

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**NEW ZEALAND LOCAL GOVERNMENT HERITAGE PLANNERS FORUM**

10am to 4pm Wednesday 27 April 2005  
Clifford Skeggs Gallery, Council Chambers, The Octagon, Dunedin

**PRESENT:** Jo Oranje, Sean Grace, Vanessa Tanner, Ian Lawlor, Nick Karlovsky, Ian Grant, George Farrant, Ralph Henderson, Aranne Donald, Leslie, Vyfhuis, Julia Forsyth, Brent Nahkies, Barbara Fill, Amanda Ross, Miriam Stacy, Sue Mavor, Janine Dunlop

Minutes taken by Jo Oranje, Dunedin City Council

**A Introduction and review of minutes of Wellington meeting of 27 October 2004. Follow up on actions from that meeting:**

- George Farrant is to coordinate a two day workshop to prepare a draft outline for our expectations for a National Policy Statement in heritage. ACC has a first draft of their own policy review which could serve as a discussion document.
- Barbara Fill advised she had been contacted by MfE and asked whether she wanted NPS or guidelines. She got the impression it was not a high priority for them.
- Reference to research that PhD student Greg Mason (Hamilton) has done which may provide useful information for this discussion. Greg has studied North Shore and WCC. It was noted that Greg is already on the mailing list for the forum.
- Barbara noted potential for doubling up of resources, with each TLA employing their own consultants for their own heritage strategies – parallel processes. Could this be dealt by having NPS?

**ACTIONS**

*George will email Susan Edwards at LGNZ to advise people early to allow consideration before the meeting. Date to be set for August, and will be hosted by George in Auckland. Two-day workshop considered appropriate.*

*Miriam is to email George with issues/options paper and review of various District Plans.*

**B Heritage weeks – Who has them? – What are the benefits and pitfalls? What is required to host one?**

- ACC, NSCC and CCC have them. ACC underestimated the level of enthusiasm from the public and theirs was unfortunately hurriedly instigated. Noted need for long lead-in time for publicity to allow patrons to plan for it.
- Events serve to highlight the heritage of the City, heighten awareness of heritage and include tours around character/conservation areas and visits to current and completed projects. Noted interest in seeing projects 'mid-stream'.
- ACC's week was self-organised
- NSCC's week is organised by the Libraries. Received alarming response and events included displays at library, talks by authors, liaison with historical societies by library was focal point.
- Agreed by all that significant manpower required for liaison and compilation as a single event. It requires a full time stage manager. It can be an annual burden.
- CCC's has been running for 13 years and is run by an events company. The Community group involvement carries it. Receives \$30,000 Council funding, \$20,000 sponsorship.
- Nature of CCC's week includes particular target groups, professional development, education (schools), \$3,000 scholarship for heritage training, award for involvement in heritage, guest speakers. Its an established event but not reaching new audiences. Runs for 10 days. Has theme each year (this year's is 'Restoration - Hands on Heritage'). Gain feedback through surveys undertaken by event manager.

- WCC's Promotion Council has heritage promotion for a month. Not Council or Tourism funded. Includes workshops for owners of heritage and school tasks.
- ARC is tied up with DoC's Heritage Week. Cooperation present, but not "brilliantly coordinated".

### **C National Heritage Week, ie coordinate heritage weeks across the country**

- CCC not keen on National Week – they want a point of difference.
- Benefit of allowing shared guest speakers
- Concept of 'rolling heritage week' raised to allow shared resources and encourage travel around centres.
- Need to 'keep the pot boiling' with events throughout the year. Eg, ACC has town hall tours daily, a couple of tours a year of Civic Theatre, Architects Week
- Appears to be public interest in talks by those involved in projects rather than patter from the pro's.
- Possible idea is to have a National Heritage Week or Heritage Day focus with follow-on through the communities.
- Stories are equally important for heritage.
- May be easier to manage at a Regional level, linking with Regional Councils?

### **D Heritage Funds**

- Selwyn has \$10,000/year for 3 years – has commitment but no framework. Considering Council-run vs stand alone trust with community representatives
- ACC has an ecological fund which is being phased out to a built fund. Subsidises individual efforts, provides money once the work is done. Principles set on what is to be done, standards etc. If short cuts taken, then grant is cut. Fund is \$50,000 - preference given to those works required by statutes. Average payout is \$10,000-12,000, but no limit. Suspensory loan – if building is sold within 4 years, the loan is called back in full. Grant funds conservation plans etc too, not just works.
- EBOP – have problems as no expertise in type of work required. If trust employed it would cost more. Recognise need for external help to determine appropriate work. Funds conservation plans first, rather than works. Staff initially assess application and then take to Council committee.
- NSCC – Has a trust with members poorly equipped for expertise. Rely on staff time (which costs). The applications (?) are advertised once every 2 months prior to meeting. No criteria to help decision-making. Trust finds it difficult to attract money from sponsors. Receive \$15,000 per year from Telecom. Fund doesn't pay for standard maintenance – that's the responsibility of the owner. Focuses on conservation plans, restoration of original elements etc. Trust education is of equal value to the \$ in the grant.
- CCC – Fund has \$1million per year (See their website for details, or contact Neil Carrie). Some money available for aspects such as legislation. Competitive system and should not require significant staff time as each application should include all information allowing decision to be made.
- WCC – have heritage fund and building safety fund. Anything over \$5,000 comes with an encumbrance on the title (not liked by applicants). Conservation plans, work schedules etc all required. Payments are staged with work reviewed by conservation architect. Also use money for Council to commission plans or employ technical advice – this has more control over outcomes.
- ARC – fund up to half the project. Like to encourage use of other funds too. Note need to be sure works don't affect archaeological aspects. Lot of staff time required, even with help in filling out forms!
- Seismic upgrade implications on heritage funds – Criteria for seismic work needs to be strengthened and only fund projects that are done sensitively?
- Brent Nahkies is preparing some work on this matter.

**E ICOMOS review of the ICOMOS charter – at first round of comments and feedback.**

Discussion regarding the need for reworking of individual issues, but entire revamp may be more appropriate. Suggestion that we feed info into the charter as a group. Discussion about membership.

*ACTIONS*

*Barbara Fill is to contact ICOMOS re the forum's input/consultation.*

**F Inclusion of Heritage in Section 6 RMA – has it resulted in District Plan changes?**

- CCC – yes
- EBOP – reviewing their Plan anyway.
- WCC – undergoing major change anyway. Heritage Strategy is first step to Plan Change.
- Porirua – overdue anyway. Doing inventory and strategy at the same time. 2-3 yr programme. Doing a Rural review also.

**G Heritage guidelines**

- Use universal principles but tailor to suit
- Quality Planning website useful tool in this regard
- Need to demonstrate good ideas and bad examples, rather than prescriptive details.
- Noted that design guidelines don't necessarily lead to good design. Need designers to think contextually.
- Guidelines should heighten awareness – ie, should be able to read them, then put aside while designing.
- Frequently Asked Questions format may be appropriate.

*ACTIONS*

*All to bring current documentation/guidelines from our Councils to next meeting.*

**H Summary of Seismic Upgrading workshop (Christchurch Feb 05)**

- LGNZ Website (heritage part) - contact Susan Edwards – has minutes from meeting of seismic upgrade meeting. Miriam Stacey can send if required.
- Spending on seismic matters is grudge purchase.
- Questions about the scope of the issue – how many buildings are involved? Costs? WCC developed scoping document – could be 5000+ buildings in Wellington!
- Buildings built before 1976 need upgrade at time of change of use (Building Act definition)
- Some work can be done easily, or will be OK if good engineer involved.
- Early 70s buildings are worst – eg concrete blocks 'unsaveable'. Many 80s buildings designed to blow windows out.
- Dunedin issue – abandoned buildings degenerate and are then demolished. Wellington and Queenstown expected to have biggest problems.
- Some buildings already thought to be strengthened may not meet correct levels.
- Need education to increase awareness. Lots of ignorance from estate agents, purchasers etc. Will be effects on property values.
- See Dept of Building and Housing website ([www.dbh.govt.nz](http://www.dbh.govt.nz)) – policies, 'Quaketown', cost/benefit analysis. Is up to each authority to see how big an issue it is.
- Britomart development used as case study
- Timing? When will we enforce heritage buildings requirements? Prioritising?
- Two parallel systems (i) Change of use – bring as near as practicable to new building (ie, 2/3<sup>rd</sup> Code) = mandatory (ii) Rest of buildings where use not changing

- = voluntary. Problem with upgrading 1/3<sup>rd</sup> voluntarily, could then require further upgrade at time of change of use.
- Concept been in Local Government Act 1974 for 40-50yrs. Dunedin has not previously enforced provisions – Wellington has.
- Prioritising to reduce magnitude of job eg, Cat I 5 years to be brought up to standard, Cat II 10 yrs, Emergency services buildings, schools etc, buildings greater than 4 storeys
- All government buildings, govt pay.
- Building Act 2009 – designer certifies building complies, TA checks.
- Timaru – advertising compliance levels so tenants know how building fares with the Code. Use a grading system. OSH obligations – occupants could put pressure on for safe buildings. Eg, San Francisco – market demands it!
- One-third compliance means occupants can walk from building, but building is a write-off; Two-thirds compliance means building also survives and allows continuing use.
- Impacts – invasion vs visual effects. George gave example of Church – steel beams are least invasive but visually obtrusive. Cut channels and install strengthening, plaster over = very invasive but no visual effects.
- Will affect retaining walls, wharves, bridges, dams etc
- Suggestion for sharing a draft policy to see other Council approaches. Susan Edwards, LGNZ, can arrange share.

## **I Education and Training**

- Little available in New Zealand
- Universities address heritage: (i) Massey has a block course in heritage (ii) Waikato – 2003 heritage planning was focus, but they shift focus annually (iii) Victoria 2<sup>nd</sup> year conservation planning
- Wellington – Christmas course - 4-5 day seminar/session HPT course. Barbara Fill does one-off lectures on heritage at Design School.
- High turnover of Planners so courses need to be run often.
- British HELM website – [www.helm.org.uk](http://www.helm.org.uk) Historic Environment Local Management. Programmes and training for Council staff, workshops.
- Need to feed into NZPI – encourage need for professional development in heritage, provide courses/workshops. Could be part of degree or after degree.
- Many TA's have no heritage experts on staff.
- ACC has a roadshow to educate new Planners – burden though as turnover is high.
- Need to target all related professions – surveyors, planners, engineers, landscape architects, architects etc
- Section 6 RMA will lead to need for heritage experts.
- There is a recognised need in institutions but no action taken to meet demand. Issues with course design, which faculty? Which topics?
- Courses available in Australia – diploma and degree, cultural management. Possible to fly over for short courses. Summer Schools in Canberra, Masters and full time study also. RMIT Melbourne offers correspondence course.
- ARC has a heritage news website and include a heritage conservation component in staff induction.
- Ian Lawlor is trying to promote the development of a course at UIT, Massey (Albany).
- New Zealand Issues diff to Australia therefore best to have own course.
- Two week course at Years 9 & 10 secondary school.

## **ACTIONS**

*Sue Mavor to contact NZPI and encourage promotion of courses.*

*Jo Oranje to contact Otago University (may be something at MRRP course)*

## **J CCC initiatives**

- 13 leaflets of general themes
- Website [www.ccc.govt.nz/heritage](http://www.ccc.govt.nz/heritage) - can be plagiarised!

- Draft thematic history
- Current project is archaeological mapping and management plan commissioned. Known sites, sites with potential, predictive model. Rolling 30 year rule rather than pre-1900 from HP Act.
- Proposed project is urban conservation study of commercial areas of whole City. Assessment criteria, methodology (Opus, Ian Bowman, Jenny May).

#### **K Research for documentation supporting protection of buildings**

- CCC – emphasis on buildings on schedule that lack documentation. Documentation quantities differ. 365 sites updated over the year – hired 7 historians. Next year looking at researching sites to include on list
- ACC – put out an invite to public for list additions. 11,000 suggested, many included info for assessment. For ease, they were categorised (i) had lots of info (ii) enough info to continue research (iii) do nothing. Have a team of historians working fulltime. Noted over-emphasis on built heritage; less consciousness of archaeological, geological, landscapes etc. Historians have guidelines 15 categories with descriptions under each. Need original photos too. First cut – Historian spends 4-5 hours (\$100/site) research time. If no more info then put aside, otherwise move to second cut. Some sites have conservation plans as also hoping for HPT registration. Assessments are based on likely deduction. Probabilities won't score – need verification. Development threat is a priority.
- DCC advertised recently and received 1000+, some duplicated, some already listed. Used Masters student to do initial basics eg, determine accurate address, photo etc. Interesting range.
- WCC Built Heritage Strategy reviewed – 96 submissions. Heritage Area approach favoured over individual buildings. Includes groves of trees, views (eg 'from Kirk's Seat'). Hope to focus on buildings 50 years before present. Consider listing of surrounding buildings – concern about cantilevering over listed buildings. Want to list interiors.

#### **L Remission of fees for heritage works**

- Many absorb fees for works in heritage precincts/townscape precincts
- DCC no fee for resource consent applications for tree works, and simple alterations to listed buildings/precinctual buildings (eg, painting, alter windows)
- WCC considering waiving all fees
- CCC refund fees for conservation work on heritage buildings

#### **M Other matters**

- Any interest in continuation of newsletter started by Rachel Green? Jo will consider taking this up.
- Forum has no concerns with presence of Brent Nahkies at meetings.

**NEXT MEETING** – considered piggy-backing on HPT conference in Napier. Decided we wanted to appear stand-alone so settled on **Auckland, October**. Two days – 2<sup>nd</sup> day optional case studies.

*Potential future topics*

*Fee charges/remissions/waivers  
Council's interpretation of s36 RMA*