

District Plan Hearing Stream 3

Submitter ID 415 & FS 091 – Dr M Keir & Ms S Cutten

Tabled submitter content:

[WCC Methodology and guidance for evaluating Wellington's historic heritage \(Feb 2021\) \(some emphasis and comments added\)](#)

Relevance:

1. The Council provides guidance on their heritage evaluation process. This guidance highlights the intent of the historic heritage evaluations (HHE) is *only* to establish if the Council believes a site meets the threshold or eligibility to be considered for listing and is *not* to intended justify listing based on this alone or to preclude other requirements set within the RMA (ie an expectation on net benefits).
2. This guidance supports the position made in paragraphs 276 and 291 of our submission, that while the desktop heritage assessment provided by the Council attempts to assess the merits of the heritage of our home, it makes no attempt to consider or assess its heritage value, or to weigh the benefits and costs of listing as required.

Background

3. Our primary submission, [Submission 415](#), covers the shortcomings of the Councils process and lack of evidence for listing our home at some length. This content provides further support to those claims. To assist the Commissioners – we have highlighted relevant points in the within the Council's published guidance.
4. The historic heritage evaluation (HHE) provided by the Council attempts to make an assessment of historic merit, it does not attempt to assess heritage value to the community or evaluate and weigh the benefits and costs of listing a building.
5. This point is important and is supported by the Council's own guidance for evaluating historic heritage.
 - (a) Footnote 1 (page 3) notes "Eligibility [for listing] does not automatically guarantee that a place will be scheduled."
 - (b) Evaluation process step 6 (page 4) establishes whether the Council believes the "building meets the threshold [to be considered] for listing".
 - (c) To be "eligibility for [consideration of] inclusion" (page 9) places must meet one or more evaluation criteria.
 - (d) **The entire recommendation and result from the HHE (page 22) is not a recommendation whether to list or not – but only a recommendation whether the building meets threshold for eligibility as a Heritage Building.**
 - (e) We also note that Council has also failed to undertake step 2 (page 4) of their own evaluation process by not undertaking a site visit.
6. This point is further endorsed by the Council's heritage expert correctly noting the heading in their report as "Eligibility for listing in the PDP" (page 12).
7. To be clear, the HHE does not, and is not designed to establish a case for listing. The case for listing requires the effects of listing to be identified and the costs and benefits to be weighed as required under the s77J and s32 of the RMA.

Methodology and guidance for evaluating Wellington's historic heritage

FINAL v1

February 2021

Acknowledgements

This document is based on the *Methodology and guidance for evaluating Auckland's historic heritage* dated August 2019, version 2. It has been adapted to suit the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) regional policy statement heritage requirements.

Contents

Methodology and guidance for evaluating Wellington’s historic heritage	1
Acknowledgements.....	1
Contents	2
Overview.....	3
Introduction to the WCC heritage criteria	3
Evaluation Process	4
Historical Summary.....	5
Physical Description.....	5
Comparative analysis.....	8
Evaluation	9
Evaluation criteria	9
Indicators	9
The evaluation – assessment against the significance criteria	10
Significance criteria.....	10
Summary statement of significance	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Recommendations	22
Other recommendations	22
Extent.....	22
Aerial photograph	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Non-heritage fabric	23
Appendices	24
Appendix 1 Supplementary historic research	24
Appendix 2 Comparison against the Wellington Thematic Heritage Study 2013	Error!
Bookmark not defined.	
Appendix 3 Current photographs/images	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 4 Historic photographs/images	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 5 Cadastral maps and historic/current aerial photography	Error!
Bookmark not defined.	
Appendix 6 Comparative analysis	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 7 Drawings/plans	Error! Bookmark not defined.



Overview

This methodology guides the process of evaluating the significance of historic heritage places against the Wellington City Council heritage criteria to determine whether a place meets the thresholds for scheduling in the District Plan.¹ Its purpose is to ensure that there is consistency in the way places are evaluated and that evaluations contain a sufficient level of detail so that subjectivity is minimised, and evaluations are consistent, defensible and transparent.

Heritage specialists and Mana Whenua representatives are key users, however, there are a number of other interested parties to whom the methodology and guidance is relevant. This includes resource management professionals, decision-makers, community interest groups, land owners and other interested parties.

Anyone evaluating a historic heritage place for potential inclusion in the historic heritage schedule should have regard to this methodology and guidance. Evaluations that do not meet the standards set out in this document are unlikely to contain the level of detail required to support good decision-making.

Introduction to the WCC heritage criteria

The statutory framework for the identification and evaluation of Wellington's significant historic heritage places can be found in the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) regional policy statement. Policy 21 of the GWRC regional policy statement provides criteria to ensure significant historic heritage resources are identified in district and regional plans in a consistent way. The criteria are based on the Resource Management Act definition of historic heritage and commonly used assessment methodologies. The criteria provide the basis for describing and evaluating historic heritage, including the physical, historic, social and other values that people attach to historic heritage.

GWRC, district and city councils are required to assess a place, site or area against all the criteria, but may also use additional criteria. A place, site or area identified must, however, fit one or more of the listed GWRC criteria in terms of contributing to an understanding and

¹ Eligibility does not automatically guarantee that a place will be scheduled. A planning analysis followed by decision-making from the elected council are subsequent steps prior to notification



appreciation of history and culture in a district in order to have significant historic heritage values. Wellington City Council has chosen to adopt the GWRC regional policy statement criteria and include additional criteria from the WCC Heritage Assessment Criteria agreed at Council's Strategy and Policy Committee in December 2007.

Wellington City Council takes a place-based approach to historic heritage. This holistic, multidisciplinary approach considers multiple values that contribute to the significance of a historic heritage place. The place-based approach acknowledges the diversity of Wellington's historic heritage and the range of forms it takes, including landscapes, features, sites and settings. A place-based approach allows for a full understanding and appreciation of the values and overall significance of each historic heritage place. A place-based approach is in accordance with recognised good heritage practice², both within New Zealand and internationally.

Evaluation Process

The process of evaluating historic heritage significance involves the following steps:

1. Undertake historical research on the place and comparable places, the historical and physical context, and physical form/type/style
2. Visit the site to assist with understanding the place
3. Prepare a comparative analysis
4. Evaluate the place against the significance criteria
5. Prepare a statement of significance
6. Recommend whether the place meets the overall threshold for scheduling as a Historic Heritage Place or Historic Heritage Area (HHA)
7. If the place is considered to meet the threshold for scheduling, define the extent of place recommended for scheduling, the primary feature(s) and any exclusions, based on the heritage values of the place identified in the evaluation
8. Obtain a peer review of the evaluation and incorporate any subsequent amendments³

These steps are interrelated and iterative. Sometimes new information or analysis in later steps will take the evaluator back to an earlier step for revisions.

² ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, Revised 2010

³ Where an evaluation forms part of a council process (such as a plan change), the peer review is expected to be undertaken by or on behalf of the Heritage Unit



Historical Summary

The historical summary is a brief history that builds understanding of the place and its development over time. This section should include information on relevant historical contexts and associations, and identify important historical themes, events, people or experiences. For example, if the place is a State House, it may be relevant to include a brief overview of to the origins of State Housing and social welfare in New Zealand, along with more detailed information on the development, occupation and modifications of the place over time. Places that reflect successive layers of history may have multiple contextual themes to address in this section.

The summary should be written as a narrative that includes both chronological and thematic information to contextualise the place. In the evaluation against the assessment criteria, the historical summary is used to establish the extent to which the place demonstrates important historical themes, events, people and/or experiences.

The historic summary should include the following sections:

- Historic summary
- Photographs and images
- Chronologies and timelines
 - A timeline of events including modifications
 - An owner / occupation history
- A brief biography of the architect, designer, builder or significant individuals associated with the place
- Plans and elevations
- Appendix – add any additional background information, and in-depth analysis of historical contexts, associations and themes that does not relate directly to the site as an appendix.

Physical Description

The physical description describes the geographic context and physical fabric of the place. GWRC guidance includes the following advice ...

Physical values include archaeological, architectural, technological, integrity, and age. A physical description is an important part of an assessment of historic heritage values in part because it clarifies what is being assessed. How it was constructed, used and altered can all be part of its physical values. A physical description should



*highlight those attributes with high physical heritage values can be retained should any change be proposed to the site.*⁴

- **Setting - Geographic/physical context:** This section considers the wider notions of cultural landscapes and establishes the relationship between the place, and the natural and built-environment. It should include information about the location, and qualities of the place such as:
 - A description of any natural or cultural features in the surrounding landscape or townscape. This could include the local pattern of development, use/character of surrounding areas, significant streets or features (e.g. tram stops, bridges, corner site, streams and natural springs), landmarks and/or relevant topographical and landform information.
 - A description of the place and its contribution to the heritage values of the wider townscape or landscape setting. This could include evidence that a place is considered to be a local, regional or national landmark.
 - A description of any places or items that share similar historical, physical, or social values, and that may be considered as a group. This could include items on the same site (for example the St John Church Heritage Area); on multiple adjacent sites (for example houses in the Tarikaka Street Heritage Area); or which are dispersed across the city and its surrounds (for example wharves, waka landing sites, lighthouses and other features associated with maritime history).

The physical description should include the following information:

- **Building or structures:** This section contributes to the evaluation of whether a place is notable for architectural values. It should include information on:
 - Design and architectural style⁵
 - Period / age / era
 - Form, including orientation on the site and roof-form
 - Scale, including the number of stories
 - Materials
 - Ornamentation
 - Craftsmanship
 - Features associated with the setting such as fences, gates and out-buildings (unless noted in the site description)
 - Significant or notable interiors
 - Significant or key modifications

⁴ *A guide to historic heritage identification*, Greater Wellington Regional Council, 2010, page 15
<http://www.gw.govt.nz/assets/Plans--Publications/A-guide-to-historic-heritage-identification.pdf>

⁵ For architectural style, follow the descriptions of architecture style established in the *Glossary of Architectural Styles* in the Wellington City Council Heritage Building Inventory 2001, and *The New Zealand Period House: A Conservation Guide* by Stuart Arden and Ian Bowman



- Any other architectural values
- **Materials:** Include a bullet point list of materials including structure, details on cladding, fenestration, entrances, and any special features
- **Setting - Site description:** this section establishes the extent and qualities of the surroundings of a place. It should establish the setting or context of the place that contributes to an appreciation and understanding of its character, history and/or development. Relevant information could include
 - Site size
 - Topography
 - General layout of features
 - General spatial organisation on site
 - Orientation
 - Key site features such as boundary treatments
 - Significant plantings, notable trees and/or important vegetation
 - Features associated with the setting: include fences, gates, outbuildings, steps, paths, driveways and other structures that contribute to the significance of the place
- **Archaeological sites:** This section identifies archaeological sites (or places that include or may include archaeological sites or features)⁶ and should be completed by an archaeologist. The section contributes to the evaluation of the potential for archaeological investigation that may contribute new or important information about the human history in the district, region or nation. Relevant information could include:
 - Site type/s (for example headland pā)
 - Description of the features present, including any that contribute to the context of the place. Where relevant, provide a reasoned interpretation based on analogy or recorded history of what subsurface features are likely to be present. For example, a historic-era domestic settlement site will typically include rubbish pits or deposits of discarded artefacts and food refuse, an infilled well and latrine, and evidence of buildings and structures including postholes or footings
 - For known⁷ features or archaeological deposits: description of the deposits or features present, including any that contribute to the context of the place. Information on stratigraphy (and soil composition where relevant), and the extent of any known disturbances (such as previous excavations or impacts of subsequent developments on the site).
 - For buildings and structures: information on layout, access arrangements, materials and distinctive features, including fixtures and fittings

⁶ Note that this may include standing buildings and structures.

⁷ Either through historical records or prior investigation.



- Features associated with the setting such as fences, gates and outbuildings (unless noted in the site description)
- **HNZPT Extent of List Entry:** The HNZPT extent of list entry has been included in this report to ensure that Council has regard to the full extent of any entry on the New Zealand Heritage List / Rārangā Kōrero.

Comparative analysis

Comparative analysis examines how a place compares with other similar or related places in the local area, region or wider context. If a place is considered to be representative, important, rare, unique, notable, innovative, old, unmodified or a good example of its type or era, **those qualities should be established through comparative analysis.** The comparative analysis does not need to include a comprehensive assessment of each place. Instead, it should establish the key points of difference between the nominated place with respect to the basis of comparison.

The basic methodology for comparative analysis is as follows:

- Determine the basis for comparison. This should be the key reason why the place is considered to be significant. For example - where a house appears to be significant because of who lived there, the appropriate basis for comparison is other buildings in which that person lived, and what phase of their life each is associated with.
- Select three or four comparable places. These may include (but are not limited to) places already scheduled by WCC, listed by HNZPT, or identified by Engineering NZ, on Archsite, or in a thematic or other reviews. **Note that the comparison may also include places that have not been listed, scheduled for their historic heritage values, or recorded archaeological sites.**
- Create a table in Appendix 1 of the assessment template that includes:
 - The point of comparison being examined, and why this is relevant / important to the subject place. Why was this point selected for analysis?
 - The name and/or address / location of each comparable place
 - A photograph of each place including the date it was taken and the source in the caption
 - A brief discussion (50 words or less) to discuss how each place is comparable to the subject site. Consider - why is it considered comparable? How is it the same? / How is it different? This can be a bullet point list.
 - Any current recognition or protection (i.e. is the place listed by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT), or scheduled by a local authority?)
- Analysis/conclusions. Write a brief summary (150 words or less) of the comparative analysis. What has the comparative analysis revealed? What has it established about the significance of the subject place? What is the outcome of this work?



More information on comparative analysis is available in:

- Auckland Council, *Methodology and guidance for evaluating Auckland's historic heritage* dated August 2019, version 2
- HNZPT, *Significance Assessment Guidelines: Guidelines for Assessing Historic Places and Historic Areas for the Heritage New Zealand List Rārangā Kōrero*

Evaluation

Evaluation criteria MK: eligible to be considered for inclusion

The GWRC directs that places are eligible for inclusion in the schedule if they are found to have significant historic heritage values that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of history and culture under one or more of the evaluation criteria. Further information on the application of the GWRC heritage criteria can be found at <http://www.gw.govt.nz/assets/Plans--Publications/A-guide-to-historic-heritage-identification.pdf>

Indicators

The process of evaluating historic heritage value against the criteria is guided by inclusion indicators. The inclusion indicators assist with determining when a place has value against a criterion. Not all criteria (or all indicators) will be relevant to the evaluation of every place.

The indicators:

- are not exhaustive
- assist with applying the criteria - they are not criteria, and
- assist with determining the overall value level under each criterion

The requirements for a criterion can be met if:

- The specific requirements of a criterion are addressed
- There is sufficient evidence

The threshold for inclusion in the District Plan schedule is that:

MK: threshold to consider a site for inclusion



- The place, site and/or area has significant⁸ historic heritage values that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of history and culture under one or more of the evaluation criteria.

The evaluation – assessment against the significance criteria

- The evaluation must use standard terms for describing levels of significance which are:
 - NA/none; little; some; or significant
- Where relevant, identify the community of interest or geographic area which the place has value. Use the standard terms: local, regional, national or international
Conclude with a sentence clearly identifying the value attributed. For example:

“The [place] is considered to have **some** social (sentiment) value by the community in the **local** [add name of suburb] area.”

OR

“The [place] has **significant** historic value in the **Wellington Region** for its association with the theme of [add theme –for example A3.2 Response to earthquakes/base isolated buildings].”

- Use bold font for the value level and the geographic level of significance

Significance criteria

A. Historic values: these relate to the history of a place and how it demonstrates important historical themes, events, people or experiences.

(i) Themes: the place is associated with important themes in history or patterns of development.

⁸ Significant is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as adj. *4(a) Sufficiently great or important to be worthy of attention; noteworthy; consequential, influential.*



GWRC guidance

- What theme or themes in history is the place associated with?
- It is important to consider how a place fits into the wider context of local, regional and/or national history. Knowing the main themes of history can be helpful in grouping similar places together, widening understanding of history and identifying those themes that are under- or over-represented.

GWRC examples include:

- The Austrian State Houses, Titahi Bay
- Former 2YA Transmitter Building on Mount Victoria

WCC inclusion indicators:

- The theme or pattern of development is important; and
- There is an association between the place and the theme/pattern

WCC guidance:

- Relevant themes can be found in the *Thematic Heritage Study of Wellington January 2013* - https://wellington.govt.nz/~/_/media/services/community-and-culture/heritage/files/thematic-heritage-study.pdf
- Other important patterns or themes that are not included in the Thematic Heritage Study may also apply

(ii) *Events: the place has an association with an important event or events in local, regional or national history.*

GWRC guidance:

- Was the place a site or location of a significant historic event?

GWRC examples include:

- Papawai Marae, Greytown
- Battle Hill, Pauahatanui

WCC inclusion indicators:

- The event is important; and
- There is an association between the place and the event



(iii) People: the place is associated with the life or works of an individual, group or organisation that has made a significant contribution to the district, region or nation

GWRC guidance:

- Does the place have a connection with a person, persons, group or organisation? What is the nature of the connection?
- It is important to consider how significant a connection is, not just that there is a connection. For instance, the place where a composer wrote their music would have a more significant association with the composer than the house they were born in.

GWRC examples include:

- Wallaceville Animal Research Station
- Nash House, Lower Hutt

WCC inclusion indicators:

- The person or organisation made a significant contribution to Wellington, or NZ; and
- There is an association between the person or organisation, their life or works, and the place

(iv) Social: the place is associated with everyday experiences from the past and contributes to our understanding of the culture and life of the district, region or nation.

GWRC guidance:

- Does the place tell us about our social history?

GWRC examples include:

- Daisy Hill Farm House, Johnsonville
- Lower Hutt Post Office, Lower Hutt

WCC inclusion indicators:

- The place contributes to an understanding of the social history of Wellington or NZ



B. Physical values: these values relate to the physical evidence present.

- (i) Archaeological: there is potential for archaeological investigation to contribute new or important information about the human history of the district, region or nation.***

GWRC guidance:

- Is it likely that archaeological remains are present on the site?

It can be challenging to identify archaeological values, because sites are usually underground and there is not always visible evidence at the surface. However, there are ways of knowing where sites are likely to be found. The New Zealand Archaeological Association maintains the Site Recording Scheme for all known archaeological sites in New Zealand. In recent years, they updated their site record information with a GPS device to ensure the location is correct. The area extent of these sites can vary widely. A concentration of known sites can be an indication that further unidentified sites may exist in the area. An absence of any sites can be an indicator that an area has never been surveyed. The surest way to determine whether or not archaeological remains are present is to engage a qualified professional archaeologist. An archaeologist can help you avoid damaging archaeological sites.

GWRC examples include:

- Waikakeno, East Wairarapa
- Te Pa o Kapo, Porirua

WCC guidance:

- Evidence that a place meets this criterion can include:
 - an archaeological report produced by a suitably qualified archaeologist.
 - clear evidence that the place pre-dates the year 1900. This can include, but is not limited to, evidence from historical maps and other sources. The Thomas Ward survey map (1891) for Wellington is an excellent source of information, particularly for sites associated with post-colonial pre-1900 activity. If the place/site is located within the boundaries of this map, there is the potential for archaeological features to be present.



(ii) Architectural: the place is notable for its style, design, form, scale, materials, ornamentation, period, craftsmanship or other architectural values

GWRC guidance:

- What is the architectural style?
- Is there anything unique about the way it is made or the materials it is made from?
- Is it a remarkable design achievement?

GWRC examples include:

- Otaki Railway Station, Otaki
- Massey House, Lambton Quay & The Terrace, Wellington

WCC inclusion indicators:

- The place is notable for its architectural qualities

WCC guidance

- The term **notable example**⁹ can be used to describe any of the following
 - **A fine example** – the place/ object displays a large number or range of characteristics that is typical of the class; the place/object displays characteristics that are of a higher quality or historical relevance than are typical of places/ objects in the class; or the place/object displays the principal characteristics of the class in a way that allows the class to be easily understood/ appreciated.
 - **A highly intact example** – the place/ object displays characteristics of the class that remain mostly unchanged from the historically important period of development or use of the place/ object.
 - **An influential example** – the place/ object contains physical characteristics of design, technology or materials that were copied in subsequent places/objects of the class (direct physical influence), or other places/ objects were created, altered or used in response to the characteristics of this place/ object.

⁹ Victoria Heritage Council, *The Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Thresholds Guidance 2019*
http://heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/VHRCriteriaandThresholdsGuidelines_2019Final.pdf



- **A pivotal example** - the place/object encapsulates a key evolutionary stage in the development of the class.

(iii) Townscape: the place is strongly associated with other natural or cultural features in the landscape or townscape, and/or contributes to the heritage values of a wider townscape or landscape setting, and/or it is a landmark.

GWRC guidance (adapted):

- If the place was lost, what effect would this have on the townscape?
- Does the place make a significant contribution to the townscape?
- The place has significance based on its prominence, visibility or association with a particular landscape. Where there is a concentration of similar places, heritage values can derive from the associations between places.

GWRC examples include:

- St Gerard's Church and Monastery, Mount Victoria, Wellington

WCC inclusion indicators:

- The place is strongly associated with natural or cultural features in the landscape or townscape; and/or
- The place contributes to an important view, vista or panorama; and/or
- The place is a landmark

(iv) Groups: The place is part of a group of buildings, structures, or sites that taken together have coherence because of their age, history, style, scale, materials, or use.

GWRC guidance (adapted):

- If the place was lost, what effect would this have on the group?
- Does the place make a significant contribution to the group?
- Where there is a concentration of similar places, heritage values can derive from the associations between places.



GWRC examples include:

- Tarikaka Street Railway Houses, Ngaio, Wellington

WCC inclusion indicators:

- There is a group of buildings, structures or sites
- The place contributes to the values of the group

(v) Surroundings: the setting or context of the place contributes to an appreciation and understanding of its character, history and/or development.

GWRC guidance:

- What is the setting of the place?
- What are its boundaries
- Any assessment of heritage values should consider the setting of a place, and identify the extent of its surroundings, and whether or not the setting contributes to or detracts from its heritage significance. When considering the surroundings of a building, for example, consider out-buildings, gardens and other features associated with it.

GWRC examples include:

- Clyde Quay Boat Harbour, Clyde Quay, Wellington
- Brancepeth Station, Masterton

WCC guidance:

This section can be used to describe the extent of the setting that contributes to the significance of the place.

(vi) Scientific: The area or place has the potential to provide scientific information about the history of the district or region

WCC guidance

- This section may be used if the scientific values of a place cannot be fully described under *B(i) Archaeological* and *(vii) Technological* values



(vii) Technological: the place provides evidence of the history of technological development; and/or demonstrates innovation or important methods of construction or design; and/or contains unusual construction materials.

GWRC guidance:

- Does the place show scientific or technological achievement?

GWRC examples include:

- Cape Palliser Lighthouse
- Pukuratahi Howe Truss Bridge, Rimutaka Incline

WCC inclusion indicators:

- There is a technological development or innovation
- The place provides evidence of, or demonstrates, the development or innovation

(viii) Integrity: the significant physical values of the place have been largely unmodified. This includes the retention of important modifications and/or additions from later periods.

GWRC guidance:

- How intact is the place?
- Has the place undergone change since its establishment?
- Alterations can have significance in their own right

GWRC examples include:

- Public Trust Building, Lambton Quay, Wellington
- Upper Hutt Blockhouse, Upper Hutt

WCC guidance:

- Intactness and authenticity are generally considered to be components of integrity.
- If assessing an archaeological site it can be difficult to determine the integrity of below ground features. The extent of known modifications (either through previous archaeological excavations or the impacts of developments or activities on the site) is important to consider here. Use this information to



determine whether significant features of the site have the potential to be largely intact.

- Integrity does not necessarily relate to the way the place was when it was established but can derive from a wider period of significance. Later modifications to the place could be just as significant (sometimes more) than an original design or configuration.
- Integrity does not only relate to physical fabric; the way integrity is considered is dependent on the value being assessed. For example, the following may contribute to integrity and authenticity:
 - Continuing association with significant people, institutions or cultural practice, may be relevant a place that has historical values
 - Design integrity may be relevant to a place that represents the work of a notable architect
 - Physical fabric from the time the event occurred may be relevant to a place that is significant for its association with a historic event
- Replacement of short lifespan fabric (marine timbers, roofing, etc.) does not necessarily preclude a place having value if it retains the relevant aspects of integrity

(ix) Age: the place is particularly old in the context of human occupation of the Wellington region.

GWRC guidance:

- How old is the place?
- Age can be an indicator of heritage significance, but a place does not need to be old in order to have heritage values.

GWRC examples include:

- Thistle Inn, Mulgrave Street, Wellington
- Taylor Stace Cottage, Pauatahanui

C. Social values: these values relate to the meanings that a place has for a particular community or communities.

(i) Sentiment: the place has strong or special associations with a particular cultural group or community for spiritual, political, social, religious, ethnic, national, symbolic or commemorative reasons.



GWRC guidance:

- Does the place have particular importance for a group or groups of people?

GWRC examples include:

- ANZAC Hall, Featherston
- St Mary's Church, Otaki

WCC inclusion indicators:

- There is an identifiable community or cultural group – A community or cultural group is a group of people who share a common interest, including an experience, purpose, belief system, culture, ethnicity or values. The group are connected by a common interest and may live or meet at the same locality; or, were once located together and are now geographically separated; or, have never met in person (for example they are a virtual group and interact online).
- The community or cultural group have a strong attachment to the place – an attachment includes feelings, memories and associations that are important to the group's sense of identity, as well as their practices, expressions and representations.

WCC guidance

- Caution needs to be taken when ascribing social value. Efforts to engage potential communities of interest or the public may be necessary to make a case, particularly if the evaluation may be contentious. Supporting factors to consider (these are not values, but may support values):
 - Recognition on a list maintained by a heritage organisation such as HNZPT, Engineering NZ, DOCOMOMO etc.;
 - The existence of an organisations dedicated to the retention of the place (e.g. Friends of ...);
 - That the place is the subject or location of public events (e.g. ANZAC Day events at a war memorial);
 - There is evidence of protests or appeals during attempts to alter or remove the place; extraordinary attempts to save it;
 - There are public nominations or submissions for scheduling;
 - Inclusion of the place in literature, history books or heritage trails.

(ii) ***Recognition: the place is held in high public esteem for its historic heritage values, or its contribution to the sense of identity of a community, to the extent that if it was damaged or destroyed it would cause a sense of loss.***



GWRC guidance:

- Is the place well known in the community?
- Would it be missed if it was lost?

GWRC examples include:

- Wellington Town Hall, Wellington
- Gear Homestead, Papakowhai

WCC inclusion indicators are similar to *C(i) sentiment*

(iii) Sense of place/ continuity: the place provides evidence of cultural or historical continuity, or contributes to a sense of place for a community

WCC inclusion indicators are similar to *C(i) sentiment*

D. Tangata whenua values: the place is sacred or important to Māori for spiritual, cultural or historical reasons.

GWRC guidance:

- Have iwi, hapu, marae or whanau indicated this place is important to them?
- Only mana whenua can identify Māori sites of significance. Information and advice about consultation with iwi can be found on Greater Wellington's website.

GWRC examples include:

- Tapu Te Ranga, Island Bay
- Ngā Rā a Kupe, Palliser Bay

E. Rarity: the place is unique or rare within the district or region.

GWRC guidance

- Are there many other places like this?
- Any assessment should include analysis of how common the type of site is.



GWRC examples include:

- Cone Hut, Tararua Ranges
- Solway Railway Station, Wairarapa

WCC guidance:

- An assessment of uniqueness and rarity requires comparative analysis
- Do not state that a place is rare without explaining why that matters. Why is that aspect of rarity important?
- Rather than rely on rarity per se to convey significance, consider why the place is rare and whether that reason tells a significant story. What can present and future generations learn from the fact that this place exists?
- Rarity does not automatically impart significance. A place can be rare without being important or significant
- Apply the most relevant geographic context when discussing rarity (e.g. a two-storey villa is rare within the context of Johnsonville, but not necessarily rare within the wider context of suburban Wellington).

F. Representativeness: the place is a good example of its type, era or class it represents.

GWRC guidance

- Is the place typical for these type of places?
- Does the place represent other places that were once common but are now rare?
- Rarity and representativeness are sometimes connected in that a place could be rare as one of the few remaining examples of a type of place, but also a good representative of a type of place that was once common.

GWRC examples include:

- Stewart Dawson's Corner
- Lower Hutt Fire Station

WCC guidance:

- An assessment of representativeness requires comparative analysis of the type, class or era



Recommendations

Based on the preceding evaluation, make a recommendation on whether the place meets the **threshold for eligibility as a Heritage Building**, Heritage Object, or Heritage Area.

Note that the threshold for listing is that the place, site and/or area has **significant** historic heritage values that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of history and culture under one or more of the evaluation criteria.

Include in the recommendation:

- Whether the place is a unique, rare and/or representative example of a particular type or class of things; and
- The level of integrity and/or authenticity (NA/none; little; some; significant); and
- The geographic context (“not applicable”, “local”, “regional”, “national” & “international”; and
- The overall significance (“little overall historic heritage value; “some historic heritage values”; “significant historic heritage values”)

Other recommendations

Use this section to set out any additional recommendations not covered under the above headings. Delete the section if not required.

For example,

- If the evaluation has identified comparative places within the region that are of high value and not scheduled, it may be appropriate to recommend that place is a high priority for evaluation in the future. Additionally, if a regional thematic study is recommended to provide greater context, mention this here
- It is also useful to consider if the District Plan objectives, policies, rules and design guides can be used to manage the heritage values of the place. This is generally a question of the existence of sufficient physical fabric that relate to (or demonstrate) the key part of the criterion. Where a place has significant historical or social value, but little or no physical values, the overall recommendation may suggest other ways to manage and interpret the heritage values of the site – for example inclusion in a heritage trail.]

Extent

Include any recommendations here for the extent of the place, and of the proposal for scheduling within the District Plan. Give consideration to:

- The curtilage of small buildings on large sites
- Ancillary buildings and structures including fences and signs
- Interiors



- Properties and archaeological sites that are located over multiple units / boundaries / legal descriptions / titles
- Cultural landscapes and places that have a thematic relationship or group values
- Historic or significant landscaping, gardens, settings and surroundings
- Provision for ongoing amenity values and use

Non-heritage fabric / exclusions

- Include a bullet point list of non-heritage fabric and features that do not contribute to, or may detract from, the values for which the historic heritage place
- Include a bullet point list of buildings that have a negative effect on the values of a Historic Heritage Area (HHA).



Appendices

Appendices to be attached as applicable to each evaluation. Add, delete and renumber appendices as necessary. A suggested table of contents is as follows:

Appendix 1 Comparative analysis

Appendix 2 Wellington Thematic Heritage Study 2013

Appendix 3 Supplementary historic research

Appendix 4 Supplementary images

Appendix 5 Records(s) of title, Deeds register and Gazette notice information

[Insert any other relevant appendices]

