

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Stream 3
(Historic Heritage
chapter 26)

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF RICHARD JOHN KNOTT
ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

HISTORIC HERITAGE

2 June 2016

 **Simpson Grierson**
Barristers & Solicitors

J G A Winchester / S J Scott
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com
PO Box 874
SOLICITORS
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. SCOPE	4
3. HISTORIC HERITAGE - METHODOLOGY FOR IDENTIFICATION IN PDP	5
4. SITE SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS ON HISTORIC HERITAGE - SEEKING DE-LISTING	10
5. SITE SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS ON HISTORIC HERITAGE - CHANGE IN GROUPING ..	12
6. SITE SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS ON HISTORIC HERITAGE - SUBMISSIONS SEEKING NEW LISTINGS.....	42
7. OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND RULES	47
8. HERITAGE LANDSCAPES	50

Appendix A: ODP criteria to identify heritage;

Appendix B: Plan Change 3 to the ODP criteria to identify heritage items, which was also used for new items listed in the PDP;

Appendix C:Heritage New Zealand Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Information Sheet 2 (model criteria to identify heritage items);

Appendix D: Proposed Regional Policy Statement for Otago criteria to identify heritage items;

Appendix E: Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan criteria to identify heritage items; and

Appendix F: List of Heritage Assessments for specific scheduled items that I consider in my evidence.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1** My full name is Richard John Knott. I am a Heritage Specialist, Urban Designer and Town Planner. I run my own heritage, urban design and master planning practice, Richard Knott Limited.
- 1.2** I hold a Post Graduate Diploma in Building Conservation, a Master of Arts in Urban Design, a post graduate Bachelor of Planning and a Bachelor of Arts with Honours in Town and Country Planning.
- 1.3** I am a Member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation, UK, a Chartered Town Planner (Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute, UK) and Member of the Institute of Highway Engineers, UK. I have worked in these areas for over 26 years.
- 1.4** I am a Making Good Decisions Certificate Holder (2010 and 2013) and am an Independent Planning Commissioner for Auckland Council, Hamilton City Council and Whangarei District Council, often sitting on Hearings Panels where specialist heritage or urban design expertise is required. I recently sat as Commissioner on the Hearing for Whangarei District Council's Plan Change 124, Built Heritage.
- 1.5** I have held various senior heritage and urban design positions in New Zealand and the UK. This includes Group Manager Urban Design at Manukau City Council, where I was responsible for the leadership of heritage and urban design matters, and Conservation Officer at the Borough of Poole, UK where I led heritage matters. Prior to establishing my own practice in 2014, I was an Associate Director at AECOM NZ Ltd and ran their Design and Planning business for New Zealand.
- 1.6** I have experience of identifying buildings for inclusion on local and national lists in both the UK and New Zealand. In 2014 I assessed a number of buildings for Auckland Council and have also sat as Commissioner on a number of hearings where the assessment of buildings has been a key matter. I therefore feel that I am well placed to consider whether the criteria used in the ODP are still appropriate.

- 1.7** In relation to the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**), in February 2015 I assisted Queenstown Lakes District Council (**Council**) with the identification of appropriate boundaries for the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone in Arrowtown and since September 2015 I have been assisting with the revision/update of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines.
- 1.8** I have now been engaged by the Council to provide evidence in relation to the Historic Heritage chapter of the PDP.
- 1.9** Although this is a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.
- 1.10** The key documents I have used, or referred to, in forming my view while preparing this brief of evidence are:
- (a) ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010;
 - (b) Section 32 report for Historic Heritage chapter;
 - (c) Section 32 Report for Plan Change 3 to the Operative District Plan (**ODP**);
 - (d) various guidance and other district plans as referred to in my evidence; and
 - (e) the various assessments as referred to in my evidence and included as **Appendix F**.
- 1.11** In relation to individual buildings, my evidence mainly consists of a peer review of existing reports and information. Due to time limitations before the hearing I have not at the time of writing this evidence visited each item discussed. Where I have visited an item I have noted this in the relevant section. I will be undertaking additional site visits before the hearing. Should any of these visits cause me to alter my view on any matter I will confirm this when I give my evidence.

1.12 I have attached to this evidence the following:

- (a) **Appendix A:** ODP criteria to identify heritage;
- (b) **Appendix B:** Plan Change 3 to the ODP criteria to identify heritage items, which was also used for new items listed in the PDP;
- (c) **Appendix C:** Heritage New Zealand Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Information Sheet 2 (model criteria to identify heritage items);
- (d) **Appendix D:** Proposed Regional Policy Statement for Otago criteria to identify heritage items;
- (e) **Appendix E:** Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan criteria to identify heritage items; and
- (f) **Appendix F:** a list of Heritage Assessments for specific scheduled items that I consider in my evidence.

2. SCOPE

2.1 My evidence covers the following matters:

- (a) Historic Heritage – Methodology for Identification in PDP;
- (b) Site Specific Submissions on Historic Heritage:
 - (i) Submissions seeking de-listings;
 - (ii) Submissions seeking a change in grouping;
 - (iii) Submissions seeking listings;
 - (iv) Removal of the Pig 'n' Whistle from the Queenstown Court House Historic Heritage Precinct; and
 - (v) Heritage New Zealand's Proposed Additions to Schedule 26.10 Archaeological Sites;
- (c) Objectives, Policies and Rules:
 - (i) Management of Internal and External Alterations;
 - (ii) The Management of Setting and Curtilage Areas; and
- (d) Heritage Landscapes:
 - (i) Glenorchy Heritage Landscape Key Features to be Protected.

3. HISTORIC HERITAGE - METHODOLOGY FOR IDENTIFICATION IN PDP

3.1 The majority of listings in the PDP schedule were rolled over from the ODP. The schedule in the ODP came about through two main processes:

- (a) those that were included in the ODP at notification, and therefore were assessed against the ODP criteria, which is set out in the ODP (see **Appendix A**); and
- (b) those that were added by PC3. PC3 to the ODP was notified in June 2005 and became operative in March 2008. This plan change added additional items to the ODP schedule. Although PC3 did not change the criteria as set out in the ODP, the section 32 analysis for PC3 confirms that an alternative set of criteria were used when assessing new items to be added to the schedule at that stage.

3.2 It is the PC3 criteria which have been used to assess the additional items added to the list in the PDP that have not been rolled over from the current ODP Schedule. The PC3 criteria are copied in full as **Appendix B**.

Clarity as to criteria in PDP

3.1 Neither the PDP nor the section 32 report confirms the methodology for the identification or assessment of items to be added to the Schedule. This matter has been noted in the submission of Jackie Gillies and Associates (**JGAA**) (submission 206) (with reference to PDP section 26.2.3) that:

There is no indication as to what the 'Council's criteria' are or where these might be accessed

and that:

Council should include their criteria or provide a reference as to where this might be accessed.

3.2 I agree with the submission in respect of this matter. It is my view that the criteria which have been used to identify items, and which will be used to identify any additional items at a future date, should be included within the body of the PDP to provide clarity. This is the approach taken in the ODP,

where the criteria used to identify items are set out on page 13-3 (and also in the table above).

- 3.3** Whilst the PC3/PDP criteria were used for the most recent assessments and are therefore the obvious choice to include in the PDP, I consider that consideration should first be given to their appropriateness.
- 3.4** Overall whilst their detailed wording varies, I am content that the overall outcome of using either the ODP or PC3/PDP criteria would be similar. I therefore consider it very unlikely that a building assessed under the ODP criteria would not 'score' very similarly were it assessed under the PC3/PDP criteria. This is important as the majority of items on the PDP schedule were originally assessed under the original ODP criteria.
- 3.5** Both the ODP and PC3/PDP criteria are also very similar to those used within other district plans and to the 'model' assessment criteria given by Heritage New Zealand in their Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Information Sheet 2 (attached as **Appendix C**). The Heritage NZ guidelines are very similar to those also set out in the Proposed Regional Policy Statement for Otago (attached as **Appendix D**).
- 3.6** The table below sets out a comparison of the two sets of QLDC criteria and also those proposed in the notified version of the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (**PAUP**; extract attached as **Appendix E**) and those set out in the Heritage New Zealand guidance referred to above. The PC3/PDP, PAUP and HNZ criteria have been reordered to match the order of the ODP Criteria.
- 3.7** I have included the PAUP criteria because it provides a useful comparison and:
- (a) I am familiar with the use of the criteria within it; and
 - (b) the PAUP includes perhaps the largest heritage project currently being undertaken in New Zealand. Auckland Council has attempted to systematically identify additional heritage items, based upon thematic headings, within each of their Local Board areas.

QLDC ODP	QLDC PC3 / PDP criteria	PAUP	Heritage New Zealand
- Historical and Social	- Historical and Social	- Historical - Social	- People - Events - Public esteem - Commemorative - Statutory recognition
- Archaeological Significance	- Archaeological	- Knowledge	- Archaeological
- Technological Significance	- Technological	- Technology	- Technology and Engineering - Education - Scientific -
- Group Significance	- Townscape and Context	- Context	- Patterns - Identity
- Landmark Significance	- Architectural Value	- Physical Attributes - Aesthetic	- Architecture
- N/A	- Rarity and Representative	- N/A	- Rarity - Representativeness - Integrity - Vulnerability
- N/A	- Cultural and Spiritual Value	- Mana Whenua	- Tangata whenua

3.8 Whilst the detailed 'titles' and wording of criteria varies between each methodology, I note that the criteria utilised for PC3 and for the assessments carried out for the PDP do cover a greater range of matters than the original ODP criteria. I consider that they also more closely meet the range of matters suggested for use by HNZ and used in the PAUP.

3.9 Given this, having compared the ODP criteria and those used in PC3 to other assessment criteria I am satisfied that they both remain relevant and are an appropriate method of assessing items for inclusion on the schedule within the

PDP. Overall I consider that those matters used in PC3 and the more recent assessments for the PDP are more appropriate.

- 3.10** Once a listing has achieved the criteria, it is then placed within one of three categories, which are discussed further below.

"Categories" of listings

- 3.1** Concurrent with being identified as meeting criteria, each item in the PDP is then classified as fitting one of three categories, with each category recognising the relative significance of the building/item. These Categories are defined in the ODP but not specifically in the PDP (although the notified chapter does refer to the three categories and the schedule in 26.9 categorises each listed item).

- 3.2** The ODP definitions of the categories are (from page 13-4 of the ODP):

- (a) Category 1:

The heritage resource warrants the highest level of protection because it is extremely significant to the District and demolition is not contemplated. Category 1 shall include all places of greatest historical or cultural heritage significance including all items in Category I of the Historic Places Trust's Register.

- (b) Category 2:

The heritage resource warrants permanent preservation because of its significance to the District. The Council would be unlikely to approve any significant alteration but would take steps to arrange compensation or acquisition if the owner's property rights are unreasonably restricted.

- (c) Category 3:

Preservation of the heritage resource is encouraged. The Council will be more flexible regarding significant alterations. Category 3 shall include all places of special historical or cultural significance.

3.3 This general approach is not dissimilar to that taken by Heritage New Zealand for the national 'List' and within the PAUP, although in those cases only two Categories are utilised as follows:

- (a) Heritage New Zealand:¹
 - (i) Category 1 historic places are 'places of special or outstanding historical or cultural heritage significance or value'.
 - (ii) Category 2 historic places are 'places of historical or cultural heritage significance or value.'

- (b) Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan:²
 - (i) Category A is a Historic Heritage Place that is of exceptional overall significance, with this significance generally extending well beyond the immediate locality of the place. Its protection from loss or damage is essential. It is expected to be of exceptional value in relation to one or more of the evaluation criteria. A Category A historic heritage place is expected to be of overall significance to the Auckland region or a greater geographic area.
 - (ii) Category B is a Historic Heritage Place that is of considerable overall significance. Its protection from loss or damage is very important. It is expected to be of considerable value in relation to one or more of the evaluation criteria. A Category B historic heritage place is of overall significance to the locality or a greater geographic area.

3.4 I consider that Category 1 in the PDP closely resembles HNZ's Category 1 and the PAUP Category A.

3.5 The ODP Category 2 and 3 effectively split the HNZ Category 2 and PAUP Category B into two sub categories. This is similar to the national list in the UK, where there are three categories (in that case Grade I, II* and II). I believe there are benefits in having these three levels, with Category 3 providing the opportunity to have associated rules which provide greater

1 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, s 65.

2 PAUP, Part 2, Chapter E: Overlay objectives and policies, 2. Historic Heritage.

flexibility for some owners than would be possible were all Category 2 and 3 buildings all contained together.

3.6 I recommend the retention of the second and third category in the PDP and that the following details, explanations and definitions of the Categories are included in the text of the PDP, in response to JGAA's submission. These have been amended from those included in the ODP to make them more simple/clear and to appropriately refer to the Heritage New Zealand 'List' (**HNZ List**):

(a) Category 1

The heritage resource warrants the highest level of protection because it is extremely significant to the District and is often also extremely significant regionally and/or nationally. Category 1 shall include all places of greatest historical or cultural heritage significance including all items in Category 1 of the Heritage New Zealand 'New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero' ('the List').

(b) Category 2

The heritage resource warrants permanent preservation because it is very significant to the District.

(c) Category 3

Preservation of the heritage resource is encouraged. The Council will be more flexible regarding significant alterations. Category 3 shall include all other places of special historical or cultural value.

4. SITE SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS ON HISTORIC HERITAGE - SEEKING DE-LISTING

Item 251 Former Methodist Church, 8 Berkshire Street, Arrowtown

4.1 Anna-Marie Chin and Phil Vautier (Submission 368) have indicated in their submission that this building has been modified extensively over the years and that they have also recently altered it. They consider that the listing does not make sense. They do not want to have a category over this building, although are sensitive to it being old and have taken advice from heritage consultants on work they have undertaken.

4.2 HNZ have submitted in support of the proposed listing.

Response

4.3 I viewed this property on 1 April 2016. This is a new item which was not scheduled under the ODP. A heritage report was produced for the Council in 2013 by JGAA.³ This was based on the PC3/PDP assessment criteria. This is included in **Appendix F**.

4.4 This confirms that overall the building possesses Moderate Heritage Significance:

(a)	Historic and Social Value	High
(b)	Cultural and Spiritual Value	Moderate
(c)	Architectural Value	Moderate
(d)	Townscape/Contextual Value	Moderate
(e)	Rarity and Representative Value	Moderate
(f)	Technological Value	Low
(g)	Archaeological Value	Moderate

4.5 From my site visit, it appears that the building has been significantly altered since the heritage assessment was carried out with the removal of large extensions on the north and south elevations, and alterations to the western elevation. These alterations have taken the building back to what appears to be a more original form and shape.

4.6 The ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) New Zealand Charter (**Charter**) is a set of guidelines on cultural heritage conservation, produced by ICOMOS New Zealand. The Charter is widely used in the New Zealand heritage sector and forms a recognised benchmark for conservation standards and practice. The Charter provides specific guidance on Restoration and specifically indicates that restoration should not involve conjecture.

4.7 In this instance, without having full details of the work carried out, I am not able to comment upon whether the alterations involved conjecture or whether they just revealed previously hidden original fabric. I cannot therefore be sure as to how the alterations sit against the philosophy of the ICOMOS NZ Charter.

3 Heritage Assessment of the Former Methodist Church, Jackie Gillies and Associates.

4.8 The physical alterations and the stripping away of layers of the 'history' of the building, since the assessment completed in 2013, have potentially impacted upon the heritage significance of the building. In particular, the work may have reduced the architectural and archaeological value of the building, although without examining this in detail I cannot at this stage confirm this.

4.9 However, having considered the previous assessment, I consider that even if there has been a negative impact upon the architectural and archaeological value of the building, it remains of high Historic and Social Value and of moderate Cultural and Spiritual, Townscape/Contextual and Rarity and Representative Value. Overall I consider that it therefore remains of Moderate Heritage Significance.

4.10 In view of the above I consider it remains appropriate that the building be recognised as a Category 3 building. I therefore do not agree with the submitter and consider that the building should remain as a Category 3 building.

5. SITE SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS ON HISTORIC HERITAGE - CHANGE IN GROUPING

Item 3 Antrim Engines Slipway and Cradle, Kelvin Peninsula

5.1 Real Journeys Limited (Submission 621) has indicated that Item 3 should be amended so that the Slipway and Cradle are identified as Category 3. Elsewhere in their submission they note:

Continued provisions of access to and use of the slipway facilities at the Kelvin Peninsula are necessary to maintain the "TSS Earnslaw" and protect its heritage values. These facilities are historic and require constant maintenance and upgrading in order to fulfil their purpose and to meet relevant safety and engineering standards.

5.2 IPENZ (Submitter 201) comment that this item seems to encompass the Kelvin Heights slipway, the winch house which has the *Antrim* engine, and also the *Antrim's* former boiler, and that if the proposed listing is intended to include these features, clarity would be achieved by noting the specific features in the schedule.

- 5.3** IPENZ further comment that the *Antrim* Engine was awarded an IPENZ Engineering Heritage Recognition plaque in 1996 and that the engine, boiler and slipway have ongoing heritage importance as significant aspects of local transport and tourism infrastructure.
- 5.4** Real Journeys Limited (FS 1341) opposes relief that seeks additional protection of heritage items or features associated with the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the TSS Earnslaw and associated infrastructure and slipway area.

Response

- 5.5** This group of items is currently scheduled as Category 2 in the ODP and Category 2 in the PDP. I viewed the slipway area on 1 April 2016. However, I did not have the opportunity to view the Antrim engine or boiler.
- 5.6** At the time of my visit, significant work was taking place to the slipway. This work is set out in the Heritage report prepared in 2015 by Peter Petchey of Southern Archaeology Ltd on behalf of the owners.⁴ The purpose of that report was to assess the heritage values of the slipway and in particular to consider the heritage implications of partially implemented plans to upgrade the slipway structure using concrete and steel to replace original timber elements.
- 5.7** The rails along which the cradle would run were previously supported on longitudinal timber beams, which in turn sat on perpendicular sleepers. Through the work just described, the longitudinal beams have been replaced with steel beams. The work is taking place to ensure that the slipway continues to meet the owner's operational requirements.
- 5.8** The Southern Archaeology report confirms that work on the project was stopped by the Council as a resource consent was required for work of this extent and nature on a heritage site listed in the ODP. However, I understand that consent has now been granted. This is subject to a condition which requires that an area of the original timber slipway structure located in place at the head of the formation, where the weight of the TSS Earnslaw never

4 Archaeological Site No. E41/280 Heritage report, Peter Petchey, Southern Archaeology Ltd (2015).

reaches, will be retained as a sample of the historic structure in immediate context with the winding house and Antrim machinery.

- 5.9** Given the submission, it is appropriate to consider whether the recent removal of original (or historic) fabric and its replacement with a modern alternative has altered the heritage significance of the item.
- 5.10** The Peter Petchey report contains an assessment of the slipway, broadly in line with the criteria used by HNZ for the assessment of historical significance to consider items for inclusion on their list. The report confirms that the slipway has historic, physical context and cultural values.
- 5.11** I have not had an opportunity to carry out a full heritage assessment of this item against the PDP criteria. However, having considered the Peter Petchey report, I believe that the work which is being carried out would have a negative impact upon some of the heritage values of the slipway. However, I believe that it remains of moderate Historic and Social Value, Townscape and Context Value and Technological Value. It therefore remains appropriate that it be recognised as a Category 2 item.
- 5.12** In view of the above I do not consider that the slipway should be downgraded from Category 2 to 3. Given this, I see no need to 'split' the current item into its various parts.
- 5.13** However, I do support the recommendation from IPENZ that the description be updated to ensure that there is no confusion over what features are included in the item.

Item 18 Transit of Venus Site, 8 Melbourne Street, Queenstown

- 5.14** JGAA (Submission 604) suggests that the Transit of Venus site (Item 18), which is currently proposed as Category 2 should be rated at a similar level to Items 20 and 21 (the Lake Levels Plaque at Marine Parade and Rees Tablet, Marine Parade respectively) as all three items have similar characteristics and heritage values. Both of these items are Category 3.

Response

- 5.15** As pointed out in the submission, Item 18 does have much in common with Items 20 and 21, with all relating to commemorative plaques. For Item 18 to be included in a higher category than the other two items it would be necessary for it to somehow be recognised as being very significant to the District (the requirement for Category 2) rather than of special historical or cultural value (the requirement for Category 3).
- 5.16** I have not fully researched each item nor carried out a full assessment against the PDP criteria. However, having objectively considered each item I consider it very unlikely that that the Transit of Venus Site would 'score' any more highly against the criteria than the other items or that it is very significant to the District. I therefore consider that all three items are of special historical or cultural interest and should therefore appropriately be within Category 3.
- 5.17** In view of the above, I recommend that the submission be accepted.

Item 34 Invincible Mine, Vicinity Rees River

- 5.18** Heritage New Zealand (Submission 426) notes that there are three schedule entries relating to this site, not all of which refer to the HNZ List entries. They clarify that the Invincible Mine and buddle site were functionally linked but are located on separate land parcels and are the subject of two separate HNZ List entries - 5603 and 5604. They submit that for the sake of clarity, these should be combined into a single entry covering both sites, rather than having three separate listings relating to this place.
- 5.19** They also note that the legal description provided in sections 26.9 and 26.10 appears to be out of date and ask for it to be updated.
- 5.20** IPENZ (Submission 201) support the inclusion of the Invincible Mine Buddle Site (Item 704 and Item 703).
- 5.21** The Director General of Conservation (Further Submission 1080) supports the HNZ submission.

Response

- 5.22** Item 34, Invincible Mine is included in the ODP and PDP as a Category 3 Item. Items 703 and 704 are Archaeological Sites in schedule 5 of the ODP and schedule 26.10 of the PDP.
- 5.23** It is clear from the submission that there is some confusion over the extent of this item and I therefore recommend that the detailed description of 34 be amended to 'Invincible Mine and Buddle sites' so that it is clear that it encompasses all of the features.
- 5.24** However, I do not agree with HNZ's submission that Items 703 and 704 be deleted. Items 703 and 704 relate to archaeological sites. Archaeological Sites are subject to their own controls, with the activity status of various activities set out in Table 5 (of Chapter 26 of the PDP). I consider that it would not be appropriate to remove these entries as these items would no longer be provided with the protection that those specific controls bring.

Item 37 TSS Earnslaw, Berthing located at Steamer Wharf, Beach Street

- 5.25** JGAA (Submission 604) recommends that the description for this item be altered to ensure that it is clearly stated that it is the ship, which is protected. They consider that the current description could be misconstrued.

Response

- 5.26** It is important that each entry to the schedule is clear and easily identifiable. I therefore agree with the JGAA submission on this matter and recommend that the schedule entry be amended to 'TSS Earnslaw (the ship), whose berthing is located at Steamer Wharf, Beach Street' to confirm that that it is the ship which is protected.

Item 40 Kawarau Falls Bridge, Frankton

- 5.27** Heritage New Zealand (Submission 426) confirms that this is a Category 1 item on the HNZ List and request that this be identified as a Category 1 Item rather than Category 2. IPENZ (Submission 201) support the inclusion of this

item on the schedule; they confirm in their submission that this was constructed as a Dam. The HNZ description also confirms this.

Response

5.28 I visited this site on 1 April 2016. I was already familiar with the bridge/Dam having previously viewed it from both the lake and land. I have read the HNZ Assessment of the place⁵ which clearly confirms the architectural, historical and technological significance of the bridge/Dam.

The Heritage Assessment carried out by JGAA in 2012⁶ to assess the impact of the proposed new bridge upon the heritage significance of the existing/old bridge indicates that it has historical, technical and contextual significance. The site assessment report⁷ by Stacey Solomon on behalf of the Wakatipu Heritage Trust also indicates that the bridge has high overall heritage value in respect of each criteria assessed as below. These criteria are similar but not identical to those used for PC3 and PDP assessments:

(a)	Historical/social value:	High
(b)	Cultural value:	Moderate
(c)	Architectural value:	High
(d)	Landscape/townscape value:	High
(e)	Rarity/representative value:	High
(f)	Technological value:	High
(g)	Archaeological value:	Low

5.29 Having visited this site and considered these reports, I conclude that the bridge/dam is extremely significant and should therefore be included in Category 1. This sits comfortably against the proposed description for Category 1 to *'include all places of greatest historical or cultural heritage significance including all items in Category 1 of the Heritage New Zealand 'New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero' ('the List')*.

5 Heritage New Zealand, Historic Place Assessment under Section 23 Criteria, Wayne Nelson, September 1998.
6 Proposed New Kawarau Bridge, Frankton – Heritage Assessment, Jackie Gillies and Associates, April 2012.
7 Wakatipu Heritage Trust – Site assessment report for a historic place – Kawarau Falls Bridge, Stacey Solomon, December 2013.

Item 42 Stone Walled Race, 26 Hallenstein Street Queenstown

- 5.30** This is currently proposed in the PDP as a Category 3 item and is included in the ODP as a Category 3 item. IPENZ (Submission 201) point out that it is a Heritage New Zealand Category 2 Historic Place. They believe that it should be Category 2 in the PDP to be consistent with the Council category of rare infrastructure items such as the Arrowtown Cobbled Gutters (Ref. 305, No. 2086). IPENZ do recognise that an Archaeological Authority would be required to modify or destroy this site, which is a protection measure external of the PDP.

Response

- 5.31** As outlined above, PDP Category 1 is intended for (in summary) extremely significant items, Category 2 for significant items and Category 3 for special items. I have set out that I consider ODP Category 1 is the equivalent to HNZ Category 1 (which is intended to recognise *'places of special or outstanding historical or cultural heritage significance or value'*). However, as outlined above the Housing New Zealand Category 2, which is for 'places of historical or cultural heritage significance or value' overlaps the PDP Categories 2 and 3.
- 5.32** Whilst I therefore consider it clear that an item recognised as Category 1 on the HNZ list should automatically be recognised as being Category 1 in the PDP (as is indicated in the Category descriptions proposed above) I do not think that the same should be true of Category 2 HNZ items automatically being recognised as PDP Category 2.
- 5.33** As no substantive information on the value of the listing has been provided in the IPENZ submission on this matter, I cannot support this request to upgrade the category, at this time.

Item 45 (Map Reference 10) Skippers Bridge, Shotover River

- 5.34** HNZ (Submission 426) request that this item be increased from Category 2 to Category 1, in recognition of its identification as a Category 1 item on the HNZ list.

Response

- 5.35** The bridge is included in the HNZ Skippers Road registration report,⁸ where it is confirmed that the bridge is of outstanding technological innovation. The IPENZ Engineering Heritage Register Report⁹ recognises the bridge as having social and technological significance.
- 5.36** Whilst I am not able to make a full assessment against the PDP criteria, having read both of these reports, I conclude that the bridge has High Historical/Social Value and High Technological Value. Overall, I therefore consider that it is extremely significant and should therefore be included in Category 1. This sits comfortably against proposed description for Category 1 to *'include all places of greatest historical or cultural heritage significance including all items in Category 1 of the Heritage New Zealand 'New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero' ('the List')'*.

Item 47 Frankton Cemetery Walls and Gates, Frankton-Ladies Mile Highway

- 5.37** JGAA (Submission 604) consider that the walls and gates at the Frankton Cemetery, which are included in the ODP and PDP as a Category 2 item, should be included in the same category as Item 47 Stone Cemetery walls, Queenstown, which are within Category 3.
- 5.38** This is within the section of their submission where they have suggested changes to ensure greater consistency throughout the PDP, with a comparison to like features elsewhere or where they have knowledge of the heritage values of the features through the preparation of Conservation Plans or Archaeological Assessments etc.
- 5.39** In this case they do not note that they have produced a Conservation Plan or Archaeological Assessment for the item.

8 Registration Proposal – Skippers Road, Otago/Southland Area Office, New Zealand Historic Places Trust, June 2006.

9 IPENZ Engineering Heritage Register Report, Skippers Canyon Suspension Bridge, Simon Daisley, February 2013.

Response

- 5.40** I visited this site on 1 April 2016. In this instance I have not been able to locate copies of heritage assessment reports for either the Frankton Cemetery Walls and Gates or the Queenstown Stone Cemetery Walls.
- 5.41** I consider that it is important that there is consistency within the plan.
- 5.42** Whilst I see merit in the JGAA recommendation that the Frankton Cemetery Walls and Gates be moved to Category 3 to ensure consistency with the Queenstown Stone Cemetery Walls there has been no evidence submitted to substantiate this. Unless evidence is submitted I am not able to support this suggested amendment and must rely upon the assumption that the original assessments identified different values for each of these items and they were consequently classified accordingly.

Item 57 Hulbert House (Tutuila) 68 Ballarat Street (noting that Hilbert House is actually Item 56)

- 5.43** JGAA (Submission 604) suggests that this should be upgraded to Category 2 as this rating more closely ascribes to its high heritage values. They suggest that this would be a Category 1 listing but for the recent modifications.
- 5.44** This is within the section of their submission where they have suggested changes to ensure greater consistency throughout the PDP, with a comparison to like features elsewhere or where they have knowledge of the heritage values of the features through the preparation of Conservation Plans or Archaeological Assessments etc. They note that they have produced an Archaeological Assessment for the item, although this is not included with the submission.
- 5.45** Heritage New Zealand (submission 426) has also suggested that this building be increased from Category 3 to Category 2 as it is on the HNZ List as a Category 2 item.

Response

- 5.46** This building is scheduled as a Category 3 building in the ODP. I viewed the building on 1 April 2016.
- 5.47** As outlined above, Council Category 1 is intended for extremely significant items, Category 2 for significant items and Category 3 for special items.
- 5.48** The HNZ Heritage Assessment Report (2012)¹⁰ confirms that the house is one of an increasingly smaller number of early houses, which remain in Queenstown. Its setting and location are impressive and it remains a prominent landmark. Architecturally, it is a fine example and the interior is also significant because of its high degree of intactness. The report also points out matters relating to the social and historical significance of the building.
- 5.49** Having considered the report, I conclude that the building has moderate historic and social value, architectural value and townscape and context value. Overall, it is in my view of very significant heritage value and warrants recognition as a Category 2 item.
- 5.50** In view of the above, I agree with both submissions that the building be recognised as a Category 2 building.

Item 58 Stone Building, 17 Brisbane Street, Queenstown

- 5.51** JGAA (Submission 604) recommend that this building, currently proposed to be included within Category 2 should be moved to Category 3. This is within the section of their submission where they have suggested changes to ensure greater consistency throughout the plan, with a comparison to like features elsewhere or where they have knowledge of the heritage values of the features through the preparation of Conservation Plans or Archaeological Assessments etc.
- 5.52** In this case they do not note that they have produced a Conservation Plan or Archaeological Assessment for the item.

10 Hulbert House, Queenstown, Heritage Assessment Report, New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga, Susan Irvine and Jonathan Howard, May 2012.

Response

- 5.53** I viewed this site on 1 April 2016. This building is included in the ODP as Category 2. As no substantive evidence has been submitted on this matter, I cannot support this request at this time.

Item 59 McNeill Cottage (Mullhollands Stone House), 14 Church Street

- 5.54** JGAA (Submission 604) recommend that Item 59 should be downgraded from Category 2 to Category 3 as only the external walls and roof remain of the original cottage.
- 5.55** This is within the section of their submission where they have suggested changes to ensure greater consistency throughout the plan, with a comparison to like features elsewhere or where they have knowledge of the heritage values of the features through the preparation of Conservation Plans or Archaeological Assessments etc.
- 5.56** In this case they do not note that they have produced a Conservation Plan or Archaeological Assessment for the item.

Response

- 5.57** I viewed this building on 1 April 2016. I did not gain access to the building.
- 5.58** The Cottage is included in the ODP as a Category 2 building and is included on the HNZ List as Category 2.
- 5.59** From my limited look at the building, it does appear significantly altered. However, in this instance the submitter has not provided a comparison and has not provided any evidence to support their submission.
- 5.60** As no substantive information or evidence has been submitted on this matter, I cannot support this request at this time.

Item 63 Cottage, 28 Park Street

- 5.61** JGAA (Submission 604) suggest this this item be upgraded from Category 3 to Category 2 due to its high heritage significance and the unmodified character of the original cottage.
- 5.62** This is within the section of their submission where they have suggested changes to ensure greater consistency throughout the plan, with a comparison to like features elsewhere or where they have knowledge of the heritage values of the features through the preparation of Conservation Plans or Archaeological Assessments etc.
- 5.63** They indicate that they have carried out an Archaeological Assessment of the site but have not included this in their submission.

Response

- 5.64** I have been provided with the Heritage Assessment of the cottage carried out by Rebecca Reid for the Council in 2005¹¹ and also copies of an Assessment of Environmental Effects produced by JGAA in February 2016 (in relation to various alterations that the current owner wishes to make).¹² The latter document includes an assessment of the heritage significance of the building.
- 5.65** The assessments indicate that the building has moderate/medium to high heritage significance. Rebecca Reid noted the following individual values. Where there was no rating against an item I have assumed that this means 'Low':

(a)	Historical/Social Value	High
(b)	Cultural/spiritual Value	Low
(c)	Architectural Value	High
(d)	Landscape/Townscape Value	Moderate to High
(e)	Rarity/Representative Value	High
(f)	Technological Value	Low
(g)	Archaeological Value	Low

11 Queenstown Lakes District Council Heritage Assessment of 28 Park Street, Rebecca Reid, 2005.
12 28 Park Street, Assessment of Environmental Effects, Jackie Gillies and Associates, February 2016.

5.66 Having read the assessments and reports, I agree with their conclusions and consider the building to be very significant to the District. I therefore suggest that the building should be reclassified as Category 2. This sits comfortably against my recommendation that Items 81 (Arcadia, Paradise) and 56 (Hulbert House) also be moved into Category 2.

Item 65 Queenstown Bowling Club Pavilion, located within the grounds of the Queenstown Gardens

5.67 JGAA (Submission 604) indicate that this building should be downgraded from Category 2 to Category 3.

5.68 This is within the section of their submission where they have suggested changes to ensure greater consistency throughout the plan, with a comparison to like features elsewhere or where they have knowledge of the heritage values of the features through the preparation of Conservation Plans or Archaeological Assessments etc.

5.69 They indicate that they have produced a Conservation Plan for the building but have not included a copy of this with their submission.

Response

5.70 The heritage assessment for this building prepared by Rebecca Reid for the Council in 2005¹³ confirms that the building has overall Moderate to High heritage value. The individual values were noted as below (where there was no rating against an item I have assumed that this means 'Low'):

(a)	Historical/Social Value	High
(b)	Cultural/spiritual Value	Low
(c)	Architectural Value	Moderate
(d)	Townscape/Context Value	High
(e)	Rarity/Representative Value	High (rarity)
(f)	Technological Value	Low
(g)	Archaeological Value	Low

13 Queenstown Lakes District Council Heritage Assessment – Bowling Club Pavillion and grounds, Rebecca Reid (2006).

5.71 I am not aware of any significant alterations having been made to the building since this assessment was carried out and therefore consider that the conclusions still stand and that the building is very significant to the District.

5.72 In line with my recommendations regarding other items with a similar heritage value, I consider that the building is appropriately identified as a Category 2 Item. I do not therefore support the submission on this matter.

Item 67 Sainsbury's House, Skippers Mt Aurum Recreational Reserve

5.73 HNZ (Submission 426) raise a number of issues in relation to this item, which is currently listed as Category 3 in both the ODP and PDP, as follows:

- (a) the entry does not make reference to the correct New Zealand Heritage List reference and should be updated;
- (b) neither sections 26.9 (Buildings Structures and Features) or 26.10 (Archaeological Sites) appear to include the Pleasant Terrace Workings, a category 1 historic place (NZ Heritage List ref.5175). They acknowledge that Sainsbury's House, which is included within the extent of the historic place, is included in section 26.9 under reference 67.
- (c) the Pleasant Terrance Workings should be included within the PDP heritage schedule and note that for the sake of clarity and in acknowledgement of the linkages between the various heritage values that comprise the historic place, that instead of creating an additional entry for the Pleasant Terrace Workings the existing entry for Sainsbury's House should be extended to encompass the full extent of the Category 1 historic place. This includes the workings and the outbuilding associated with the Sainsbury's House.
- (d) the site is of 'special or outstanding historical or cultural significance or value.' (recognised by being a HNZ Category 1 place) and that it therefore qualifies as a Category 1 Item in the PDP.

Response

- 5.74** I have read the HNZ¹⁴ Registration Report for the Pleasant Terrace Workings. From this I conclude that overall the site has high historic and social value, (townscape and) context value and archaeological value and that it is overall extremely significant to the District.
- 5.75** I consider that it would be appropriate that the Pleasant Terrace Workings be added to the PDP schedule as a Category 1 item.
- 5.76** I note HNZs recommendation that this single item should encompass the existing scheduled Sainsbury's House and the full extent of the Listed heritage place (including the Sainsbury's House, the workings and outbuildings as noted above). I agree with this approach as a means provide clarity and to provide appropriate protection.

Item 70 Threepwood and Stone Buildings, Lake Hayes and Item 242 Threepwood Stables

- 5.77** JGAA (Submission 604) suggest that Item 70 (Threepwood and the Stone Buildings) should be split into two separate entries to reflect the different characteristics of each building; these being:
- (a) 70a) Threepwood timber villa - Category 2; and
 - (b) 70b) Threepwood stone woolshed - Category 3.
- 5.78** JGAA (Submission 604) suggest that Item 242 (the stables) should be upgraded to a Category 1 due to its high heritage significance and unmodified state.
- 5.79** This is within the section of their submission where they have suggested changes to ensure greater consistency throughout the PDP, with a comparison to like features elsewhere or where they have knowledge of the heritage values of the features through the preparation of Conservation Plans or Archaeological Assessments etc.

14 Registration Report for a Historic Place - Pleasant Terrace Workings, Heather Bauchop, September 2013.

- 5.80** They indicate that they have produced a Conservation Plan for all the buildings.
- 5.81** The further submission from Justin Crane and Kirsty Mactaggart (FS 1350) support the stables inclusion into the PDP as a Heritage Item but strongly oppose that the building be upgraded from Category 2 to Category 1.
- 5.82** They support the JGAA submission to the extent that there should be separate heritage listings for the Threepwood Homestead (ie, the timber villa) as (Category 2) and the Woolshed as (Category 3), as this is a downgrade of the heritage listing for the woolshed.
- 5.83** They are not convinced that the heritage values of these buildings merit the higher category listings and consider that the Stables as a Category 2 building, and the Woolshed as a Category 3 building, is consistent with the objectives and policies in the PDP and in particular recognises and provides adequate protection whilst providing for the sustainable use of the historic heritage buildings. The listing category needs to enable the adaptation of buildings of their sustainable use to provide for their use and their longevity.

Response

- 5.84** I visited this site on 1 April 2016 and viewed these buildings externally (although I was able to view the inside of the stables).
- 5.85** Threepwood and the Stone Buildings are included on the schedule within the ODP, Category 2.
- 5.86** There are a number of buildings on this site, including:
- (a) The Homestead ('Threepwood');
 - (b) The Stables;
 - (c) The Woolshed;
 - (d) The Manager's Cottage;
 - (e) The Marshall Cottage;
 - (f) The Lee Memorial;
 - (g) Various tractor and implement sheds; and
 - (h) Hay Barn (on Ladies Mile).

5.87 There are three entries in the PDP schedule for this site:

- (a) Item 70; Threepwood and Stone Buildings. I understand that the intention is that only the Homestead and Woolshed are covered by this item in the PDP with the plural 'buildings' being carried over from the ODP (in error) which did not separately schedule the Stables and instead included them as part of this group;
- (b) Item 240 Marshall Cottage; and
- (c) Item 242 Threepwood Stables. This covers the stables only.

5.88 The other buildings/items noted above are not included on the schedule.

Item 70 Threepwood and Stone Buildings

5.89 In relation to item 70, there is agreement between JGAA and the further submitters that there should be separate entries for Threepwood and the Woolshed and also agreement regarding the Categories for these (ie, Category 2 and 3 respectively).

5.90 The heritage significance of the buildings is discussed in the 2005 Conservation Plan produced by JGAA. Having considered this, I agree with the submitters regarding this matter and believe that splitting the item into two would provide significant clarity and better reflect the heritage value of each.

Item 242 Stables

5.91 A Heritage Assessment was carried out for the Stables by JGAA in 2011.¹⁵ This confirms that the stables exhibit high overall heritage value:

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|----------|
| (a) | Historic and Social Value | High |
| (b) | Cultural and Spiritual Value | Moderate |
| (c) | Architectural Value | High |
| (d) | Townscape/Contextual Value | High |
| (e) | Rarity and Representative | High |
| (f) | Value | High |
| (g) | Technological Value | High |

15 Heritage Assessment of Threepwood Stables, JGAA (2011).

(h) Archaeological Value High

- 5.92** I viewed this building on 1 April 2016 and note that whilst there has been some modification to the building and little maintenance, it continues to retain many original features such as the remaining stalls which contribute to its historic, social and architectural values. I find no reason not to concur with the JGAA assessment and conclude that the building is extremely significant to the District.
- 5.93** In view of the above, I agree with the submission that the stable building should be increased to Category 1.

Item 76 Mill House, 549 Speargrass Flat Road (Mill Creek)

- 5.94** HNZ (Submission 426) recommend that the Category of this building be increased from Category 3 to Category 2. This section of their submission also refers to a number of items and heritage significance and in particular indicates that:

This is an existing situation which has been carried over from the operative District Plan. All of the relevant listings are items that are entered on the New Zealand Heritage List. The heritage values of these places have been established through the process of entry onto the New Zealand Heritage List. Given the emphasis in sections 26.2 and 26.5.1 on protection being applied on a scale based on the relative significance of heritage items, Heritage New Zealand considers it important that the QLDC categories assigned to scheduled items accurately reflect the level of heritage significance.

It is considered that the reports enclosed in Appendix C relating to each of these items supports the relief sought i.e. the upgrading of items from QLDC category 3 to category 2; or QLDC category 2 to category 1.

- 5.95** Trustees of the Mill House Trust (FS 1113) strongly oppose the submission by HNZ to upgrade the heritage classification of the building. They point out that HNZ do not include any supporting report with their submission and that they are therefore not able to respond to the relief.

- 5.96** They also point out that the Mill House has already been significantly modified by modern architectural renovation and heritage values are already compromised as a result. They confirm that HNZ have not inspected or assessed the property (unless they have done so without the owner's consent).
- 5.97** They wonder whether, as HNZ have focussed their reporting on the neighbouring flour mill and Oast House, they have included Heritage Item 76 in their summary submission at their point 32 in error. They suggest that the incorrect reference to Heritage Item 76 in the HNZ submission means that the HNZ submission on this property should be struck out.
- 5.98** They further submit that the modification of this property is such that the historic categorisation should be downgraded and removed (e.g. from Category 3 to no classification).

Response

- 5.99** I viewed this property from the road on 1 April 2016. It is currently scheduled as a Category 3 building in the ODP.
- 5.100** The HNZ submission makes very clear reference to their submission relating to items that are entered on the New Zealand Heritage List where the heritage values of the place have been established through the process of entry onto that list.
- 5.101** Whilst the entry for this building in the ODP schedule and in the PDP schedule indicate that it is listed by HNZ (item 2241), the reference on the HNZ List relates to the Wakatipu Flourmill Complex at 557 Speargrass Road. I have checked the extent of place of 557 Speargrass Road, Lot 1 DP 18523 (CT OT12A/101), and it is clear that this does not include Mill House. I have further examined the HNZ List and it does not include Mill House as an item.
- 5.102** It therefore appears that the Trustees of the Mill House Trust are correct and that HNZ have included this property in their submission in error, and also that QLDC have incorrectly made reference to it being on the HNZ List in error in both the ODP and PDP.

5.103 In terms of the heritage values of the Mill House, an assessment of the building was carried out by Chontelle Syme on behalf of the Wakatipu Heritage Trust in February 2014 as part of the Wakatipu Heritage Trust Inventory Project 2013-2014. This is attached in **Appendix F**.

5.104 The Wakatipu Heritage Trust Inventory Project was run by the Trust in partnership with the Department of Conservation, the Council, University of Otago and HNZ to assess sites already on the ODP schedule to increase the information available about each (as there was previously little information available).

5.105 This report concludes that overall the Mill House building has Moderate Heritage Value, with each criteria assessed as below. These criteria are similar but not identical to those used for PC3 and PDP assessments:

(a)	Historical/Social Value	High
(b)	Cultural/Traditional Value	Moderate
(c)	Architectural Value	High
(d)	Landscape/Townscape Value	High
(e)	Rarity/Representative Value	Moderate
(f)	Technological Value	Moderate
(g)	Archaeological Value	Moderate
(h)	Heritage Assessment	Moderate

5.106 I have viewed the property at 549 Speargrass Road from the road and considered the Wakatipu Heritage Trust assessment. Having done this, I believe the assessment to be fair and have no reason to not agree with its conclusions.

5.107 Recognition that the Mill House building has moderate value would mean that it would appropriately be recognised as a Category 3 building. I therefore do not agree with either the submitter or further submitter and consider that the building should remain as a Category 3 building. However, the reference to the HNZ listing in the schedule, be removed.

Item 77 Oast House, 557 Speargrass Flat Road (Mill Creek)

5.108 Heritage New Zealand (Submission 426) have submitted that as this item is a Category 2 item on their List it should be upgraded from Category 3 to Category 2 in the PDP.

5.109 The building is included in the ODP as a Category 3 building.

Response

5.110 I viewed this building on 1 April 2016. As outlined above, I do not think that the fact that a building is included on the HNZ List as Category 2 means that it should automatically be recognised in the PDP as Category 2.

5.111 A heritage assessment was carried out of this building by Chontelle Syme on behalf of the Wakatipu Heritage Trust in December 2013.¹⁶ This indicated that overall the building has High overall heritage value:

(a)	Heritage Assessment	High
(b)	Archaeological Value	High
(c)	Architectural Value	High
(d)	Cultural/Traditional Value	High
(e)	Historical/Social Value	High
(f)	Landscape/Townscape Value	High
(g)	Rarity/Representative Value	High
(h)	Technological Value	High

5.112 The HNZ registration report for the wider Wakatipu Flourmill Complex¹⁷ (within which this building is located) confirms that the site overall has aesthetic, archaeological and historical significance or value. It specifically notes that the oat drying kiln (**Oast house**) is the most prominent feature and lends the place aesthetic value, and is rare and so adds to the archaeological value of the complex.

5.113 Having read the heritage assessment and considered the registration report, I do not consider that the two sit comfortably against each other. I consider that the assessment 'scores' the building consistently more generously than I

¹⁶ Wakatipu Heritage Trust Heritage Assessment of Oast House, Chontelle Syme, 2013.

¹⁷ Registration Report for Historic Place – Wakatipu Flourmill Complex, Christine Whybrew, November 2012.

would expect from having read the registration report and from my brief viewing of the building. Taking the heritage assessment forwards would suggest that the building is extremely important to the District and potentially that it would be recognised as being of outstanding significance and be identified as a Category 1 item in the PDP and also appear as a Category 1 item on the HNZ List.

- 5.114** On balance, I consider that it would be more reasonable to conclude from the information available that overall the building has moderate heritage value, with moderate value against all criteria. On this basis the building is considered significant and warrants identification as a Category 2 item.

Item 79 Tomanovitch Cottage, East of DOC Reserve, Gibbston

- 5.115** Heritage New Zealand (submission 426) has suggested that this building be increased from Category 3 to Category 2.

- 5.116** It is included in the ODP as a Category 3 item and is Category 2 on the HNZ List.

Response

- 5.117** I visited this site on 1 April 2016. The building is currently used for storage, and whilst potentially vulnerable to deterioration as it is not in everyday active use, the owners have placed a waterproof sheet over the roof to protect it from the weather.

- 5.118** As outlined above, I do not think that the fact that a building is included on the HNZ List as Category 2 means that it should automatically be recognised in the PDP as Category 2.

- 5.119** The HNZ Assessment of the building¹⁸ confirms that it is very rare to see a surviving mud brick building such as this and identifies its cultural significance.

- 5.120** Having read the HNZ Assessment, I consider that the building is of moderate historic and social value, architectural value and rarity and representative value and overall it is of moderate heritage interest. It is therefore very

18 Registration Proposal for Tomanovitch Cottage, Gibbston, Heather Bauchop, (2004).

significant to the District and worthy of being recognised as a Category 2 building.

Item 80 Cottage Whitechapel, (Tomes) (Original Part Only)

- 5.121** JGAA (Submission 604) suggest that this should be upgraded from Category 3 to Category 2 as it is a rare remaining example of a mud brick cottage from the gold mining era.
- 5.122** This is within the section of their submission where they have suggested changes to ensure greater consistency throughout the plan, with a comparison to like features elsewhere or where they have knowledge of the heritage values of the features through the preparation of Conservation Plans or Archaeological Assessments etc. In this case they do not reference a Conservation Plan or Archaeological Assessment and do not make a comparison to like features elsewhere.

Response

- 5.123** I viewed this building on 1 April 2016. It is still recognisable as a mud brick cottage. Whilst extensions have been added on the rear, they do not detract from the form or dominance of the original cottage.
- 5.124** However, as no substantive evidence has been submitted on this matter, I cannot support this request at this time.

Item 81 Arcadia, Paradise, Glenorchy (Original Part Only)

- 5.125** JGAA (Submission 604) indicate that they believe that Item 81 should be upgraded from Category 2 to Category 1. I note that Item 81 is currently shown as Category 3 in both the PDP and ODP.
- 5.126** JGAA consider it to be a rare and unmodified grand house of considerable historical and architectural significance, stating that there are no others of its calibre in the District. They consider that when compared to Items 63 (Cottage 28 Park Street, **PDP** Category 3) and 56 (Hulbert House, 68 Ballarat Street **PDP** Category 3 and HNZ List Category 2) it has a much greater significance.

5.127 They suggest that further research is required.

Response

5.128 The Heritage Assessment carried out by Alexandra Neems for the Wakatipu Heritage Trust in 2013¹⁹ identified that overall the building had Moderate to High heritage value.

(a)	Historical/Social Value	High
(b)	Cultural/Traditional Value	Moderate
(c)	Architectural Value	Low
(d)	Landscape/Townscape Value	High
(e)	Rarity/Representative Value	Moderate
(f)	Technological Value	Moderate
(g)	Archaeological Value	Low

5.129 Having considered the assessment I agree that overall the building has moderate to high heritage value and is therefore very significant to the District. The building should therefore be reclassified as Category 2. This sits comfortably against my recommendation that Items 63 (28 Park Street) and 56 (Hulbert House) also be moved into Category 2.

Item 91 Kinross Store and Buildings, Gibbston

5.130 Heritage New Zealand (submission 426) have suggested that this building be increased from Category 3 to Category 2.

5.131 JGAA (Submission 604) have indicated that this item should be amended to read 'Kinross STONE buildings', not store, and request that the small timber framed miners' cottage should also be added to the description. They indicate that they have produced a Conservation Plan for the building but this has not been provided with their submission.

19 Wakatipu heritage Trust Heritage Assessment of Arcadia Homestead, Alexandra Neems, 2013.

Response

- 5.132** This item is currently scheduled Category 3 in the ODP and is included on the HNZ List as a Category 2 item.
- 5.133** As outlined above, I do not think that the fact that a building is included on the Heritage New Zealand List as Category 2 means that it should automatically recognised in the PDP as Category 2.
- 5.134** HNZ have provided their own 'Recommendation for Registration', which identifies that the building has Aesthetic, Architectural, Archaeological and Historical significance and concludes that:

Kinross Farm Steading, Gibbston, is recommended for registration as a Category II historic place as a place of historical and cultural heritage significance and value. It is a good example of a farm steading, which is a relatively uncommon arrangement of farm structures in New Zealand. The buildings and structures have aesthetic appeal in the grouping of the structures and in the use of stone as construction material. The farm is associated with the Kinross family, early European settlers in the former gold-mining town of Gibbston, Central Otago. It is a good representative example of the development of commerce and agriculture in Central Otago from the late 19th century onwards.

- 5.135** From reading the HNZ report, I conclude that the building has moderate historic and social value, architectural value, townscape and context value and rarity and representative value. Overall it has special heritage value and is therefore appropriate identified as being a Category 3 item. I do not therefore agree with the HNZ submission.
- 5.136** To provide greater clarity I agree with the submission of JGAA that the description of the Item be altered to read 'Kinross Stone Buildings'.

Item 97 Former Glacier Hotel (Kinloch Lodge) Armadale Street, Kinloch

- 5.137** JGAA (Submission 604) ask for clarification regarding which category this building is included within, as the column in the table includes '3 2'.

Response

5.138 This item is included in the ODP as a Category 3 item. I have been advised by Council officers that an early 'Microsoft Word' version of the PDP text showed the category as '3 2' (i.e. 3 struck through and replaced by 2).

5.139 The assessment carried out in by Rebecca Reid in 2005, for PC3, identified that the building has High overall significance. The individual values were noted as below (where there was no rating against an item I have assumed that this means 'Low'):

(a)	Archaeological Value	Low
(b)	Architectural Value	High
(c)	Cultural/Traditional Value	High
(d)	Historical/Social Value	High
(e)	Landscape/Townscape Value	High
(f)	Rarity/Representative Value	High
(g)	Technological Value	Low

5.140 Having read the assessment, I agree with its conclusions regarding the heritage value of the building. The building is therefore extremely significant to the District and should be identified as a Category 1 building.

Item 101 St Peter's Parish Centre (former Vicarage), 1 Earl Street

5.141 JGAA (Submission 604) indicates that this should be upgraded to Category 2 as it has high historical, spiritual, social and technological significance.

5.142 This is within the section of their submission where they have suggested changes to ensure greater consistency throughout the plan, with a comparison to like features elsewhere or where they have knowledge of the heritage values of the features through the preparation of Conservation Plans or Archaeological Assessments etc.

5.143 They indicate that they have produced a conservation plan for the building, although this has not been provided.

Response

5.144 As no substantive evidence has been submitted on this matter, I cannot support this request at this time.

Item 107 Courthouse (Former Library and Reading Room and Justice Building), Ballarat Street

5.145 JGAA (Submission 604) indicate that the interior of this building is now much modified and the building should therefore be downgraded from Category 1 to Category 2.

5.146 Ngai Tahu Property Limited (FS 1226) and Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited (FS 1226) support this.

Response

5.147 This building is listed as Category 1 in the HNZ List. I visited it on 1 April 2016.

5.148 The Conservation Maintenance Report (2007)²⁰ for this building includes an assessment of the significance of the building and its elements. This identified that parts of the interior (the Courtroom and Judges Chamber) were of considerable significance. The external elevations were considered to have exceptional significance, with other levels of significance being assigned to other parts of the building.

5.149 Having read the Conservation Management Report and viewed the building, I consider that notwithstanding the alterations the building still has high historic and social value, architectural value and townscape and context value. Overall the building is extremely significant to the District and should remain identified as a Category 1 building.

5.150 In view of the above regarding the overall significance of the building and the need to remain consistent with identifying Category 1 Listed places within PDP Category 1, I do not support the proposed change.

20 The Historic Courthouse Queenstown, Conservation Maintenance Report, Oakley Gray Architects, 2007.

Item 110 Ayreburn Homestead and stone farm buildings

5.151 This group of buildings is currently scheduled as Category 2 in the ODP and proposed as Category 2 in the PDP. The buildings are not on the HNZ List.

5.152 JGAA (submission 604) have suggested that the listing for the homestead and the stone farm buildings should be separated and their individual Categories altered (Please note; their original submission mistakenly referred to the buildings as item 111. I have updated the text below to recognise that it was proposed as item 110), with the categories requested as follows:

- (a) 110a) Ayreburn Homestead, timber villa and stone garage (original cottage) - Category 2;
- (b) 110b) Ayreburn stone stables/woolshed - Category 2;
- (c) 110c) Ayreburn stone cart shed – Category 1 (very rare extant example of its type); and
- (d) 110d) Ayreburn stone dairy building - Category 3.

Response

5.153 Some good historical research regarding the Homestead and site is available in the Site Assessment Report completed by Stacey Solomon on behalf of the Wakatipu Heritage Trust²¹ and in the Heritage Area proposals report completed by JGAA²².

5.154 The former identifies the buildings together to have Significant Heritage Value:

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|-------------|
| (a) | Archaeological value | Low |
| (b) | Architectural value | Moderate |
| (c) | Cultural value | Low |
| (d) | Historical/social value | Significant |
| (e) | Landscape/townscape value | Moderate |
| (f) | Rarity/representative value | Significant |
| (g) | Technological value | Low |

21 Wakatipu Heritage Trust Site Assessment Report for Ayreburn Station, Stacey Solomon, December 2013.
22 Ayreburn Farm Heritage Area – Proposals for future use, Jackie Gillies and Associates.

- 5.155** This assessment is in line with the current identification of the buildings as a Category 2 item.
- 5.156** The JGAA report does include an assessment of the significance of the place as a whole and does include some reference to individual buildings. However, there is not sufficient detail for me to be fully confident as to the different heritage value of each of the buildings.
- 5.157** Accordingly, unless additional information is provided I cannot support the request at this time.

Item 131 Stables, Barn, Smithy, Stone Cottage, Wooden Cottage and Ruins, Thurlby Domain, Speargrass Flat Road

- 5.158** JGAA (submission 604) have suggested that this group of buildings be upgraded to Category 1 due to its rarity in the District and its high historical, architectural, social, group, setting and technological significance.
- 5.159** Heritage New Zealand (submission 426) confirms that the HNZ List entry for this item has recently been reviewed and it is now a Category 1 historic place. They have asked that the schedule be updated to show the buildings as being Category 1 on their List (they do not ask that the local category of the buildings in the PDP be upgraded).

Response

- 5.160** I visited this group of buildings on 1 April 2016. This group of buildings are currently scheduled as Category 2 in the ODP and also proposed as Category 2 in the PDP.
- 5.161** A comprehensive assessment of the significance of this range of buildings is contained in the HNZ's own Registration Report.²³ This concludes that the place qualifies as a Category 1 historic place. It is recognised as having aesthetic, architectural, cultural, historical and social significance or value.
- 5.162** As discussed above, the HNZ criteria sit comfortably against those proposed to be included in the PDP and I have confirmed that I believe that PDP

23 New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga, Registration Report for a Historic Place, Susan Irvine, November 2014.

'Category 1 shall include all places of greatest historical or cultural heritage significance including all items in Category 1 of the Heritage New Zealand 'New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero' ('the List').

5.163 Having read the updated HNZ registration report, I agree that the buildings together have high historic and social value, architectural value and townscape and context value. They are extremely significant and should therefore be included in Category 1.

Item 140 Bullendale Township - including Eden Hut and Musters Hut, Item 701 Dynamo, Item 702 All settlement and gold mining relics

5.164 IPENZ (Submission 201) comment that the Bullendale Hydro Electric Dynamo and Mining Site (HNZ Listing 5601) seems to be included in the PDP as the Bullendale Township listing (Listing 140, Category 2). They point out the Bullendale Hydro Electric Dynamo and Mining Site is Category 1 on the HNZ List, and seek that it be listed as Category 1 in the PDP.

5.165 They consider the site to be of outstanding national significance as it was the site where the use of hydro-electricity was pioneered for industrial purposes in 1886. The survival of so much of the overall system, including the major parts of the original dynamos and electric motor, makes this an internationally significant industrial and engineering heritage site.

5.166 HNZ (Submission 426) note that there are three entries in the schedule which relate to this one area:

- (a) Item 140, Bullendale township;
- (b) Item 701, Dynamo; and
- (c) Item 702, All settlement and gold mining relics.

5.167 They ask that the entries be rationalised with Item 140 becoming the 'Bullendale Hydro Electric Dynamo and Mining Site'. They believe that the amended entry should be identified as Category 1, reflecting the Category 1 status of the site on their List.

5.168 The HNZ submission is supported by the Director General of Conservation (FS 1080).

Response

5.169 The HNZ Assessment of Significance²⁴ confirms very clearly that the area is of outstanding significance. Having read this report I agree that the site has high historic and social value, townscape and context value, rarity and representative value, technological value and archaeological value. It is extremely significant to the District and should therefore be included in Category 1. This sits comfortably against the proposed description '*Category 1 shall include all places of greatest historical or cultural heritage significance including all items in Category 1 of the Heritage New Zealand 'New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero' ('the List')*'.

5.170 I also agree that the entry should be 'renamed' to more closely reflect the HNZ List entry and to provide clarity.

5.171 However, I do not agree with HNZ's submission that Items 140, 701 and 702 should be combined into one entry. Items 701 and 702 relate to archaeological sites. Archaeological Sites are subject to their own controls, with the activity status of various matters set out in Table 5 (of Chapter 26 of the PDP). I consider that it would not be appropriate to remove these entries as these items would no longer be provided with the protection that those specific controls bring.

6. SITE SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS ON HISTORIC HERITAGE - SUBMISSIONS SEEKING NEW LISTINGS

Gratuity cottage, 9 Gorge Road, Queenstown

6.1 HNZ (Submission 426) note that Gratuity Cottage is entered on the HNZ List as a Category 2 historic place, meaning that it has been confirmed as having 'historical or cultural significance or value'. They believe that it should also be included on the schedule in the PDP.

6.2 JGAA (Submission 604) indicates that also believe that this building should be included on the schedule and include a brief assessment of its heritage significance (see below).

24 New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga, Review Report for a Historic Place, Bullendale Hydro Electric Dynamo and Mining Site, Peter Petchey and Heather Bauchop, March 2012.

Response

6.3 I understand that this building was not added to the PDP schedule as the owners were not agreeable to the building being included (I note the owners have not made a further submission in opposition to either submission seeking a listing). Notwithstanding this, I agree with the submissions and that the PDP schedule should include all buildings which meet the assessment criteria (and which are therefore by definition of heritage significance). I am not aware that the Council has previously assessed the building.

6.4 In their submission HNZ have provided an assessment of the cottage against the PDP assessment criteria:

(a)	Historic and Social Value	High
(b)	Cultural and Spiritual Value	Moderate
(c)	Architectural Value	Moderate
(d)	Townscape/Contextual Value	Low
(e)	Rarity and Representative Value	High
(f)	Technological Value	Moderate
(g)	Archaeological Value	High

6.5 The JGAA (submission 604) indicates that the building has the following significance:

- (a) Rarity - One of very few early timber cottages remaining in Queenstown;
- (b) Technical – Example of early timber framing (possibly NZ Beech from Head of the Lake, 3"x 1 ½" framing);
- (c) Integrity - Mostly intact original fabric; and
- (d) Social – very small, (only 2 rooms plus kitchen) demonstrating crowded conditions and way of life in early Queenstown.

6.6 Given the range of scores and the significance outlined above, I consider that overall the cottage has Moderate heritage value. I consider that the building is therefore 'significant' and warrants identification as a Category 2 item. I consider that the schedule should be updated accordingly.

Millbrook Stables and Blacksmiths Shop

6.7 JGAA (Submission 604) indicate that they completed an assessment for this building but ask whether it is included in the schedule.

Response

6.8 I visited these buildings on 1 April 2016.

6.9 A heritage assessment of the stables, implement shed and blacksmith's building/smoker was carried out by JGAA for the Council in 2013.²⁵ This concluded that the overall heritage value of the buildings was high:

(a)	Historic and Social Value	High
(b)	Cultural and Spiritual Value	Moderate
(c)	Architectural Value	Moderate
(d)	Townscape/Contextual Value	High
(e)	Rarity and Representative Value	High
(f)	Technological Value	High
(g)	Archaeological Value	High

6.10 The assessment identifies the following categories for the buildings:

- (a) The stables (remaining historic stone structure) - Category 2;
- (b) Implement shed (remaining historic stone structure) - Category 2; and
- (c) Blacksmith's building/smokery - Category 2.

6.11 I consider that the suggested categories are in line with assessments and recommendations set out for other items above. Accordingly, I consider that the three buildings should be added to the schedule, as one item recognising their close relationship to each other.

Removal of the Pig 'n' Whistle from the Queenstown Court House Historic Heritage Precinct

6.12 Ngai Tahu Property Limited and Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited (Submission 596) requests that the Queenstown Court House Historic

²⁵ Heritage Assessment of stables, implement shed and blacksmith's building/smokery, Jackie Gillies and Associates, 2013.

Heritage Precinct be amended to exclude the Pig 'n' Whistle building. They indicate that:

- (a) the building is not a historic building;
- (b) the ODP heritage precinct applicable to the site did not relate to the Pig 'n' Whistle building;
- (c) sufficient control exists to manage the potential relationship between the Pig 'n' Whistle building and heritage buildings without requiring it to form part of the heritage precinct; and
- (d) monitoring of the District Plan has not identified any issue justifying extending the boundaries of the precinct to include the building.

Response

6.13 The submitter suggests that this building was not previously within the Precinct under the ODP. Examination of the ODP maps shows that the boundary of the Precinct previously ran through the centre of the building; it is therefore partly within the Precinct in the ODP.

6.14 A report by JGAA²⁶ prepared for the purposes of reviewing the precinct for the PDP recommended that the OPD Precinct boundary be extended to include the present open, green space either side of Horne Creek. There was no recommendation within this report regarding the Pig and Whistle building.

6.15 Rebecca Reid had carried out an assessment of the Pig and Whistle building as part of PC3 to determine whether it warranted being scheduled in its own right.²⁷ However, this assessment related to a previous single storey building on the site and not the current three storey building which has subsequently been developed and which is the subject of this submission..

6.16 Whilst this is a new development, it does have a landmark quality in that it is a large building of local materials in a prominent position and does sit comfortably with the heritage buildings within this heritage precinct.

26 The Queenstown Lakes District Council Town Centre Heritage Precincts Appraisals (Queenstown & Arrowtown) – Identification of Non-Contributory Buildings, Jacky Gillies and Associates, September 2014.
27 Heritage Assessment of Pig and Whistle Building. Rebecca Reid. July 2006.

6.17 The statement of significance for the Precinct (within the PDP) states that:

'The Precinct represents the historically significant civic centre of Queenstown and contains a number of important heritage buildings, open spaces and structures. Their design and the nature of their stone construction convey their high status within the District. The buildings / structures are an architectural statement of permanency, stability and prosperity as the town evolved progressively from its early canvas tent and timber structures to a new generation of enduring public buildings. The buildings / structures generally remain intact and have a high degree of historical and architectural authenticity within the town. They are very distinctive and prominent features of the townscape in this part of Queenstown and define its provenance. Their scale, form and materials are characteristic of 19th century Queenstown and, together, they are considered to have high 'group' / contextual value in relation to each other. The Stone Bridge is also a rare example of its kind in the District.'

6.18 Whilst it has some merits in its own right, overall I consider that the building does not exhibit the characteristics discussed in the statement of significance and does not therefore directly contribute to the heritage precinct. I therefore consider that the boundary should be adjusted to remove the building from the precinct.

Heritage New Zealand's Proposed Additions to Schedule 26.10 Archaeological Sites

6.19 HNZ (Submission 426) have submitted extensive information regarding the following archaeological sites and suggested that they be added to schedule 26.10 Archaeological Site:

- (a) Sew Hoys big beach claim historic area;
- (b) Wong Gong's terrace historic area;
- (c) Reko's Point Chinese Goldmining Sites;
- (d) Roaring Meg Bridge Abutment; and
- (e) Frankton Mill Site, Kawarau Road, Frankton.

- 6.20** The PDP does not confirm criteria for the inclusion of Archaeological Sites on the schedule at 26.10 although does indicate at 26.2.4 that for nominations to be considered they should include a detailed assessment by a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist.
- 6.21** Some additional explanation is given in the ODP (pg. 13-1 and 13-2), which confirms that the identification of archaeological resources in the ODP is in response to the requirement of the RMA to have particular regard to the recognition and protection of heritage values.
- 6.22** The ODP points out (pg. 13-4) that 'Where possible, the Plan recognises waahi tapu, waahi tapu areas and archaeological sites. However due to the nature of these resources, it may not be possible to identify all sites or list them in the schedule at 26.10. The nature of these particular heritage resources also makes them difficult to categorise as has been done for the other listed heritage items.'
- 6.23** On the basis of this background information, I believe that it is recognised that the schedule at 26.10 cannot be exhaustive but should instead include sites where there has been a detailed assessment carried out and there is clear that the site has archaeological significance to the District.
- 6.24** I have reviewed the information provided by HNZ with their submission and conclude that the sites referred to in that submission are each of archaeological significance to the District and should be added to the schedule within the District Plan to provide the additional protection of the objectives, policies and rules.

7. OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND RULES

- 7.1** The matters set out below refer to similarly titled sections within the S42A report of Ms Vicki Jones. For the sake of brevity, I have not repeated the details of each submission.

Management of Internal and External Alterations

- 7.2** I consider it important to ensure that owners are given the opportunity to keep their building in good repair and also ensure that they remain suitable for use.

This does have to be balanced against the need to protect buildings from inappropriate alteration.

- 7.3** The proposed rules allow the repair and maintenance of protected buildings and features as a permitted activity. The scope of this rule is relatively limited with works that do not meet these standards instead being classed as an alteration.
- 7.4** I consider that this is an appropriate manner to address this matter. However the two rules relating to alterations (26.6.5 External Alterations and 26.6.6 Internal Alterations) both rely upon the statement 'works affecting the fabric or characteristics of buildings and features'.
- 7.5** I consider that it is appropriate to include such a statement, as it allows those works which are not repair and maintenance but which do not harm the heritage interest of the building to take place without the need for a resource consent.
- 7.6** However, there is currently no definition of 'fabric or characteristics'. I believe that there would be benefit in including an appropriate definition to provide further clarity on this matter.
- 7.7** I therefore suggest that the following definition be utilised:

For the purpose of this chapter, 'heritage fabric or characteristics' means any physical aspect of a heritage feature, which contributes to its heritage values as assessed in accordance with the criteria provided in section 26.6.22, and includes:

- a. Original and later material and detailing which forms part of, or is attached to, the interior or exterior of a protected feature;*
- b. The patina of age resulting from the weathering and wear of construction material over time;*
- c. Fixtures and fittings that form part of the design or significance of a heritage feature, but excludes inbuilt museum and artwork exhibitions and displays;*

The Management of Setting and Curtilage Areas

7.8 A number of the rules use the term 'setting'.

7.9 Note: 3, page 26-6, of the PDP defines Setting as:

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. ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010

7.10 I have concerns regarding the practical use of this definition. For instance rule 26.6.7 'Development within the curtilage or setting' could apply to land well beyond the legal boundary of a heritage item. Whilst I understand the reasoning for this, I am not convinced that this is appropriate and could place a high burden upon other owners. I also believe that it will be very difficult to administer and could involve significant subjectivity.

7.11 In my view, providing an 'extent of place' provides greatest clarity on this matter but accept that where an 'extent of place' does not exist, that it best to rely upon a more narrowly defined setting.

7.12 To assist with this matter I have reviewed the extents of place for relevant items as defined in the HNZ List and also the extent of place identified for Item 253, which has been identified as part of the assessment for that building. I can confirm that I am content with adopting that which has been defined for item 253 and some of those done by HNZ for the purpose of the PDP.

7.13 I also recommend the narrower definition of setting set out below:

For the purpose of this Chapter, setting means the area around and/ or adjacent to a heritage item listed in 26.9, which is integral to its function, meaning, and relationships and which is contained within the same legal title as the item listed in the Inventory.

8. HERITAGE LANDSCAPES

Glenorchy Heritage Landscape Key Features to be Protected

8.1 In relation to the Glenorchy Heritage Landscape, NZ Tungsten Mining Ltd (Submission 519) also request that the statement of significance and the "key features to be protected" sections for the Glenorchy Heritage Landscape be amended. They seek that the listed protected features be amended to only include 'significant mining entrances', rather than all 'mines', as proposed, and that the reference to 'mine sites along Judah Rd' and 'all other known archaeological sites' be amended, citing that subsurface heritage features have little amenity value and therefore have greatly reduced heritage value; that only historic tracks need be protected; and that reference to 'mine sites' is too general. There are further submissions both in support and in opposition to this submission.

Response

8.2 Policy 26.5.3.3 indicates that the intention is to '*Recognise and protect the different layers of history within heritage landscapes and the relationship between these layers to retain their cultural meaning and values*'.

8.3 The statement of significance for the area indicates:

The Glenorchy Heritage Landscape (GHL) is significant for its specific scheelite mining activities that extended from the 1880's until the 1980's, which have left a significant group of mine sites and infrastructure, along with a unique social history of the people who worked there. They in turn, represent the hard won and sometimes fruitless endeavours of a close knit community of miners that spanned a hundred years of mining at Glenorchy. The GHL encompasses the

majority of the key mine sites, tracks, a cableway and sections of water races that represented the primary scheelite producing area in New Zealand. The combination of private and state-owned mines is also a unique part of the GHL's history in the ubiquitous and contemporary gold mining industry of the Wakatipu Basin. Overall, the scheelite mining history symbolised by the GHL is a unique one of national heritage significance.

- 8.4** I consider that the various mine entrances, track, mine sites and archaeological sites etc, are each significant and represent different layers of history within the area.
- 8.5** Having considered the statement of significance and the expectations of Policy 26.5.3.3 it would not be appropriate in my opinion to amend the protected features to refer only to particular mine entrances or other features.
- 8.6** In view of the above I do not consider that the Key Features to be Protected should be amended.



Richard Knott

2 June 2016

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

ODP criteria to identify heritage (from ODP, 13-3)

Explanation and Principal Reasons for Adoption

As part of the Council's obligation to have particular regard to the recognition and protection of heritage resources, the Plan identifies certain individual buildings, groups of buildings, objects and places as being significant and worthy of protection in the public interest. Such items are listed in the Schedule of Protected Features (Appendix 3).

Listed items are classified into one of three Council categories. Within each of the categories, different levels of protection are afforded to the particular heritage item. The Protected Features have been listed for a number of reasons, including:

Historical and Social Significance

Historic value or significance in terms of a notable figure, event, phase or activity, and whether it is an important reflection of social patterns of its time and has the potential to provide knowledge of Otago and New Zealand history.

Cultural and Spiritual Significance

Contribution to the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, religion or other belief and/or the esteem in which it is held by a particular group or community, including whether it is of special significance to the takata whenua.

Architectural Significance

Significance in terms of a design of a particular style, period or designer and whether it has significant aesthetic value.

Archaeological Significance

Significance in terms of important physical evidence of human activities which, through archaeological investigation, could provide knowledge of the history of Otago and New Zealand.

Technological Significance

The heritage items importance for the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or constructional methods which were innovative for the period or of noteworthy quality.

Group Significance

Degree of unity in terms of scale, form materials, texture and colour in relationship to its setting and/or surrounding buildings.

Landmark Significance

Landmark significance in the community consciousness.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

PC3/PDP criteria to identify heritage items

Text from QLDC Plan Change No.3 heritage (Part 2) Section 32 Report – Page 66

APPENDIX 6: CRITERIA USED FOR ASSESSMENT OF FEATURES

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT AND SELECTION OF HERITAGE STRUCTURES

1. Historic and Social Value

- Whether the feature reflects characteristics of national and/or local history.
- With regard to local history, whether the feature represents important social and development patterns of its time, such as settlement history, farming, transport, trade, civic, cultural and social aspects.
- Whether the feature is significant in terms of a notable figure, event, phase or activity.
- The degree of community association or public esteem for the feature.
- Whether the feature has the potential to provide knowledge and assist in public education with regard to Otago and New Zealand History.

2. Cultural and Spiritual Value

- Whether it is of special significance to takata whenua.
- Contribution to the characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, religion or other belief which is held by a particular group or community.

3. Architectural Value

- Whether the building or structure has architectural or artistic value.
- Whether the feature represents a particular era or style of architecture or significant designer.
- Whether the style of the building or structure contributes to the general character of the area.
- The degree to which the feature is intact.
- Whether the building or structure has undergone any alteration, thereby changing the original design.

4. Townscape and Context Value

- Whether the feature plays a role in defining a space or street.
- Whether the feature provides visual interest and amenity.
- Degree of unity in terms of scale, form materials, textures and colour in relation to its setting and/or surrounding buildings.

5. Rarity and Representative Value

- Whether the feature is a unique or exceptional representative of its type either locally or nationally.
- Whether the feature represents a way of life, a technology, a style or a period of time.
- Whether the feature is regarded as a landmark or represents symbolic values.
- Whether the feature is valued as a rarity due to its type, style, distribution and quantity left in existence.

6. Technological Value

- Whether the building has technical value in respect of the structure, nature and use of materials and/or finish.
- Whether the building or structure is representative of a particular technique.

7. Archaeological Value

- Significance in terms of important physical evidence of human activities which through archaeological investigation could provide knowledge of the history of Otago and New Zealand.

APPENDIX C



Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance

Information Sheet 2

Assessment criteria to assist in the identification of Historic Heritage Values

The following best practice criteria are promoted by the NZHPT for use by local authorities and communities to encourage a systematic and transparent approach to identification and assessment of historic heritage.

Physical values

Archaeological information: Does the place or area have the potential to contribute information about the human history of the region, or to current archaeological research questions, through investigation using archaeological methods?

Architecture: Is the place significant because of its design, form, scale, materials, style, ornamentation, period, craftsmanship or other architectural element?

Technology and Engineering: Does the place demonstrate innovative or important methods of construction or design, does it contain unusual construction materials, is it an early example of the use of a particular construction technique or does it have the potential to contribute information about technological or engineering history?

Scientific: Does the area or place have the potential to provide scientific information about the history of the region?

Rarity: Is the place or area, or are features within it, unique, unusual, uncommon or rare at a district, regional or national level or in relation to particular historical themes?

Representativeness: Is the place or area a good example of its class, for example, in terms of design, type, features, use, technology or time period?

Integrity: Does the place have integrity, retaining significant features from its time of construction, or later periods when important modifications or additions were carried out?

Vulnerability: Is the place vulnerable to deterioration or destruction or is threatened by land use activities.

Context or Group: Is the place or area part of a group of heritage places, a landscape, a townscape or setting which when considered as a whole amplify the heritage values of the place and group/ landscape or extend its significance?

Historic values

People: Is the place associated with the life or works of a well-known or important individual, group or organisation?

Events: Is the place associated with an important event in local, regional or national history?

Patterns: Is the place associated with important aspects, processes, themes or patterns of local, regional or national history?

Acknowledgements

This assessment criteria to assist in the identification of historic heritage values is based on Proposed Change No.1 to the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (Heritage Criteria), Environment Bay of Plenty Regional Council, November 2005 and advice provided by Karen Greig and Lynda Walter, Insitu Heritage Ltd

Source: NZHPT, *Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Series*, Discussion Paper No.1, Historic Heritage Principles and Issues, 3 August 2007

The NZHPT welcomes any feedback and comments on this information sheet.

Comments can be provided to information@historic.org.nz. (Attention: Sustainable Heritage Guidance)

Cultural values

Identity: Is the place or area a focus of community, regional or national identity or sense of place, and does it have social value and provide evidence of cultural or historical continuity?

Public esteem: Is the place held in high public esteem for its heritage or aesthetic values or as a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment?

Commemorative: Does the place have symbolic or commemorative significance to people who use or have used it, or to the descendants of such people, as a result of its special interest, character, landmark, amenity or visual appeal?

Education: Could the place contribute, through public education, to people's awareness, understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's history and cultures?

Tangata whenua: Is the place important to tangata whenua for traditional, spiritual, cultural or historical reasons?

Statutory recognition: Does the place or area have recognition in New Zealand legislation or international law including: World Heritage Listing under the World Heritage Convention 1972; registration under the Historic Places Act 1993; is it an archaeological site as defined by the Historic Places Act 1993; is it a statutory acknowledgement under claim settlement legislation; or is it recognised by special legislation?

APPENDIX D

SCHEDULE 7

Matters for the identification of historic heritage values

Items, places and areas of historic heritage value are assessed against the following matters:

PHYSICAL VALUES

1. Archaeological information	Does the place or area have the potential to contribute information about the human history of the region, or to current archaeological research questions, through investigation using archaeological methods?
2. Architecture	Is the place significant because of its design, form, scale, materials, ornamentation, style, period, craftsmanship or other architectural element?
3. Technology	Does the place demonstrate innovative or important methods of construction or design, does it contain unusual construction materials, is it an early example of the use of a particular construction technique or does it have the potential to contribute information about technological history?
4. Scientific	Does the area or place have the potential to provide scientific information about the history of the region?
5. Rarity	Is the place or area, or are features within it, unique, unusual, uncommon or rare at a district, regional or national level or in relation to particular historical themes?
6. Representative-ness	Is the place or area a good example of its class, for example, in terms of design, type, features, use, technology or time period?
7. Integrity	Does the place have integrity, retaining significant features from its time of construction, or later periods when important modifications or additions were carried out?
8. Vulnerability	Is the place vulnerable to deterioration or destruction or is threatened by land use activities?
9. Context or Group	Is the place or area part of a group of heritage places, a landscape, a townscape or setting which when considered as a whole amplify the heritage values of the place and group/ landscape or extend its significance?

HISTORIC VALUES

10. People	Is the place associated with the life or works of a well-known or important individual, group or organisation?
11. Events	Is the place associated with an important event in local, regional or national history?
12. Patterns	Is the place associated with important aspects, processes, themes or patterns of local, regional or national history?

CULTURAL VALUES

13. Identity	Is the place or area a focus of community, regional or national identity or sense of place, and does it provide evidence of cultural or historical continuity?
14. Public esteem	Is the place held in high public esteem for its heritage or aesthetic values or as a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment?
15. Commemorative	Does the place have symbolic or commemorative significance to people who use or have used it, or to the descendants of such people, as a result of its special interest, character, landmark, amenity or visual appeal?
16. Education	Could the place contribute, through public education, to people's awareness, understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's history and cultures?
17. Takata whenua	Is the place important to takata whenua for traditional, spiritual, cultural or historical reasons?
18. Statutory recognition	Does the place or area have recognition in New Zealand legislation or international law including: World Heritage Listing under the World Heritage Convention 1972; registration under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014; is it an archaeological site as defined by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014; is it a statutory acknowledgement under claim settlement legislation; or is it recognised by special legislation?

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX E

Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan criteria to identify heritage items (from Chapter B, notified 30 September 2013)

4.1 Historic Heritage)

Policies

Identification and protection

2. Identify a place as having historic heritage value if it has one or more of the following values:
 - a. historical: The place reflects important or representative aspects of national, regional or local history, or is associated with an important event, person, group of people or idea or early period of settlement within New Zealand, the region or locality
 - b. social: The place has a strong or special association with, or is held in high esteem by, a particular community or cultural group for its symbolic, spiritual, commemorative, traditional or other cultural value
 - c. Mana Whenua: The place has a strong or special association with, or is held in high esteem by, Mana Whenua for its symbolic, spiritual, commemorative, traditional or other cultural value
 - d. knowledge: The place has potential to provide knowledge through scientific or scholarly study or to contribute to an understanding of the cultural or natural history of New Zealand, the region, or locality
 - e. technology: The place demonstrates technical accomplishment, innovation or achievement in its structure, construction, components or use of materials.
 - f. physical attributes: The place is a notable or representative example of a type, design or style, method of construction, craftsmanship or use of materials or the work of a notable architect, designer, engineer or builder;
 - g. aesthetic: The place is notable or distinctive for its aesthetic, visual, or landmark qualities
 - h. context: The place contributes to or is associated with a wider historical or cultural context, streetscape, townscape, landscape or setting.

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F:

A link to the list of Heritage Assessments for specific scheduled items that I consider in my evidence [here](#).

1. Item 3 Antrim Engines Slipway and Cradle, Kelvin Peninsula
 - *Heritage report, Peter Petchey, Southern Archaeology Ltd (2015), page 1*
2. Item 40 Kawarau Falls Bridge, Frankton
 - *HNZ Heritage Assessment, page 57*
 - *Heritage Assessment, JGAA (2012), page 66*
 - *Site assessment report, Stacey Solomon (2013), page 81*
3. Item 45 Skippers Bridge, Shotover River
 - *HNZ Skippers Road Registration Report (2006) page 89*
 - *IPENZ Engineering Heritage Register Report (2013), page 138*
4. Item 57 Hulbert House (Tutuila) 68 Ballarat Street
 - *HNZ Heritage Assessment Report (2012), page 156*
5. Item 63 Cottage, 28 Park Street
 - *Heritage Assessment, Rebecca Reid (2005), page 187*
 - *Assessment of Environmental Effects, JGAA (2016), page 191*
6. Item 65 Queenstown Bowling Club Pavilion
 - *Heritage Assessment, Rebecca Reid (2006), page 212*
7. Item 67 Sainsbury's House, Skippers Mt Aurum Recreational Reserve
 - *HNZ Heritage Assessment, Pleasant Terrace Workings (2013), page 215*
8. Item 70 Threepwood and Stone Buildings, Lake Hayes and Item 242 Threepwood Stables
 - *Threepwood Conservation Plan, JGAA (2005), page 257*
 - *Threepwood Stables Heritage Assessment, JGAA (2011), page 342*
9. Item 76 Mill House, 549 Speargrass Flat Road (Mill Creek)
 - *Heritage assessment, Chontelle Syme, Wakatipu Heritage Trust (2014), page 362.*

- *HNZ assessment for Wakatipu Flourmill Complex, 557 Speargrass Road(see item 77), page 365*
10. Item 77 Oast House, 557 Speargrass Flat Road (Mill Creek)
- *Heritage Assessment, Chontelle Syme, Wakatipu Heritage Trust (2013), page 365*
 - *The HNZ Registration Report for Wakatipu Flourmill Complex, page 374.*
11. Item 79 Tomanovitch Cottage
- *The HNZ Assessment of the building, Registration Proposal – Tomanovitch Cottage, Heather Bauchop (2004), page 396.*
12. Item 81 Arcadia, Paradise, Glenorchy (Original Part Only)
- *Heritage Assessment, Alexandra Neems, Wakatipu Heritage Trust (2013), page 424*
13. Item 91 Kinross Store and Buildings, Gibbston
- *HNZ 'Recommendation for Registration', page 432*
14. Item 97 Former Glacier Hotel (Kinloch Lodge) Armadale Street, Kinloch
- *Heritage Assessment (2005), page 437*
15. Item 107 Courthouse (Former Library and Reading Room and Justice Building), Ballarat Street.
- *Conservation Maintenance Report (2007), page 443*
16. Item 110 Ayreburn Homestead and stone farm buildings
- *Site Assessment Report, Stacey Solomon, Wakatipu Heritage Trust, page 599*
 - *Heritage Area proposals report, JGAA, page 607*
17. Item 131 Stables, Barn, Smithy, Stone Cottage, Wooden Cottage and Ruins, Thurlby Domain, Speargrass Flat Road
- *HNZ Registration Report (2014), page 615*
18. Item 140 Bullendale Township - including Eden Hut and Musters Hut , Item 701, Dynamo and Item 702, All settlement and gold mining relics
- *HNZ Assessment of Significance Peter Petchey and Heather Bauchop (2012), page 657.*
19. Item 251 Former Methodist Church, 8 Berkshire Street, Arrowtown

- *Heritage assessment JGAA, page 716*

NEW ITEMS – NOT NUMBERED

20. Gratuity cottage, 9 Gorge Road, Queenstown

- *HNZ assessment of the cottage against the **PDP** assessment criteria, page 724*

21. Millbrook Stables and Blacksmiths Shop

- *Heritage Assessment of stables, implement shed and blacksmith's building/smoker was carried, JGAA (2013), page 732*

22. Pig 'n' Whistle, Queenstown Court House Historic Heritage Precinct

- *Heritage Assessment, Rebecca Reid (2005), page 742*
- *QLDC Town Centre Heritage Precincts Appraisals (Queenstown & Arrowtown), JGAA (2014), page 744*