

**Summary of Hearing Statement – Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan 2015**  
**Heather Louise Bauchop**  
**29 June 2016**

1. My name is Heather Louise Bauchop. My qualifications and experience are outlined in my written statement. My written statement refers to the Heritage New Zealand heritage identification process, and discusses the heritage values of several individual historic places.

The Heritage New Zealand List

2. The Heritage New Zealand List identifies New Zealand's significant and valued historical and cultural heritage places. It is maintained by Heritage New Zealand.
3. It was formerly known as the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Register of historic places, historic areas, wāhi tapu and wāhi tapu areas. Its size, scale and national focus make the List one of the most important historical information resources in New Zealand.
4. Importantly, the List in itself is primarily an identification measure rather than a planning tool. The List does not directly create regulatory consequences or legal obligations on property owners and does not directly create specific rights or control over property. Practical protection of places and areas is provided through regional and district plans. I therefore consider it appropriate for the District Plan to recognise and manage effects on sites entered on the New Zealand Heritage List by including them in the Proposed District Plan Inventory of Protected Features.
5. The List is divided into five parts:
  - Historic places
  - Historic areas
  - Wāhi tūpuna
  - Wāhi tapu
  - Wāhi tapu areas
6. **Historic places** on the List are assigned as:
  - Category 1
  - Category 2
7. Categories only apply to historic places.

### Settings

8. I consider that settings form part of or contribute to the heritage values of a heritage item.
9. The current practice for entries on the New Zealand Heritage List is to identify settings through description and by drawing a physical extent on a map. This is often the legal land parcel although it may also be a line drawn within a legal land parcel – this is often the case for very large legal land parcels, for example in rural historic properties.
10. I note that the Section 42A report proposes the inclusion of some mapped setting extents for items scheduled in the inventory of protected features. In several cases this has come from the New Zealand Heritage List, including, for example, PDP Item 57 Bordeaux's Store. I support the inclusion of this information.

### Interiors

11. In my opinion, interiors usually form part of the heritage values of a place. The current practice for entries on the New Zealand Heritage List is to identify interior features that contribute to the significance of a place through descriptive text and photographs. Each individual feature is not usually itemised but the layout and general features, for example such things as pressed metal ceilings, stained glass windows, elaborate light fittings, or notable timber panelling would usually be mentioned.

### Categories

12. I agree with Richard Knott's evidence that Category 1 places should always be Category 1 in the QLDC plan. These places have been through a rigorous process to identify their values, and in general their values are universal and tell a significant story.
13. I agree that generally Category 2 Heritage New Zealand places should be Category 2 QLDC places, but I recognise that there may be items where a Category 3 QLDC listing may be acceptable. For example there may be situations in which the protection that Category 2 QLDC listing offers is not required, for example when there are no interior or significant interior values as is the case with the stone-lined Channel (PDP Item 42). But I believe the assessment should take into account the values of the place.
14. Sections 8.4-8.13 of my written statement outline my views on individual heritage items which I will not repeat here.
15. I am happy to answer any questions.