

OCULUS

Noun: oculus, plural noun : oculi

Meaning: A round or eyelike opening or design, in particular

HISTORIC PLACES

AOTEAROA

*The Voice of Heritage
for New Zealand*

Historic Places Aotearoa AGM: Follow Up

NAPIER 2016



photos courtesy of the Art Deco Trust



“Thank You” to Historic Places Hawkes’s Bay for organizing/hosting what was I am sure you will agree, was a great AGM. The venue (and catering), the tours, the meal and the networking were of a high standard that was only surpassed by Napier’s Art Deco buildings!

The HPA AGM continues to develop and evolve and this years will be seen as a very distinct step forward.

“I wish you all the best for the Christmas/New Year break and look forward with working with you in the New Year to further advance the recognition and protection of heritage in New Zealand / Aotearoa.”

James Blackburne President HPA

Oculus: The HPA AGM Keynote Address Issue

This special Oculus features the text of the Keynote Adresses to the HPA AGM given by Minister Foss MP (on behalf of Minister Barry MP) and Jacinda Ardern MP Labour Spokesperson for Heritage to the HPA AGM.

HPA considers it is important to hear (and read) at first hand our elected representatives thoughts on Heritage. We encourage you to read the text of each Keynote Address and provide feedback.

Heritage crosses all political boundaries and HPA suggests that you invite the Minister and the respective Opposition Heritage Spokespersons to any heritage events or debates etc you may be holding. (This includes sending their offices your Publicity Material, Media Releases etc.) By actively involving the politicians in your activities you are continually reminding them, there is a passionate organised influential group of Heritage Advocates working hard to retain our built heritage.

Minister Foss has generously provided us with notes of the Keynote Address he gave at the HPA AGM on behalf of Minister Barry.

His office advises: "As I am sure you will appreciate, these are speech notes, and are therefore not necessarily a verbatim copy of the speech delivered."



Hon Craig Foss
On behalf of Hon Maggie Barry

Historical Places Aotearoa Conference, Saturday 29 October 2016

Thank you for inviting me here to this weekend of discussion, reflection and forward-thinking about New Zealand's unique heritage places.

I'm pleased to be here on behalf of the Minister for Arts, Culture and Heritage, but also as the Member of Parliament for the Tukituki electorate here in the beautiful Hawke's Bay.

And it's very fitting that we are gathered in the MTG Century Theatre, which is a harmonious blend of twentieth century architectural styles and one of the most distinctive buildings in the region.

Heritage buildings are important to all New Zealanders. They are living reminders of the people and events of our history, and are an essential part of our identity as communities and as a nation.

Heritage architecture is also an important contributor to the economy. It is the public face of our towns and cities, creating vibrant places that people want to live in and tourists want to visit. Napier is a prime example of this, with thousands of visitors flocking here each year to experience its unique and world-renowned art deco townscape.

The theme for this weekend, 'Bringing heritage together in New Zealand', is timely because in order for this sector to be effective, there need to be strong links between grass roots advocacy groups, owners of heritage properties, local government and Heritage New Zealand. Like strands of a rope, they are much stronger together.

Some fantastic things are underway in this sector at both the grass roots level and the Government level, and I think it's worth mentioning a few highlights from the past year.

Two months ago in Wellington, the Prime Minister and Governor-General officially opened the Queen Elizabeth II Pukeahu Education Centre in the former Home of Compassion Crèche.

The structure was built in 1914 and was the first purpose-built crèche in the country. In 2014 the building was moved 15 metres from its original position near the Basin Reserve, and was identified as an ideal base for the Pukeahu National War Memorial Park education programme.

After being earthquake strengthened and having its exterior restored, this repurposed heritage building is now a vibrant education hub for New Zealand students to learn about civics, citizenship and our history of conflict and peacekeeping.

Over the past year the first Wahi Tupuna sites were registered under the new Heritage New Zealand legislation at Waitangi, Whakarewarewa and at the site of Toitu Tauraka Waka in Dunedin.

This is a new type of classification for places of strong traditional associations to Māori which formally identifies and acknowledges these ancestral connections, and allows the stories of these special places to be shared and celebrated.

I look forward to more Wahi Tupuna sites being identified and registered in the future.

As many of you will know, in August this year Minister Barry announced the launch of the Heritage Earthquake Upgrade Incentive Programme – perhaps better known as Heritage EQUIP.

We have always known that many New Zealand towns and cities are in a precarious situation straddling multiple fault lines – and the history of this region is a haunting reminder.

But it was devastating effects of the Canterbury earthquakes which really woke this country up in the most horrific way to the dangers of earthquake-prone buildings.

We have understood as a nation that unsafe buildings simply cannot continue to contain people until work is done to make them safe. This has put some types of heritage buildings throughout New Zealand in the spotlight.

In response to the earthquakes, Government undertook a major review of the earthquake-prone building provisions in the Building Act 2004. The resulting Building (Earthquake-prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016 requires the owners of earthquake-prone buildings to carry out strengthening work within set timeframes. This will come into force in early 2017.

During the first stage of the review, two key things became apparent: firstly, that the cost of strengthening heritage buildings is a major hurdle for private owners, and secondly, that it is hard for owners to find the information they need to make decisions about their buildings.

Heritage buildings have significant value to all New Zealanders, but it is the owners who bear the strengthening costs. Where these costs are prohibitive, there is a real risk we may lose some of our most significant heritage or it could be left indefinitely vacant. This could seriously impact regions where heritage buildings support the continued viability of towns, businesses and communities.

Because of the public value of our most significant built heritage, Government recognises that it has a role in supporting its retention for the benefit of all New Zealanders.

Government is investing \$12 million over four years in Heritage EQUIP in the form of contestable grants supported by an information package.

The comprehensive, web-based information package will give clear guidance on the options available to heritage building owners, so they can make informed decisions.

Heritage EQUIP recognises that the Government cannot meet the full cost of strengthening – which is why it is designed as an incentive fund to help leverage support from a range of partners.

As with all heritage conservation projects it is vital that there is support from owners and the wider community, and the design of the fund is geared to help enshrine and leverage support at the local, regional and national levels.

Decisions on funding will be made by the Chief Executive of the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, on the advice of an expert advisory panel. It will be a rigorous and transparent application process to ensure those most eligible are given the highest priority. The first funding round will be called for by the end of this year.

Heritage EQUIP is an initiative that celebrates and supports New Zealand's unique built heritage, so future generations can enjoy heritage-rich environments as we and our forebears have done, and I look forward to seeing what we can achieve through it.

It is important there are independent voices making the case for cultural heritage, as there is for natural heritage. Laws do not on their own save heritage buildings. There also needs to be a community appreciation of the importance of heritage, and political will to take action.

This is why volunteers are so valuable to the heritage sector. Through publications, lectures, awards ceremonies, public events, and their own expertise and enthusiasm, volunteers raise the profile of our heritage and build the collective community support that underpins the sector.

Historic Places Aotearoa and its constituent groups are a vitally important force for the heritage sector, and there are many fantastic examples of Historic Places groups working together with Heritage New Zealand to ensure the best outcomes for our nation's heritage.

One local example is the work of Historic Places Hawke's Bay on the Mokopeka Power Station, which is a Category One heritage building. The landowner has allowed the group access and they have established a local trust to look after and work on the restoration and maintenance of this site.

Heritage New Zealand supports this project through a National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund grant, administered on behalf of the Crown, which was provided to cover the costs of preparing a conservation plan.

Another great example of volunteer work here in the Hawke's Bay is Napier's Art Deco Trust. For 30 years the Trust has been dedicated to the preservation, promotion and celebration of the Art Deco City of Napier.

Each year an estimated 25,000 people take an Art Deco Walk, many of which are guided walks led by the Trust's expert volunteer walk guides.

Hordes of visitors flock to Napier each February to enjoy the Tremains Art Deco Weekend, which wouldn't be able to happen without the support of over 120 dedicated volunteers.

And of course many of our best-loved heritage properties around the country are managed by groups of dedicated volunteers, including the Dame Ngaio Marsh House in Christchurch and Katherine Mansfield's Birthplace in Wellington.

A challenge for the heritage sector is not only maintaining this volunteer base but also recruiting volunteers from successive generations. We know it's possible - we only have to look at the student volunteer army in Christchurch and the collaborative power of social media to see the potential for mobilising younger people.

Reform to the Resource Management Act is a key priority for the Government. The introduction of the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill represents the second phase of the Government's resource management reform programme.

It comprises about 40 individual policy proposals aimed at delivering substantive improvements to the Resource Management Act. Hundreds of written submissions were received on the Bill and we expect to see some changes introduced in light of the valuable contributions made by submitters.

While many of the proposals in the Bill do not directly intersect with the heritage sector, they are likely to be of interest nonetheless.

Key changes include:

- the recognition of natural hazard risk management as a new matter of national importance, and changes to the consideration of natural hazards in subdivision consents;
- the introduction of two new plan making processes;
- and a suite of changes to consenting and notification processes.

The Ministry for the Environment is working with Heritage New Zealand and the Ministry for Culture and Heritage to ensure that parts of the Bill allow Heritage New Zealand to fulfill its roles.

The Bill includes many provisions to enable much needed urban development to occur. This has been achieved while keeping the requirement to protect historic heritage as a matter of national importance and recognising Heritage New Zealand's important role in our environmental management system.

This question of managing population growth and urban development with heritage preservation is one of the biggest challenges facing the sector, and it's an issue we all need to work together on.

I acknowledge there are sometimes difficulties juggling competing values. Government is interested in hearing your thoughts and ideas on these matters, and I hope you have some fruitful discussion at your facilitated workshop later this afternoon.

Winston Churchill once said *"We shape our buildings; thereafter they shape us."*

With this in mind, it's important to consider both tangible and intangible value in any conversation about cultural heritage so that we are able to identify and protect our heritage places for present and future generations.

I know how much time, personal energy and expertise heritage projects demand, and I appreciate that many of you here today have worked to support, protect and raise awareness of New Zealand's heritage for many years.

The energy and passion here at this conference is testimony to the commitment of Historic Places Aotearoa and the sector to identifying future directions, working together, sharing ideas, comparing notes on challenges and opportunities, exploring the links between organisations, and recognising common goal and needs.

The volunteers and groups which make up Historic Places Aotearoa are the lifeblood of our heritage sector. I hope you can continue to work together effectively with Heritage New Zealand, local councils and property owners to achieve the best outcomes for New Zealanders, so that future generations can appreciate our national heritage in the same way that we do now.

I wish you all a productive and rewarding weekend.

ENDS



Hon Maggie Barry.
Member for North Shore,
National Party
Minister Arts Culture and Heritage
Maggie.Barry@parliament.govt.nz
Parliament Office
Private Bag 18888
Parliament Buildings
Wellington 6160
+64 4 817 9999

Jacinda Ardern MP, Labour Spokesperson for Arts Culture and Heritage has generously provided us with a copy of her HPA AGM Keynote Address.

Feedback Sought: Jacinda Ardern MP in her Keynote Address includes specific proposals to strengthen Heritage Retention.
“... I will leave with you a few of these thoughts in writing. Please do feel free to take the time to think about them, and any other ideas you have in this space. I would welcome your thoughts. “



I want to start by acknowledging the manawhenua of this land. I also want to acknowledge James, and all of the executive of Historic places. You do incredible work.

Long before I took on the portfolio of heritage spokesperson, I had a love of heritage. I have often wondered where it started. Was it when I first read a book about Antarctic exploration, a particular passion of mine that probably seems normal now, but as a 14 year old girl growing up in Morrinsville who had never seen snow, it was slightly less normal.

The idea though, that huts that once housed these explorers still stood, and in many cases, had been restored and preserved on the ice as a rarely seen capsule of history was absolutely fascinating to me. But if I'm honest, my amateur appreciation started well before that.

It started in Te Aroha. If I were to name one place that is an anchor for me, it is this small town nestled between the Hauraki plains and the rural Waikato. Both of my parents were born under this mountain. My mother's family farmed along the Waihou river.

My father's family were drain diggers. As a child, most of my Sunday's were spent in Te Aroha visiting my grandparents. My nana and grandad had a home on the edge of the historic domain, only 100 metres or so from the old geyser and colonial bath houses that people would visit to renew their health long before my family arrived.

My grandparents' home was old. Really old. For a long time there was no inside toilet, and I remember being terrified of the spider riddled outhouse that sat next to the outside room with the copper that my nana did the washing in.

She would make sure that when we visited, she had the coal range roaring to not just heat the water, but to put a roast on. I can still remember when, finally, an electric oven was installed in my nana's kitchen. She even used it...occasionally.

We would fill our visits with games in the domain, or on the steep streets that rolled down from Mt Te Aroha. Horrific flooding in that tiny town in the 80s meant that huge guttering, the likes of which I have never seen anywhere else, were installed down the streets that drained away from the mountain. My sister and I would use them for leaf races, starting at the top, and flowing all the way down to the historic old post office.

I always remember loving that post office. It remains the first heritage building I ever remember noticing as a child. It had what, to a child's mind, looked like a royal seal at the top of it. I thought it was beautiful, the kind of thing the queen would visit, if she ever came to Te Aroha.

But it was more than that. That building was part of my mum and dad's story. My Aunty used to work there as a telephone operator, probably listening to all of the calls. My mother worked there too, as a clerk. If you believe my father's version of events, she would spy on my dad from the window on the top floor. I love that building. It's not only beautiful, and a part of what makes that historic town, it is part of my story. And my family's story.

Nothing that I have described is especially unique or special. I know that all of you, by virtue of the work you do, will have some personal and almost emotional draw to the buildings and places you work to protect – for the precise reason that they are not just buildings and places, they are memories and taonga.

I wanted to start by acknowledging those special relationships. But, having a feeling or sense of connection to these places, as we all know, is not enough.

We have to back it up, ensure that our protections are robust, that our advocacy is able to be meaningful, and that we achieve the outcomes that the public expects.

In my short time in the Arts, Culture and Heritage portfolio, there have been too many examples where that has not been the case.

Let me share a few issues that I have seen emerge over the years, that will not feel new to any of you.

The Christchurch earthquake was devastating in its enormity. There was so little in that situation that could be controlled, but how we dealt with heritage was one of them.

I wasn't there, so I will never fully understand the enormity of it, and the justifiable fear that still exists today. But the ramifications from a heritage perspective, have obviously been huge. There was the immediate effect, which was to start pulling down buildings that were deemed to be a risk. That is utterly understandable. But some of the fear was squarely placed at the feet of historic buildings, in an environment where it was extremely hard to point out that they had in fact, not taken lives.

The Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act of course allowed this demolition work to continue, giving broad sweeping powers which cut out the RMA process. Like I say, I don't want to trivialise or diminish the situation that led to those powers, but in our minds by 2014, when 47% of the listed heritage buildings in Christchurch central city had already been demolished, it was more than time for those extraordinary powers to come to an end.

We called for the section 38 of the CERA act to be scrapped, for the quick fire demolitions to end, and more specifically we called for the public to have a voice on the future of the cathedral through a full RMA process.

The way in which the question of the cathedral has dragged, and has held up the rebuild of the central city has been hard to watch, not least for those who have made such a strong case for this historic buildings rebuild, and restoration. In our minds, there has been a case for stronger government intervention here.

But the ramifications of the earthquake have of course been felt even more broadly than that. In the wake of the quakes, the rest of the nation had revised insurance bills arrive, and for many in heritage buildings, they were crippling.

This really just compounds a second problem. The financial strain that often comes onto those who own heritage buildings, who are often unable to recoup their costs. Let's take an example – the owner for instance of a heritage building in Fielding. Not only will they be facing hefty costs to ensure their building is up to scratch, this has often coincided with increases in insurance. If they run a business out of the building, there is rarely going to be any increase in profit as a result of upgrading a building, and if they rent it, there will be an expectation the building is safe without an unreasonable hike in their costs.

Add to that the fact that regional New Zealand has had it tough in some areas in recent years, and you have a recipe for vacating the property, allowing it to become run down, or both. I don't say that to place blame on anyone, in my mind,

the only thing we should be pointing the figure at is the great vacant hole where all of the ideas should be to fix this problem.

First, what assistance is there to help owners in these situations? As you know, there are options like the National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund. But is this genuinely enough, and will it reach the shop owner in Fielding?

Relative to some of the schemes offshore, there is very little in place that acknowledges that there is a collective good to maintaining these buildings, and maybe it's time we acknowledged that.

In our last manifesto, we talked about what we could do to remedy this situation. We set out that we wanted to investigate methods to ensure that heritage buildings in private ownership are not left in a state of demolition by neglect, triggered by for instance the expense of new earthquake proofing requirements. This could for instance include tax incentives to restore listed buildings. I would welcome your thoughts on this commitment, and what you think it should look like if we really want to make a difference in this space.

But we face another difficult challenge that has been exemplified in recent times – the issue of buildings that should be protected, that on paper have the highest protection we can offer, but have still been destroyed. You will know this issue all too well – there have been 26 listed buildings lost in the last 5 years. And probably the most recent tragedy that we will be adding to that list is Aniwanuiwa

Many of you will already know about this architecturally designed visitors centre that sits in the bush near Lake Waikaremoana, and has done since 1976. It was a Category One Historic Place and one of national significance. It was designed by John Scott, a man who has been described by the Institute of Architects as not only a “pioneering Maori architect” but an “outstanding figure in twentieth Century New Zealand architecture.” John has passed, but he has left us some fine legacy buildings that we have a responsibility to protect.

The land this historic building sat on is held by Tuhoe; but the care and maintenance of the building, was up to the Department of Conservation. Concerns over the apparent ability of the building to withstand an earthquake meant the first floor was closed in 2007. By 2010 a report on weather tightness issues was interpreted to mean that the building needed to sit entirely empty and unused, and that is exactly what happened. Letters from around that time show that because DOC had no interest in going back into the building, they also had no interest in spending any money on it. Let's face it, they were struggling to do their job with what budget they had, it was never going to be their priority. But it needed to be someone's priority.

But it did appear at first that there might be hope. After all, the only person that ultimately we needed to convince to save the building was the Minister of Conservation, who helpfully happened to be the Minister for Arts Culture and Heritage.

And the building was already listed. There was not much more you could do to highlight it's importance but writing it in large red letters on the side.

But what happens when those who should be on your side, have an agenda. When those responsible for making a decision over it's future, have a pre determined view, and when the local council has no requirement to take into account the heritage listing of a building, and instead condemn it?

The answer, sadly, is that we lose a taonga. I have not seen an example in recent times of just how shallow our heritage protections can be, than this case.

I want to acknowledge those in this room who fought so hard to save this building. We exchanged many phone calls, shared information, lobbied on every front we could. In desperation, I chased one minister out of the debating chamber, and passed notes in the house to others who seemed to be diligently avoiding me. Sadly, it came to naught.

But this experience has to count for something. That's why I want to work with you collectively to come up with solutions that ensure Aniwaniwa never happens again.

The first question I would like to pose, is what happens to heritage listed buildings in crown ownership? Should all buildings in this category be managed by Heritage NZ? I have very little faith in the ability of DOC to preserve these buildings, and they aren't resourced to either. Turnball house for instance is also in their care, and continues to sit empty. There will be others. Would such a change make any meaningful difference, or at least ensure improved maintenance of listed buildings?

Secondly, how do we ensure listed buildings are given due regard at a local level? I have seen a few ideas floated in this space, and if you indulge me for a moment, I would like to canvas a few with you.

Firstly, if you look at the interface of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA) with the RMA, there is a gap in what councils must have regard to.

S74(1) of Heritage NZ act states as follows:

74 When local authorities must have particular regard to recommendations

(1) In respect of a historic area entered on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga may make recommendations to the local authorities that have jurisdiction in the area where the historic area is located as to the appropriate measures that those local authorities should take to assist in the conservation and protection of the historic area.

Under s65 historic areas and historic places are different things, so adding historic places to part one would strengthen the Act to a degree. But there are also plenty of caveats in there, and this amendment is probably the least we could do.

Another option is to make amendments to the RMA itself. Section 74 for instance states that

74 Matters to be considered by territorial authority

(2) In addition to the requirements of section 75(3) and (4), when preparing or changing a district plan, a territorial authority shall have regard to—

(a) any—

(i) proposed regional policy statement; or

(ii) proposed regional plan of its region in regard to any matter of regional

significance or for which the regional council has primary

responsibility under Part 4; and

(b) any—

(i) management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts; and

(ii) *[Repealed]*

(iia) relevant entry on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero required by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014;

and...

It could be possible to strengthen this section by specifying category 1 historic places, but again, this would only require council to have regard to these buildings. Evidence to date suggests this might be too weak.

The third option relates to Section 75 of the RMA, which states

75 Contents of district plans

(1) A district plan must state—

- (a) the objectives for the district; and
- (b) the policies to implement the objectives; and
- (c) the rules (if any) to implement the policies.

(2) A district plan may state—

- (a) the significant resource management issues for the district; and
- (b) the methods, other than rules, for implementing the policies for the district;
and
- (c) the principal reasons for adopting the policies and methods; and
- (d) the environmental results expected from the policies and methods; and
- (e) the procedures for monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies and methods; and
- (f) the processes for dealing with issues that cross territorial authority boundaries;
and
- (g) the information to be included with an application for a resource consent;
and
- (h) any other information required for the purpose of the territorial authority's functions, powers, and duties under this Act.

(3) A district plan must give effect to—

- (a) any national policy statement; and
- (b) any New Zealand coastal policy statement; and
- (c) any regional policy statement.

(4) A district plan must not be inconsistent with—

- (a) a water conservation order; or
- (b) a regional plan for any matter specified in section 30(1).

There are two options here. We could either amend this section to include a requirement that a district plan must give effect to any recommendation about a category 1 historic place

Or, we could opt for the nuclear option, and finally create a national policy statement on heritage.

This is something we have been thinking about for sometime, and in fact, its something we included in our last election manifesto. But I am genuinely keen to hear from you what you think will make the biggest difference.

After today, I will leave with you a few of these thoughts in writing. Please do feel free to take the time to think about them, and any other ideas you have in this space. I would welcome your thoughts.

Finally though, please let me finish with a word of thanks. For every lost historic place we have mourned, there will be one that your hard work and advocacy will have saved. I look forward to working with you to ensure that happens much more often.



Jacinda Ardern
List Member ,
Labour Party
Spokesperson Arts Culture and
Heritage
jacinda.ardern@parliament.govt.nz
Parliament Office
Private Bag 1888
Parliament Buildings
Wellington 6160
+64 4 817 9999

Heritage Notes From The Field:

Hydro Grand Hotel : Breaking News



A new date has been set for the Environment Court Hearing to hear the Application for a Resource Consent seeking demotion. The Hearings are set down for 8/9 December (2016) and there is an expectation the Application will be modified.

South Canterbury Historical Society along with the Timaru Civic Trust and a number of individuals are opposing the proposed demolition of Timaru's landmark Hydro Grand Hotel.

Christ Church Cathedral: Resolution?



The Press (Online) is reporting:

“Anglican Bishop Victoria Matthews returns to New Zealand to consider cathedral plans, sources say “

“Bishop Victoria Matthews has returned to New Zealand to consider plans for the future of the Christ Church Cathedral, according to sources close to the process.

In June, the Government tasked a working group with breaking *(the)* deadlock on the earthquake-damaged building, which has been holding up the redevelopment of Cathedral Square in central Christchurch.

The working group will make a non-binding recommendation on the building to Government and church trustees by November 28 with a public announcement planned for December 7. ...
....Sources also said there may be a restoration proposal drawn up by the working group for the bishop to consider...”

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/the-press/news/86268044/Anglican-Bishop-Victoria-Matthews-returns-to-New-Zealand-to-consider-cathedral-plans-sources-say>