

Heritage Planners Forum – 21 October 2005
Auckland Town Hall – 9am-4pm

Present: George Farrant (Auckland City Council), Sarah Pocklington (Auckland City Council), Robert Brassey (Auckland Regional Council), Duane Burt (Auckland Regional Council), Vanessa Tanner (Auckland Regional Council), Brent Nahkies (Consultant to Auckland City Council), Nicholas Karlovsky (Dunedin City Council), Neil Carey (Christchurch City Council), Miriam Stacey (Christchurch City Council), Leslie Vyfhuis (North Shore City Council), Aranne Donald (North Shore City Council).

1. NZHPT

They are looking at their relationship to TLA's and their responsibilities – especially with their interaction. Robert from HPT wanted to discuss with the forum but could not make it today – will be at next Friday's session with Megan Patrick.

2. Dunedin Meeting:

Any issues? None.

3. Updates from Regions:

NSCC:

- Doing a review of heritage character zone.
- Undertaking a special consultation with the public on Local Govt Act in relation to buying the Art Deco theatre in Devonport.
- There is a very large Archaeological site at Long Bay where a developer is proposing a medium density housing and has withheld the fact that it was an archaeological site. The developer believes he only requires consent from the Trust. Wants to move a midden like you would a protected building.
- On Fair Go this week about a heritage property where the owner wanted to add about 6 townhouses and use the house as a bed and breakfast (after a number of different proposals). NSCC liaised quite significantly making allowances that probably wouldn't have normally been looked at in order to retain the heritage building. The owner went to Fair Go because they didn't want to publicly notify the application. What was on the television was not correct by the owner.
- Looking at forum with community regarding their ideas of demolition vs retention. Demolition is a restricted discretionary activity for Residential 3. Owners leave a very minor part of the original house in the plans and say that it is alterations. Aranne advised with the Residential 3 review they will try and define alterations as opposed to demolition via a contextual analysis requirement.

Christchurch City Council:

- Urban conservation areas are being held over for now as legal advice advised to wait until the retail review was underway. Looking at retail areas having character overlays. Issues and options report to Council regarding urban conservation areas. There has been a change in all areas – community and courts – regarding heritage importance.
- Conservation Plans – noticed very low level amount of work going into them before being submitted to Council. Very difficult to ask them to redo them taking into consideration past

examples that were accepted. Next meeting in April – forum to bring good examples from their areas. ACC could copy upon request, Britomart CD versions of the 14 or so Conservation Plans.

- Website done.
- Citywide archaeological management plan done.

Dunedin City Council:

- Undertaken heritage strategy.
- Council attitude has changed – seemingly.
- Looking at potentially better budgets.
- Heritage schedule review underway.
- Priory – an Unreinforced concrete building - only one in the southern hemisphere is crumbling.
- Should we use re-use/adaptation as opposed to new buildings. Need a bit of a balance.

Auckland Regional Council:

- ARC has agreed to partly fund the NZAA upgrade. Franklin, Waitakere and Rodney City Councils are undertaking the project in 2006.
- Just been gifted Atiu Creek – 3rd largest regional park.
- 16 April is World Heritage Week – a one day event for ARC.
- They are employing a new conservation archaeologist to do a conservation plan for a pa site on private land in Awhitu.
- Restructuring at ARC. There is now a split between policy development and policy implementation to different divisions with heritage experts in a separate division again. Decision was based on specialist expertise not area.

(Discussion was then held about the heritage amendments to the RMA and whether this had resulted in changes to the Regional Policy Statement. It was suggested that it would be beneficial to TLA's if the ARC did a Regional Policy Statement emphasising the heritage protection using the RMA as a guide. Could be a political opportunity for the ARC to undertake this as a leader. ARC advised that a broad review of the RPS would be commencing within the next year).

- ARC has been advocating for retention of heritage railway stations in the upgrade of the Auckland passenger rail network. The most prominent example was the Henderson railway station, where it was suggested that the station needed to be moved to meet ONTRACK policies for clearance between tracks and structures. No one checked that ONTRACK was right about the 6m clearance. Just took it as correct. The statutory requirement for heritage appeared to be given less weight than non-statutory rail policies. Heritage Railways Trust – were they consulted. NSCC – under plan change required any designation must have cognisance of heritage rules.
- Illegal use of boatsheds at Ngapipi Road, Orakei Basin – especially protected ones. Conversions and consultation rooms. Abatement notices to owners of several of them. Real estates are selling them as potential apartments.

Auckland City Council:

- Huge amount of applications combined with a very proactive and expectant Council. No matter how much money they give can't get more personnel ... even if they could, heritage staff are difficult to come by. One new planner starting soon which takes team up to 9.5.
- Separate committee from planning now EHUF. Cr Caughey was a planner and it is nice to have someone who understands as well as being passionate about heritage.
- Review of Res 1 & 2 plus character areas.
- Also heritage schedule review. 15,000 submissions – 10000 of which were facetious. By using priority list, this helped eliminate the need to assess the 10000. 5000 left only 1 tenth will probably be scheduled.
- Too many major projects. Restoration of Britomart buildings. At final stages of CPO restoration project – tenancy fitouts. Auckland Art Gallery 70-80 million project. Tearing out 50-70s changes. Going through heritage and urban design panel. Compromising quite different addition to get full restoration. Museum – carpark plus filling in courtyard with quite different design whilst retaining visual of courtyard walls and windows.
- Need further skilled architects at ACE to assess heritage related residential area applications appropriately.
- Tree protection – occasional spate of tree poisoning. Accept removal but to deter have conditioned the consent for replacement and that tree will be rescheduled.

Heritage Week:

Heritage week nationally? Due to people wanting to maybe attend other regions could be difficult maybe just regional. Regionally go for April for Unesco World Heritage Day.

Scope of this Forum:

Question of the scope of this forum. Strong feeling that a TLA/regional council as regulatory authorities are the character of the forum. Maybe occasionally bring in groups such as the Trust but not on a regular basis. Maybe a representative of the Trust as they are working in the same direction. Should be doing this in each territory – Chch meets quarterly with the Trust. Maybe on some specific issues invite them. Should be working together as we have the same goal. Meant to concentrate on a national perspective of the TLA process. Already taking a long time at meetings discussing purely TLA issues.

Building Act / TLA Policy:

Update by Brent Nahkies on what Auckland City Council have undertaken so far ...

Deadline approaching. ACC recently put to the committee. Reports – Irene Clark and Jim Cousins. Brent, George Farrant and Bob DeLeur working on the policy regarding the new building act policy regarding earthquake prone buildings. Idea is to have a draft policy by January. Based on the evaluation of the risk, is tending towards looking at a passive approach. Incentives programme looking at the heritage buildings themselves. Section 131 policy. Trying to promote earthquake strengthening incentive – paying feasibility studies. May involve cost sharing. All sorts of other issues relating to the building. Try to integrate with other committees that are discussing this relating to policy in council. Department of Building and Housing have employed someone to look at heritage issues but not sure what his role is. Principle is retention of heritage buildings. Heritage needs better relationship with the building consents people but is good in Auckland

Passive approach – what would trigger upgrade – building consent or change of use. Christchurch is doing much of the incentive approach already. Less discretion as to what terms a change of use. LA determine whether a disabled access. Trade off for alterations etc . Need to do internal and external advocacy. Should discuss with advisory committees. Need to get the heritage message across.

Defined heritage buildings in the policy as scheduled buildings and conservation areas. What % of ACC buildings have been upgraded. 80% not upgraded if not more. Legal liabilities whichever way you go. 3 options for seismic – active management, combination of passive and active. Part of monitoring process. If start passive you can become more active as you go. Should have database showing which buildings have or have not been done. Shows how many per year done, any demolished etc. The departments preferred option is active. Need safety net for heritage buildings if considered dangerous/unsafe. Pre disaster plan and how to manage after disaster. If you push an active approach some owners will only do the minimal. Passive incentive approach will encourage more positive reaction by owners to do the job thoroughly. Consider tax implication – should it be deducted either as a capital item or expense? Capital – over time or expense which is one off. IRD not responsive. Would be good to write off the expense.

Costings done on typical construction types, to use that to feed the at risk buildings. Incentive mainly Town Hall type ones and for middle range a one off low interest loan. Need to be aware of the indirect costs. Passive is driven by owner not council. You have more of an ability to negotiate. Rate holiday while they do it? If we adopt a heavy level of requirement the costs will be intolerable. Wellington may have had some advice – ask for a copy? Stakeholders meeting in Chch. Concerns were risk assessment, cost, affordability. Goes to public for comments before Christmas but waiting on costings before it can be finalised.

Don't need to put your reasons for your approach in the policy. Should be concise but not too long but not so short as to be meaningless.

Maybe available public database of identified buildings suspected of being earthquake prone. Need to go on LIM's and PIM's, but building consent people should advise.

Strengthening standards may have negative impact on scheduled building especially on low budget. How we set them is important. Every building is different.

Miriam Stacy has a draft policy which will be copied to any interested forum party but not beyond that please.

Need to ensure that we keep in touch with progress made and any documentation that is available. ACC will provide a copy of their report to Council.

National Policy Statement:

There was a suggestion that a NPS is required to keep Govt Depts in line not TLA's in particular. Watch closely for new minister (Benson Pope) and policy from Labour. Should meet with Min for Environment. George will be having another meeting with Min of Arts, Culture and Heritage. Letter to political level as well as ministerial. Tizard will try and help pave the way. Should discuss with council to ensure mandate provided to work at ministerial level. Tizard & Gow meetings and GF to follow up on those for changes since new Govt and find out feelings by new parties to gauge letter. Suggested that the communication come from the group via LGNZ not just Heritage Planners Forum. A NPS would need to be carefully drafted to promote consistency across the country without imposing a one policy fits all statement.

Statutory Advocacy Policy Plan by NZHPT – hopefully come to the next meeting to advise.

Lucy took letter to regional iwi liaison officers. Felt there was a bias toward built heritage. Due to RMA indication should take into consideration natural and built. Indicated at other meeting that a NPS should be undertaken for all matters of national significance.

Maybe invite people in the right areas regarding what our object is.

ICOMOS is base charter they deal with. Being asked to show how the assessment of the application relates to the charter.

HPT are producing a set of policies, objectives and rules. Would be useful if we had an input into it to ensure it relates appropriately to the RMA. Are they getting feedback from MfE. Mainly guidelines? See what Robert has to say.

Invite some people from ICOMOS executive committee to discuss with.

Neil to send document.

Check whether Andrew McFarlane from Waipa District Council is on the list. Request Natasha to put a shout out as to who wants to host the next meeting in March/April? Also ask Natasha about the e-mail link so that regular contact can be undertaken.

Pamela Gare from Invercargill – see if she wants to host April meeting.

Education, and training as well as conservation plan needs to be on next agenda.

Case examples of adaptive reuse should be discussed.

Education – better applications when discussions were taken at university.

Issue with the future of the Dept of Planning in Auckland. Does it have a future or will it be conglomerated with architecture.

TA's and how we can best protect our heritage sites.

Look at ways of getting a post grad course on heritage planning/architecture. Discuss ways of doing this.