

MINUTES
FINAL VERSION
NEW ZEALAND LOCAL GOVERNMENT HERITAGE PLANNERS FORUM
First meeting
10am to 4pm Friday 18 June 2004

Our City, Former Municipal Chambers cnr Oxford Terrace and Worcester
Boulevard, Christchurch.

PRESENT: Duane Burt, Julia Forsyth, Debbie Hogan, Jo Orange, Leslie Vyfhuis,
Barbara Fill, Neil Carrie, Murray Miller, Miriam Stacy, Amanda Ross, Vanessa
Tanner, Peter Ross, Stephen Rainbow, Rachael Green, George Farrant, Sue Mavor

Minutes taken by Amanda Ross, CCC

How do we want operate the network? Purpose, format, members, meetings.

Please refer to the attached Terms of Reference for this prepared by M Stacy.

Issues that need to be addressed?

- Not enough guidance for central government on a national level – each region is out on its own
- National heritage policy vacuum
- Confusion between RMA and HPA
- Need to raise the profile of heritage (Why isn't there a Heritage Protocol when there is an Urban Design protocol?)
- Need for National Profile
- Need for National Policy Statement
- Do we align with MFE or MCH?
- Need to think strategically
- Need to network with LGNZ. They used to have key contacts for heritage advice – need to reinstate this.
- Imminent local elections – how to brief newly elected councillors on the issues?
- Potential change in government – local and national level.
- Need to lobby DOC – operating in a policy vacuum (eg Bach destruction). DOC policy allows for TLAs to have say in what DOC are doing. Need to utilise this opportunity.
- St up network for bach preservation – take cue from lighthouse network model
- Need for education from local community to central govt to those working in heritage and architectural/planning tertiary students
- All regional councils have interpreted their roles in protecting, identifying and managing archaeological sites differently – who is responsible for what – HPT, NZAA, Councils??
- No courses in heritage available in NZ – no professional training development. Mentality of heritage taking back seat to development/design beginning at tertiary level
- Need for more consideration of heritage as cultural tourism
- Need to promote heritage at a political level
- A need to get publications such as the North Shore's Good Solutions Guide available nationwide + equivalent on a national level
- Need to establish a website or resource at a national level – eg English Heritage helm project (Murray Miller has details) Who is the agency to lead this?
- All working independently in same areas – fractionalised – need to share expertise, initiatives and best practice
- Review/develop the ICOMOS charter. Scope for illustrations, clear guidelines and explanations – scope to take ICOMOS charter to a newlevel.- ICOMOS too general. Interpretation of charters –? Some interpretations not consistent with intention of charter (Murray Miller)

- Conservation principles – guidelines or should these be included in District and Regional Plans?
- Conflict between RMA and what is considered appropriate intervention?

Heritage Planners Overviews

Dunedin City Council

Debbie Hogan and Jo Oranje

- Development pressures not a big issue.
- Currently reviewing District Plan provisions – Townscape section
- Confusion with current Townscape provisions between Heritage and Townscape.
- The plan does not meet the new RMA requirements for historic heritage as a matter of national importance
- Resourcing is a major issue – no dedicated heritage planners or department.
- In the process of looking at establishing grants
- In the process of expanding the list of scheduled items
- Some conflict regarding role of HPT in consents applications – need for Service Level Agreement/protocol
- 15 scheduled archaeological sites
- Some Tangata Whenua sites mapped but problems regarding disclosure of information
- NZAA sites mapped on GIS

Taupo District Council

Rachel Green

- Lack of public and political knowledge and appreciation of heritage items – heritage takes a backseat to the natural environment.
- Appreciation of built heritage confined to tourist related sites (eg Hotels).
- Development pressures
- A number of archaeological sites
- Not a good relationship between the council and HPT
- No support network
- Heritage provisions and variation seen as minor, unimportant
- Baches under threat from high land prices and development pressure
- DOC seen as threat to baches
- Current heritage listing – 6 listed items. Survey carried out by Preey Fletcher
- Lack of resources – funding, time, staff

Auckland Regional Council

Vanessa Tanner

- Cultural Heritage Inventory, GIS identification, Bibliographic Database in place
- Currently developing Heritage Monitoring Unit – all heritage item types
- Education – produced posters and booklets for schools – positive feedback on these so far

Duane Burt

- Urban growth pressures strong – rural areas and outskirts of city affected
- Tension between retaining heritage and intensifying urban centres
- ARC has political support, management support, a large team and financial backing.

North Shore City Council

Leslie Vyfhuis

- A young community – not a lot of appreciation for/understanding of heritage – need for education
- Developing heritage walking tours
- Need for clarification of roles with HPT, ARC
- Development pressure

- Currently reviewing cultural heritage provisions - lack of guidance on this
- Using GPS for identification
- Success with good Solutions Guide publication.
- Currently reviewing listed buildings – important to make this information available

Auckland City Council

George Farrant

- Auckland “the most intense city” – a wealth of heritage
- Current team of 8 planners including an ecologist
- A busy team – up to 800 applications on the books at any one time, 200 active
- Resourcing vs scoping + jurisdiction ????
- Have a schedule for archaeology, geology, ecology (recent addition), landforms, landscapes, geomorphology – important in Auckland area
- Wahi Tapu and Wai tapu – ACC administers Ngati Paoa sites for them. Responsibility of consents for these sites lies with ACC. Report back to Ngati Paoa every 6 months and get feedback. System successful – protocol established – clear lines of what developers can and can’t do, but at the same time details of sites are kept confidential. Ngati Whatua want to get on board also.
- Problem of resourcing
- Lack of monitoring condition of individual items seen as a weakness. Confined to State of the Environment monitoring.
- Interface with NZAA
- Good working relationship with HPT
- Good support from politicians
- ‘Quantitative’ assessment - Numeric system which is regarded as above question by developers and politicians. Assessment method unchallenged. Used for all types of sites including archaeological and geological.
- Transparency and openness about assessment system – no challenges to individual listings or their rankings.
- Encountering problems with using address as an identifier of heritage sites in a city where subdivision is rife, and where a many sites are located rurally and there is no address. Also there is a need for greater certainty and specificity of location of sites. Using GPS as the prime identifier, limiting buffer zones and getting true sub-meter accuracy for sites. Importance of metadata (details of when GPS readings done etc.)
- The timing of the NZAA and ACC plan review are not aligned, so ACC reviewing own archaeological sites.
- Finding conflicts between Building Act and the RMA.
- There is no quick fix – heritage provisions are formulated slowly, building on successes.
- Accept that politicians get credit for hard work of heritage planners.
- Emphasis on pre-application dialogue with owners/developers so that issues solved before application received
- Need to integrate policy and process

Canterbury Regional Council

Peter Ross

- Have commissioned Ngai Tahu to do an inventory of areas of significance in the Canterbury region.
- Currently responding to submissions to the Annual Plan – criticized for not addressing heritage sufficiently in the plan.
- In light of the submissions and s.6 RMA, currently thinking about where to go now??

Selwyn District Council

Jufith Forsyth

- Inherited Nahkies reasonably robust ‘quantitative’ assessment system and heritage schedule, which includes a wide range of built heritage.

- Lack of understanding in the consents team of responsibilities to the HPA? HPT? and local iwi.
- 'Cultural sites' and archaeological sites identified
- There is confusion – identified cultural sites include only sites of significance to iwi, but not specifically limited to this.
- Political resistance
- Confusion over archaeological provisions – who is responsible for what – HPT, NZAA, local/regional govt?

Bay of Plenty Regional Council

Sue Mavor

- Subject to development pressure – more intense in some areas
- Strong ecological heritage awareness in this district – and slowly building on awareness and understanding of cultural heritage
- There is funding for environmental enhancement – lots of these projects have a cultural heritage component
- Regulation of archaeological sites not seen as the Council's responsibility – leave to HPT
- Currently working with other agencies to establish roles and responsibilities – DOC, HPT, iwi, Territorial Authorities, Fish and Game so not overlapping or duplicating efforts
- Heritage trails
- Areas such as Opotiki not affected so much by development pressures but lack economy to support maintenance of heritage sites
- Recent project – a regional cultural heritage park, jointly owned by a number of council's in the region.

Wellington City Council

Barbara Fill

- No archaeological sites in the plan – planners dialogue with HPT on these
- Over 500 buildings, places and objects listed
- 1 staff member dedicated to heritage!!
- Currently reviewing the RC process – planners weigh other factors before heritage
- Huge conflict – HPT taking different approach than heritage planner, lack of communication
- Need to raise profile of heritage – internally and externally.
- In an attempt to do so – have done map of central city area identifying heritage sites – by showing spatially/visually more impact
- No prohibited activities relating to heritage
- Current Wellington development comparable to the 1980s boom
- Every building under threat of development
- Problems with facadism – but one step further – trend of 'stitching' new building into the old. This approach condoned/encouraged at local school of architecture and design colleges
- 35 RC applications on the go at any one time
- Heritage trails established
- Parks and property unit see heritage as a liability rather than an opportunity
- Need for in-house education

Christchurch City Council

Murray Miller

- Problems with planners weighing different aspects of RC applications – heritage comes last – their reasoning and weighing not clear. Explanations needed for weighing/reasoning
- Need for expanding scope of ICOMOS charter – currently too general, and we are encountering interpretations which do not comply with the intentions of the charter

Neil Carrie

- Christchurch is the most litigious RMA city in NZ
- Currently focusing on RMA issues, interpretations of RMA, weight given to heritage
- Problems with planners conclusions and commissioners decisions in these respects

- Currently awaiting legal opinion on s.6 – misconception that because the current City Plan covers heritage it must fulfil s.6 but the issue is about the weighing of s.5 in terms of s.6 and 7.
- Problem of lack of detailed information in RC applications (90% of applications deficient or totally inadequate) – consent planners refuse to decline deficient applications under RMA
- CCC forced into using non-regulatory methods to a considerable extent even after cases have gone through the environment court and demolition approval (eg Park Terrace houses)

Miriam Stacy

- Cultural Heritage Management Strategy inc Heritage Vision in draft form (not public yet but avail FYI on request) approved by Council
- 5 key areas of management strategy – Identification and Assessment, Policy and Planning, Implementation, Information Management, Education and Advocacy
- Updating heritage inventory – commissioned team of consultants for thematic study involving consultation with stakeholders and communities. Aim for inclusive inventory, variety of sites, including groups and landscapes – move away from individual sites.
- Service Level Agreement between Heritage Team and Environmental Services Unit (planners) in progress.
- Currently reviewing heritage significance assessment criteria
- Risk identification – reporting bi-monthly to Arts Culture and Heritage Committee
- Working with Property Unit to develop a heritage asset management strategy
- Annual Heritage week – now managed by events manager with Heritage staff direction. New initiatives this year include a heritage scholarship (Chch residents only)
- Heritage website in final stages

Amanda Ross

- Currently working on heritage research documentation update – 1 researcher in house, and 3 – 4 consultants. Funding for research update project gained - \$40,000 annually for 2 years. Established minimum documentation requirements. 10 hours allowed for each site on average.
- Currently updating site records on heritage items – last record taken 10 years ago. Full photographic record, identifying significant setting, elements of setting.
- Move away from legal descriptions and addresses as identifiers.
- Updated site records and research enables accurate mapping of heritage items on Geomedia GIS programme. Heritage identified spatially and linked through GIS to a heritage database with historical information and photographs – this is currently only available in-house.

Summary of Key Issues to be addressed through the Forum groups

1. National Policy
2. Archaeological Provisions
3. HPT/HPA + TLA/RMA
4. Regional Government
5. Education

- Please also refer to separate discussion document about this prepared by Neil Carrie, CCC.
- Members of the network need to choose one of these 5 topics and put their name to it, and a facilitator needs to be chosen for each topic.

Other Issues Arising

- LGNZ as a potential host for this forum – M Stacy to follow up.
- Forum name – TAHPF Territorial Authority Heritage Planners Forum? (local government is inclusive of local and regional councils is preferred.
- Need to get contacts at other councils so can get them on board for the network – go through the quality planning website. Barbara Fill to find out key heritage planners through her Wellington planners network

- Each region to provide Miriam Stacy with details of heritage planner contacts
- Agreed that the minutes from the network meetings can be circulated to those outside the network if requested
- Terms of reference (focus/purpose) for the network. – M Stacy to prepare.
- Network newsletter – Rachael Green to be editor. Barbara Fill suggested a column “learning from litigation”.

Next meeting

- Wellington City Council has agreed to host – Barbara Fill to co-ordinate
- September, 2004 – venue and date to be determined and circulated
- Theme for next meeting – if there is a political change what are we going to present to new local elected government?
- opportunity to invite central government/policy makers?
- 1 day or 2 days? One day would probably more realistic with time constraints on members. (Possibility of an occasional 2 day meeting with one day as a workshop on a particular subject?)
- Do we debate the 5 issues together as a group or go into smaller groups and workshop?
- This meeting to be more structured – should do updates on what everyone has been doing (key issues/successes/failures) at the end of the day, and deal with the issues in the morning. Before the meeting groups should distribute a synopsis of their findings.
-