon Cottage in 2009 similarly failed to identify any definite features related to 19th century occupation (Johnson & Callaghan May, July 2009), although a mixed layer of soil, beach pebbles and artefacts of 19th century and later origin was consistent with gardening activities on the property (Johnson & Callaghan May 2009). It was suggested that a thin layer of charcoal exposed in a spade test pit test and trench near the north-western corner of the cottage might relate to Maori occupation, but this could not be confirmed and the charcoal might equally relate to early European activities. The upper layers included demolition material probably relating to the removal of the early 20th century northern addition to the cottage, and beneath this was possible evidence of a shell path which would pre-date 1910.

**Turner’s Row**

No archaeological investigations of the Turner’s Row part of the reserve have been carried out to assess the extent of surviving remains, but the 1993 and 2001 sewer trenches extended across this area (Best 2001, 2005). No clear evidence of the Turner’s Row phase was exposed in the trenches, although the original ground surface (a beach deposit with some intermixed 19th century artefacts) and evidence of a landslip were noted. About three years ago Dr Simon Best was asked to inspect a depression that had formed after rain in the orchard near the vegetable garden. He established that it contained fill and speculated that it might be a barrel-lined long drop to the rear of one of the houses, as he had found such features in similar locations in the neighbouring property (the Hall house: Best & Turner 1997) and others along The Strand, but this was not confirmed (Best, pers. comm.).
Figure 6. Locations of archaeological investigations previously carried out at the Pompallier House Historic Reserve
Figure 7. Location of existing (light shading) and former buildings based on historic plans shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4 and on documentary evidence. Two additional structures located on the hillside behind Clendon Cottage and Pompallier House are illustrated in contemporary paintings (Figure 2 and Figure 5), but their exact locations are uncertain, as are those of additional buildings known to have been present in Turner’s Row.
The most dominant Maori archaeological site in the vicinity is the pa Q05/824 located on the ridge above Pompallier, and forming part of the Clendon Hillside (Figure 8). The pa site is significant in that it represents a major component of Maori settlement in Russell and is integral to its early history. The pa has not been archaeologically investigated, but has been surveyed on a number of occasions. It was originally recorded as two separate sites (Q05/823 and Q05/824), but as archaeological features have been identified along the ridge connecting the two it is now recognised as a continuous site (Maingay 1991; Johnson & Callaghan 2007, 2008). The archaeological features of the site include large defensive ditches on the northern and southern ridges of the site, substantial pits and terraces, and associated shell midden (Figure 8), and are in moderate to reasonable condition (Jones 2003). Greenstone artefacts were reported to have been recovered from the site by a previous landowner.

Johnson & Callaghan (Feb 2009a: 21-22) provide a useful description and interpretation of the wider context of the pa:

‘The pa does not appear to have been the only site of its type and period at Russell as other hilltop open sites, approaching defended settlements, occurred on the summit on the ridge between Russell and Long Beach. These occurred with surviving pit complexes of reasonable size in the adjacent Matauwhi Bay catchment indicating this and the adjacent Russell catchment hillsides were used extensively for the cultivation of kumara. In addition, ancillary beach flat settlements at Russell are very likely for this period. These sites provide the overall settlement context in which the pa should be viewed. However, the site should also be seen as part of the continuum of Maori settlement at Russell also evidenced by the historic pa established on the beach flat immediately below in the early to mid 19th century and historic settlements in adjacent Matauwhi Bay. It is also probable, given the widespread evidence of early East Polynesian settlement in the Bay of Islands generally, that evidence of this nature will occur at some point on the Russell Beach flat.’

The southern boundary of the Clendon hillside is marked by a fence that runs right through the ridgeline upon which the northern part of the pa is located, passing across terracing, a defensive ditch and a pit. Three small terraces are located entirely within the property (Johnson & Callaghan Feb 2009a: figure 21, reproduced below as Figure 9).
Figure 8. Sketch plan of pa site Q05/824 (identified by its imperial numbers N11/522 and N11/521), from the NZAA site record form. Note the position of Clendon Cottage and the fenceline.
Figure 9. Plan from Johnson & Callaghan Feb 2009a (figure 21), showing the southern Pompallier House Historic Reserve boundary in relation to the archaeological features on the northern ridge of site Q05/824
Archaeological Potential of Pompallier House Historic Reserve

When the historical background and archaeological evidence are considered together, it is evident that there are varying degrees of archaeological potential across the reserve. In addition, recent environmental and geotechnical reports have also provided relevant information on the condition of the grounds and vegetation. The Clendon hillslope has been subject to several geotechnical assessments (e.g. Haigh Workman 2008), and planting and re-vegetation proposals (e.g. Jones 2003; Martin 2008; Johnson & Callaghan Feb 2009a).

Apart from the earthwork features on the hilltop, there are no known archaeological features on the Clendon Hillside. An assessment by Northern Archaeological Research (Johnson & Callaghan Feb 2009a) concluded, based on research on the neighbouring Fladgate property in Tahapuke Bay (Johnson & Callaghan 2008), that due to the high level of erosion that has occurred in the past in this area, along with land disturbance related to tree felling, any potential structural remains of pre-contact Maori agriculture which may have occurred on the hillside is unlikely to have survived the successive centuries of erosion. Slips have been recorded in 1840, 1860-65, 1880-90 and as recently as 1990 (Johnson & Callaghan Feb 2009a: 17), and at least one landslip has been documented archaeologically, as discussed above. However, it is possible that more durable components such as beach shell and shingle admixtures that might survive as indirect evidence of this activity could be found at the base of the hillslope in secondary deposition. There is therefore low potential on the slopes for features relating to gardening (and is it not known whether the steep hillslope was in fact used for gardening), although the features of the pa itself on the ridge remain generally in good condition and preservation. Archaeological monitoring of tree removal and planting on the Clendon hillside did not identify any archaeological remains (Johnson & Callaghan Sep 2009; June 2010). While the flats below and northwards along the Russell waterfront would certainly have been utilised by Maori in pre-European times, no confirmed evidence of Maori occupation has been identified within the reserve, and it is probable that most if not all evidence has been destroyed by 19th century and subsequent land use. Nor has any evidence been identified so far on the Stephenson hillside.

In relation to potential 19th century remains on the hillsides, the map regression exercise undertaken by Johnson & Callaghan (Feb 2009a) indicated that there is some potential for 19th century settlement remains such as paddock fencing built in the 1830s and 1850s on the upper hillslopes. The former section boundaries illustrated in Figure 7 point to the likely location of these fences. In addition, it is possible that postholes and structural remains related to the two houses shown on the hillsides in Figure 2 and Figure 5 may have survived (see Figure 7).

On the flats surrounding Pompallier House and Clendon Cottage, including the area of the Turner’s Row Cottages located close to The Strand which were demolished by Greenway, evidence from the early plans, recorded history, and archaeological investigations in combination indicates that there is potential for the survival of both 19th century house structures and other remains relating to sheds, outhouses and workshops. Remains such as postholes, pits (including rubbish pits and long drops) and artefacts (both in situ and
redeposited) representing former structures and various periods of occupation have potentially survived in these areas. The archaeological projects already undertaken have confirmed the survival of associated features such as rubbish pits, drains, and postholes dating to both the mid 19\textsuperscript{th} century (including the Marist period of settlement) and the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century (including demolition layers). While the results of the excavations and monitoring projects indicate a concentration of such features in the former Pompallier property (Figure 6), this may be a result of sampling bias as similar investigations have not been carried out next to Clendon Cottage, or further south in the carpark/driveway area in which James Deary’s house was located, or on the northern extent of the property where it the two Turner’s Row Cottages were located. In addition, there is clear evidence of the survival of the tannery works (pits and drains) to the east and north of Pompallier House.

Remains relating to the Marist period (and therefore potentially any earlier 19\textsuperscript{th} century evidence) were found to be c.1m+ below the surface in the Eaves, England and Best excavations, sealed by a clay layer probably resulting from a major landslip. This layer, however, was not present in the Clendon garden sewer trench and in some areas early remains may be closer to the surface, as also is evidence of later 19\textsuperscript{th} century settlement. Remains therefore have the potential to be impacted on by any works extending to c.30-40cm below the surface, although exact depths are likely to vary across the property.
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ICOMOS New Zealand Charter
for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value
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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.
Definitions

For the purposes of this charter:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Iwi means a tribe of the tangata whenua.

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

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

Matauranga means traditional or cultural knowledge of the tangata whenua.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---


English language text first published 1993
Bilingual text first published 1995

**Revised text Copyright © 2010 ICOMOS New Zealand (Inc.) / Te Mana O Nga Pouwhenua O Te Ao – The New Zealand National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites.**

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any other means without the prior permission of the copyright holder.

This revised text replaces the 1993 and 1995 versions and should be referenced as the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010).

This revision incorporates changes in conservation philosophy and best practice since 1993 and is the only version of the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter approved by ICOMOS New Zealand (Inc.) for use.

**Copies of this charter may be obtained from**
ICOMOS NZ (Inc.)
P O Box 90 851
Victoria Street West,
Auckland 1142,
New Zealand.
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ICOMOS AHM Charter
INTRODUCTION

It is widely recognized that a knowledge and understanding of the origins and development of human societies is of fundamental importance to humanity in identifying its cultural and social roots.

The archaeological heritage constitutes the basic record of past human activities. Its protection and proper management is therefore essential to enable archaeologists and other scholars to study and interpret it on behalf of and for the benefit of present and future generations.

The protection of this heritage cannot be based upon the application of archaeological techniques alone. It requires a wider basis of professional and scientific knowledge and skills. Some elements of the archaeological heritage are components of architectural structures and in such cases must be protected in accordance with the criteria for the protection of such structures laid down in the 1966 Venice Charter on the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites. Other elements of the archaeological heritage constitute part of the living traditions of indigenous peoples, and for such sites and monuments the participation of local cultural groups is essential for their protection and preservation.

For these and other reasons the protection of the archaeological heritage must be based upon effective collaboration between professionals from many disciplines. It also requires the cooperation of government authorities, academic researchers, private or public enterprise, and the general public. This charter therefore lays down principles relating to the different aspects of archaeological heritage management. These include the responsibilities of public authorities and legislators, principles relating to the professional performance of the processes of inventorization, survey, excavation, documentation, research, maintenance, conservation, preservation, reconstruction, information, presentation, public access and use of the heritage, and the qualification of professionals involved in the protection of the archaeological heritage.

The charter has been inspired by the success of the Venice Charter as guidelines and source of ideas for policies and practice of governments as well as scholars and professionals.

The charter has to reflect very basic principles and guidelines with global validity. For this reason it cannot take into account the specific problems and possibilities of regions or countries. The charter should therefore be supplemented at regional and national levels by further principles and guidelines for these needs.

ARTICLE I. DEFINITION AND INTRODUCTION
The "archaeological heritage" is that part of the material heritage in respect of which archaeological methods provide primary information. It comprises all vestiges of human existence and consists of places relating to all manifestations of human activity, abandoned structures, and remains of all kinds (including subterranean and underwater sites), together with all the portable cultural material associated with them.

**ARTICLE 2. INTEGRATED PROTECTION POLICIES**

The archaeological heritage is a fragile and non-renewable cultural resource. Land use must therefore be controlled and developed in order to minimize the destruction of the archaeological heritage.

Policies for the protection of the archaeological heritage should constitute an integral component of policies relating to land use, development, and planning as well as of cultural, environmental and educational policies. The policies for the protection of the archaeological heritage should be kept under continual review, so that they stay up to date. The creation of archaeological reserves should form part of such policies.

The protection of the archaeological heritage should be integrated into planning policies at international, national, regional and local levels.

Active participation by the general public must form part of policies for the protection of the archaeological heritage. This is essential where the heritage of indigenous peoples is involved. Participation must be based upon access to the knowledge necessary for decision-making. The provision of information to the general public is therefore an important element in integrated protection.

**ARTICLE 3. LEGISLATION AND ECONOMY**

The protection of the archaeological heritage should be considered as a moral obligation upon all human beings; it is also a collective public responsibility. This obligation must be acknowledged through relevant legislation and the provision of adequate funds for the supporting programmes necessary for effective heritage management.

The archaeological heritage is common to all human society and it should therefore be the duty of every country to ensure that adequate funds are available for its protection.

Legislation should afford protection to the archaeological heritage that is appropriate to the needs, history, and traditions of each country and region, providing for in situ protection and research needs.

Legislation should be based on the concept of the archaeological heritage as the heritage of all humanity and of groups of peoples, and not restricted to any individual person or nation.

Legislation should forbid the destruction, degradation or alteration through changes of any archaeological site or monument or to their surroundings without the consent of the relevant archaeological authority.

Legislation should in principle require full archaeological investigation and documentation in cases where the destruction of the archaeological heritage is authorized.
Legislation should require, and make provision for, the proper maintenance, management and conservation of the archaeological heritage. Adequate legal sanctions should be prescribed in respect of violations of archaeological heritage legislation.

If legislation affords protection only to those elements of the archaeological heritage which are registered in a selective statutory inventory, provision should be made for the temporary protection of unprotected or newly discovered sites and monuments until an archaeological evaluation can be carried out.

Development projects constitute one of the greatest physical threats to the archaeological heritage. A duty for developers to ensure that archaeological heritage impact studies are carried out before development schemes are implemented, should therefore be embodied in appropriate legislation, with a stipulation that the costs of such studies are to be included in project costs. The principle should also be established in legislation that development schemes should be designed in such a way as to minimize their impact upon the archaeological heritage.

ARTICLE 4. SURVEY

The protection of the archaeological heritage must be based upon the fullest possible knowledge of its extent and nature. General survey of archaeological resources is therefore an essential working tool in developing strategies for the protection of the archaeological heritage. Consequently archaeological survey should be a basic obligation in the protection and management of the archaeological heritage.

At the same time, inventories constitute primary resource databases for scientific study and research. The compilation of inventories should therefore be regarded as a continuous, dynamic process. It follows that inventories should comprise information at various levels of significance and reliability, since even superficial knowledge can form the starting point for protective measures.

ARTICLE 5. INVESTIGATION

Archaeological knowledge is based principally on the scientific investigation of the archaeological heritage. Such investigation embraces the whole range of methods from non-destructive techniques through sampling to total excavation.

It must be an overriding principle that the gathering of information about the archaeological heritage should not destroy any more archaeological evidence than is necessary for the protective or scientific objectives of the investigation. Non-destructive techniques, aerial and ground survey, and sampling should therefore be encouraged wherever possible, in preference to total excavation.

As excavation always implies the necessity of making a selection of evidence to be documented and preserved at the cost of losing other information and possibly even the total destruction of the monument, a decision to excavate should only be taken after thorough consideration.

Excavation should be carried out on sites and monuments threatened by development, land-use change, looting, or natural deterioration.
In exceptional cases, unthreatened sites may be excavated to elucidate research problems or to interpret them more effectively for the purpose of presenting them to the public. In such cases excavation must be preceded by thorough scientific evaluation of the significance of the site. Excavation should be partial, leaving a portion undisturbed for future research.

A report conforming to an agreed standard should be made available to the scientific community and should be incorporated in the relevant inventory within a reasonable period after the conclusion of the excavation.

Excavations should be conducted in accordance with the principles embodied in the 1956 UNESCO Recommendations on International Principles Applicable to Archaeological Excavations and with agreed international and national professional standards.

**ARTICLE 6. MAINTENANCE AND CONSERVATION**

The overall objective of archaeological heritage management should be the preservation of monuments and sites in situ, including proper long-term conservation and curation of all related records and collections etc. Any transfer of elements of the heritage to new locations represents a violation of the principle of preserving the heritage in its original context. This principle stresses the need for proper maintenance, conservation and management. It also asserts the principle that the archaeological heritage should not be exposed by excavation or left exposed after excavation if provision for its proper maintenance and management after excavation cannot be guaranteed.

Local commitment and participation should be actively sought and encouraged as a means of promoting the maintenance of the archaeological heritage. This principle is especially important when dealing with the heritage of indigenous peoples or local cultural groups. In some cases it may be appropriate to entrust responsibility for the protection and management of sites and monuments to indigenous peoples.

Owing to the inevitable limitations of available resources, active maintenance will have to be carried out on a selective basis. It should therefore be applied to a sample of the diversity of sites and monuments, based upon a scientific assessment of their significance and representative character, and not confined to the more notable and visually attractive monuments.

The relevant principles of the 1956 UNESCO Recommendations should be applied in respect of the maintenance and conservation of the archaeological heritage.

**ARTICLE 7. PRESENTATION, INFORMATION, RECONSTRUCTION**

The presentation of the archaeological heritage to the general public is an essential method of promoting an understanding of the origins and development of modern societies. At the same time it is the most important means of promoting an understanding of the need for its protection.

Presentation and information should be conceived as a popular interpretation of the current state of knowledge, and it must therefore be revised frequently. It should take account of the multifaceted approaches to an understanding of the past.
Reconstructions serve two important functions: experimental research and interpretation. They should, however, be carried out with great caution, so as to avoid disturbing any surviving archaeological evidence, and they should take account of evidence from all sources in order to achieve authenticity. Where possible and appropriate, reconstructions should not be built immediately on the archaeological remains, and should be identifiable as such.

**ARTICLE 8. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS**

High academic standards in many different disciplines are essential in the management of the archaeological heritage. The training of an adequate number of qualified professionals in the relevant fields of expertise should therefore be an important objective for the educational policies in every country. The need to develop expertise in certain highly specialized fields calls for international cooperation. Standards of professional training and professional conduct should be established and maintained.

The objective of academic archaeological training should take account of the shift in conservation policies from excavation to in situ preservation. It should also take into account the fact that the study of the history of indigenous peoples is as important in preserving and understanding the archaeological heritage as the study of outstanding monuments and sites.

The protection of the archaeological heritage is a process of continuous dynamic development. Time should therefore be made available to professionals working in this field to enable them to update their knowledge. Postgraduate training programmes should be developed with special emphasis on the protection and management of the archaeological heritage.

**ARTICLE 9. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION**

The archaeological heritage is the common heritage of all humanity. International cooperation is therefore essential in developing and maintaining standards in its management.

There is an urgent need to create international mechanisms for the exchange of information and experience among professionals dealing with archaeological heritage management. This requires the organization of conferences, seminars, workshops, etc. at global as well as regional levels, and the establishment of regional centres for postgraduate studies. ICOMOS, through its specialized groups, should promote this aspect in its medium- and long-term planning.

International exchanges of professional staff should also be developed as a means of raising standards of archaeological heritage management.

Technical assistance programmes in the field of archaeological heritage management should be developed under the auspices of ICOMOS.

---

This Charter, written by the International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM), a specialized committee of ICOMOS, was approved by the ICOMOS General Assembly, meeting in Lausanne, Switzerland, in October 1990.
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Example of Maintenance Schedule
Indicative example only of Cyclic Maintenance Schedule to be prepared as part of Management Plan – with detailed descriptions to accompany tasks as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Area:</th>
<th>GROWING SEASON</th>
<th>AT COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenway/Stephenson Garden</td>
<td>GROWING SEASON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPRING</td>
<td>SUMMER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>OCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL - TREES, SHRUBS, FLOWERS, GROUNDCOVERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staking</td>
<td>Monthly – As Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trimming</td>
<td>Monthly – As Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hedge trimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fertiliser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weed Control</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Watering</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replacement</td>
<td>Monthly – As Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC PLANT SP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gladioli</td>
<td>plant stake dig &amp; store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bouganvillea</td>
<td>stake prune</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plumbago</td>
<td>prune</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arundo donax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mowing (Fine)</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mowing (Rough)</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fertiliser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weed Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Over Sowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTER REMOVAL</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISPOSAL OF WASTE</td>
<td>Weekly – As Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Top Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2008 Topographic Survey
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Known Archaeological Sites (Best 1993)
Figure 8. Site plan, with all known archaeological excavations marked.
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Archaeological Site Records (from NZAA)
1. Aids to relocation of site (attach a sketch map)
   Above point at southern end of Russell beach, where Fladgate's garage and gate fill the gap in the ridge and rocky point. Location map with N11/513

2. State of site and possible future damage
   Excellent condition - grassed

3. Description of site (Supply full details, history, local environment, references, sketches, etc. If extra sheets are attached, include a summary here)
   This pa with a single transverse ditch, is terraced until the point drops off about 80 ft a.s.l. above the rocky point. It is also virtually joined to the pa on the next point south by a few terraces and a couple of pits as drawn. This pa is possibly called "Te Ke Emua". Marie King at Cook Museum at Russell has a postcard 1912 era, taken from here, north along the Russell beach.

4. Owner
   N.L. & R.P. Fladgate
   "Tahapuke"
   Russell

4. Tenant/Manager
   Address

5. Nature of information (hearsay, brief or extended visit, etc.)
   Brief visit
   Photographs (reference numbers, and where they are held)
   No
   Aerial photographs (reference numbers, and clarity of site)
   SN 544/12 (1951) No

6. Reported by
   G.E. Nevin
   Northland Harbour Board
   PEP 1984

6. Filekeeper
   Date

7. Key words
   Pa - "Te Ke Emua" - south end Russell beach

8. New Zealand Register of Archaeological Sites (for office use)
   NZHPT Site Field Code

   Type of site
   Present condition and future danger of destruction
   Local environment today
   Security code
   Land classification
   Local body
**NZAA SITE RECORD ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FORM**

| SITE NO: | Q05/824 |
| MAP NO: | Q05 |
| MAP NAME: | BAY OF ISLANDS |
| MAP EDITION: | 1st 1983 |
| GRID REFERENCE |

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

Site revisited on the 20th February 2007.

A platform for a series of green plastic water tanks has been cut in the saddle between the two parts of site Q05/824 reported separately by Nevin in 1984 and Maingay in 1991. A small shell midden of pre or post contact Maori origin was exposed in profile in the south east corner of the platform (GPS E 2612975 N 6658773). The midden was exposed intermittently over a distance of 1.5m and was some 4cm thick under 10cm of brown topsoil. The midden overlay a sterile yellow clay subsoil. Contents of the midden were entirely whole and fragmentary cockle (*Austrovenus stutchburyi*) with a small quantity of charcoal fragments.

A second small shell midden (Plate 3) was exposed on the surface of what appeared to have been an angled excavator blade cut 3m north of the edge of the platform on the west side of the ridge (GPS E 2612970 N 6658788). The cockle shell was evident over an area of 0.4m x 0.2m in the blade cut. The original stratigraphic context could not be determined for the exposed shell but appeared likely to be similar to that exposed at the opposite end of the platform. It is also likely that the exposed shell midden covers a larger area than that exposed.

Minor upgrading or use of the access track on the east side of the site has re-exposed a shell midden (GPS E 2612970N 6658743) initially recorded exposed on the track by Maingay in 1991. The midden is exposed intermittently for 7m on the top side of the track with shell scattered down the track to the north for 10-12m. The midden, 5-10cm thick, occurs under 10-12cm of brown topsoil and overlying the sterile yellow clay subsoil. Contents were mainly cockle and pipi (*Paphies australis*) with a small quantity of beach rolled stone less than 8cm in diameter and fragments of charcoal and heat discoloured clay. The midden is likely to be more extensive than that exposed on the Track. A further small surface scatter was exposed a further 5m to the south between the track and the summit. The further small area of charcoal and fire cracked beach stone noted on the track by Maingay in 1991, a short distance to the south, was not evident.

The single terrace noted by Maingay in 1991 and recorded as Q05/1130, which appears as an outlying terrace to this site, has some slight surface disturbance from land clearance and has a mound of cleared vegetation deposited on it.

21/07
A series of four test pits were dug at regular intervals between the concrete water tank off the north-east corner of Clendon Cottage and the concrete sump on the boundary with the Pompallier house property over a distance of 10m (TP1-E 2612892 N 6658895, TP2-E 2612892 N 6658899, TP3-E 2612895 N 6658902, TP4-E 2612893 N 6658906). The depths of the test pits were generally been 50-60 cm and was limited to this depth as the proposed drainage trench was unlikely to extend to a greater depth. The soil profile in this area was generally consistent with some minor differences. The overall profile appeared to consist of a thin 5-cm layer of humus and decaying vegetable litter overlying layer 15-30 cm deep layer of grey-brown soil with a quantity of small water rounded beach pebbles mixed with pieces of charcoal fragments of brick, fragments of beach rolled shell, pieces of blue patterned ceramics, fragments of metal and wire. In two test pits, TP1 and TP3, this in turn overlay a yellow-orange clay subsoil. The remaining two test pits, TP2 and TP4, were not dug to sufficient depth to establish the underlying subsoil. In Test Pit 3, the humus and soil pebble layers were separated by a 10cm layer of brown soil. In these test pits, the soil, pebble and artefact layer appeared a mix of topsoil and cultural materials typical of early to mid 19th century European origin horizon consistent with having been used as a garden soil and from gardening undertaken as a component of residential settlement.

A further test it was dug to a depth of 90 cm at the base of a set of comparatively recent brick steps off the north end of the Clendon Cottage front verandah. This revealed 8cm of footpath shell of recent origin over 2-3 cm of disintegrating white lime mortar. Below this was 20 cm of brown soil mixed with occasional pieces of charcoal and earthenware pottery. This in turn overlay a 30 cm deep layer homogenous of grey soft shingle and sandy soil mixed with occasional fragments of charcoal. Directly below this was a thin 3-4cm deep layer of loosely packed charcoal fragments mixed with the material above. This directly overlay a sterile layer of homogenous of grey soft shingle and sandy soil in excess of 2 cm in depth. The top two layers of shell and mortar appeared of recent origin. The layer below appeared a general mix of historic materials consistent with mid 19th century or later settlement of Clendon Cottage or other buildings. The lower, 60 cm deep layer of charcoal appeared to represent earlier human activity and is likely to relate to pre-contact Maori settlement or related activities on the beach flat.

Reported by: Leigh Johnson and Elisabeth Callaghan  
Northern Archaeological Research  
67 Church St  
Devonport  
Auckland

Owner/Manager: The New Zealand Historic Places Trust  
PO Box 2629  
Wellington
NZAA SITE RECORD ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE NO</th>
<th>Q05/1074</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAP NO:</td>
<td>Q05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE NAME</td>
<td>Clendon Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE TYPE:</td>
<td>Historic Dwellings and Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** The site was revisited on the 29th February 2013.

The historic J.R. Clendon property once incorporated the southern end of Kororareka Beach, the entire hillside to the east incorporating the recorded Pa (Q05/824), and adjacent Tahapuke Bay to the south. Although Clendon was granted the land in 1859, the certificate of title was subsequently issued to his son-in-law (Reverend Gould) in 1876. The property was subdivided in or around 1907/8, when the Clendon Cottage property and the car-park property were issued with separate titles (and owners). By the late 1930s the Clendon and car-park properties were owned by the Bissett family who developed an accommodation complex on the two properties. The properties were later purchased by the Department of Lands and Survey and then the NZHPT (1977).

Images dating from 1827-1858 show buildings on the southern end of the beach flat in the area of Clendon cottage and the car-park turnaround area. A building is known to have been constructed on the Clendon property by 1834, although whether it was in the same location as the existing building is unknown. A building appears in images dating to 1842, 1845, with the current building shown in 1851, 1858, in photographs from 1858 and on old land plans dating to the 1890s. From approximately 1880s to the early 20th century the house was run as a boarding house known as “The Bungalow”; later being owned by the Bissetts who added a number of structures to the Clendon and car-park properties. The cottage and the additional structures were known as “Pompallier Lodge”. A “very old irregular fence” is shown in the 1907 land plan on the southern boundary of the Clendon Cottage property and a post and rail fence is shown on the western boundary of the Pompallier and Clendon properties.

From 1842 it is clear that a dwelling/structure was located in the area of the car-park and that this structure was noted on an old land plan (SO5603 c.1890) as James Deary’s house. It is believed the building was demolished at some point early in the 20th century. The old land plan dating to 1907 (DP 5670A) shows a fence dating to the 1840s to the north of the “very old dwelling” (previously shown on the 1890 plan as ‘James Dearys’ house). In additional, an “Old WC” is shown in the area of The Strand, to the west of the “very old dwelling”. An accommodation block was known to have been located within the area of the car-park (during the “Pompallier Lodge” period), although its exact location is not known. The structures are shown on a plan in the Department of Lands and Survey Report (Marchant 1977). These additional structures were demolished after the NZHPT took possession of the properties in 1977.

The Strand runs along the western boundary of the Pompallier and Clendon properties and has been formed and in use since the early 1850s (shown in a photograph dating to 1858) and quite likely predates this.

The NZTM references are approximate with regard to the 1890 James Deary house.

The images and old land plans are shown in the report entitled *Archaeological Survey and Assessment of the proposed Clendon Cottage café renovations, car-park development and drainage proposals* (Johnson and Callaghan 2013).

Reported by: Leigh Johnson and Elisabeth Callaghan
Northern Archaeological Research
P O Box 32 585
Devonport
Auckland

Owner/ Manager: NZHPT (Heritage Destinations)
DETAIL OF IMAGE FROM THE CERTIFICATE OF TITLE ISSUED IN JULY 1876 TO REV. GOULD, ORIGINALLY GRANTED THE LAND IN NOVEMBER 1859 (Crown Grant Books 1E 52, Vol 13 Folio 48).

DETAIL OF SO 5603, DATED 1890, SHOWING CLENDON COTTAGE (MRS JOHNSON’S); JAMES DEARY’S HOUSE (AREA OF THE CAR-PARK); THE FENCELINES; AND THE STRAND.

DETAIL OF DP 5670^ DATED 1907 (ALSO LABELED SO4227), SHOWING THE POMPALLIER PRINTERY BUILDING WITH A “POST AND RAIL FENCE” EXTENDING ALONG THE WESTERN BOUNDARY OF THE CLENDON AND POMPALLIER PROPERTIES; CLENDON COTTAGE WITH A “VERY OLD IRREGULAR FENCE” ON THE SOUTHERN CLENDON BOUNDARY; AND THE DEARY COTTAGE “DWELLING HOUSE” WITH THE “REMAINS OF OLD FENCE KNOWN TO HAVE BEEN STANDING 60 YEARS” ON THE NORTHERN DEARY BOUNDARY; AND AN “OLD WC” ON THE FORESHORE IN FRONT OF THE DEARY HOUSE.
Appendix 11

Drainage Plan (Haigh Workman 2008)
appendix 12

1977 Restoration Proposal (Marchant 1977)