

*NZHPT (Draft) Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guide No. 9
SER Monitoring
R McClean 18 December 2006*



New Zealand
Historic Places Trust *Pouhere Taonga*

**SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT
OF
HISTORIC HERITAGE**

Guide No. 9

**STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT
REPORTING
AND
MONITORING**

18 December 2006

Draft for Consultation

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| ABBREVIATIONS | 3 |
| CHAPTER 1. STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT REPORTING | 4 |
| THE SER HISTORIC HERITAGE FRAMEWORK | 4 |
| CHAPTER 2. EXPLANATION OF DRAFT SER HISTORIC HERITAGE INDICATORS..... | 8 |
| 2.1 HISTORIC HERITAGE STATE..... | 8 |
| 2.1.1 ISSUE: KNOWLEDGE OF THE HISTORIC HERITAGE RESOURCE..... | 8 |
| Indicator: I.1. Number and distribution of identified historic heritage | 8 |
| 2.1.2 ISSUE: KNOWLEDGE OF THE HISTORIC HERITAGE RESOURCE..... | 11 |
| Indicator: I.2. Number and type of historic heritage assessed using best practice assessment standards . | 11 |
| 2.2 HISTORIC HERITAGE THREATS/PRESSURE..... | 14 |
| 2.2.1 ISSUE: CONDITION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | 14 |
| Indicator: I.3. Number of historic heritage destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished | 14 |
| 2.2.1 ISSUE: CONDITION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | 17 |
| Indicator: I.4. The proportion of historic heritage being in good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity..... | 17 |
| 2.3 HISTORIC HERITAGE RESPONSES..... | 23 |
| 2.3.1 ISSUE: PROTECTION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE BY CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT | 23 |
| Indicator: I.5. Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage | 23 |
| 2.3.2 ISSUE: PROTECTION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE BY CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT..... | 27 |
| Indicator: I.6. Number of historic heritage actively protected by formal statutory instruments..... | 27 |
| 2.3.3 ISSUE: PROTECTION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE BY CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT..... | 29 |
| Indicator: I.7. Assessment of effectiveness of plan, resource consents and authorities relating to historic heritage | 29 |
| 2.3.4 ISSUE: RESOURCES FOR CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC HERITAGE | 32 |
| Indicator: I.8. Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage..... | 32 |
| APPENDIX 1 | 34 |
| SER HISTORIC HERITAGE REPORTING: BACKGROUND..... | 34 |
| APPENDIX 2 | 39 |
| STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT REPORT HISTORIC HERITAGE INDICATORS PROJECT..... | 39 |
| HISTORIC HERITAGE INDICATOR SAMPLING FORM | 39 |
| DRAFT STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT REPORT HISTORIC HERITAGE INDICATORS EXPLANATORY SAMPLE SURVEY GUIDELINES..... | 40 |
| Sampling Abbreviations..... | 43 |
| APPENDIX 3 | 44 |
| SUMMARY DRAFT HISTORIC HERITAGE INDICATORS..... | 44 |

Abbreviations

| | |
|-------------|---|
| ANZECC | Australian and New Zealand Environmental and Conservation Council |
| ARC | Auckland Regional Council |
| CBD | Central Business District |
| DOC | Department of Conservation |
| GWRC | Greater Wellington Regional Council |
| HPA | Historic Places Act 1993 |
| MCH | Ministry for Culture and Heritage |
| MFE | Ministry for the Environment |
| NZAA | New Zealand Archaeological Association |
| NZHPT | New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga |
| NZLGB | New Zealand Lottery Grants Board |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| OTS | Office of Treaty Settlements |
| PSR | Pressure-State-Response Framework |
| PUCM | Planning Under a Cooperative Mandate Project |
| QE II Trust | Queen Elizabeth II National Trust |
| RMA | Resource Management Act 1991 |
| WCC | Wellington City Council |
| WT | Waitangi Tribunal |

This guide has been prepared for consultation with local authorities.

The NZHPT welcomes any comments and suggestions to improve this guide.

The NZHPT is also available to meet with local authorities to discuss the scope and content of the guide.

It would be appreciated if comments can be provided to the NZHPT by 23 March 2007. All comments can be sent to:

Robert McClean
Senior Heritage Policy Adviser
New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga
PO Box 2629
Wellington
Email: rmcclean@historic.org.nz
Phone 04 4724924
Fax 04 499 0669

Chapter 1. State of the Environment Reporting

1. Every local authority has a duty to monitor the state of the whole or any part of the environment of its region or district that is appropriate to enable the local authority to effectively carry out its functions under the RMA.¹ This duty is known as state of the environment reporting or SER. Historic heritage, as a natural and physical resource, forms part of the definition of environment as defined in the Act.
2. As with other SER frameworks, research and monitoring of historic heritage requires cooperation between agencies at a district, regional, and national level. This guide emphasises the need to integrate information held by NZHPT, Department of Conservation (DOC), New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA), iwi, and local authorities. By pulling together a range of information from the key agencies, a more robust and comprehensive ‘picture’ of the state of the historic environment will be realised.

The SER Historic Heritage Framework

3. New Zealand has adopted the Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework as the basis of its state of environmental reporting. This approach, developed by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), recognises that managing our environment requires a complicated form of feedback loop: human activities and natural causes exert pressures on the environment; these change the state or condition of the environment; society responds by developing or implementing policies that influence those human activities or modify natural processes, and this in turn changes the kinds of pressures.²
4. The PSR framework can be adopted to provide information about the state of the historic heritage environment. This has been done in Australia and New Zealand at national, regional and district levels (see Appendix 1 for background information on SER historic heritage reporting in Australia and New Zealand).
5. In the context of historic heritage, the PSR framework can be conceptualised as SPR where state is the condition of the entire historic heritage environment including the condition of our knowledge of that environment; pressures are the threats on that environment caused by both human and natural interventions; and response is the response of Government and communities to manage pressures and to improve the condition of the historic heritage environment.
6. An indicator is a unit of measure that signals changes in the environment. The change may be an aspect of pressure, state, or response. The development of historic heritage indicators does not attempt to measure the ‘total’ heritage environment. Attempting to

¹ Sec 35(2)(a) RMA 1991

² WRC, *Wellington Regional Monitoring Strategy*, p 10

measure the total heritage environment, or the ‘universe’ of heritage places, is essentially a fruitless exercise since perceptions of what constitutes heritage values changes as society changes. In addition, the exercise of listing or registering a particular place inscribes new values.³

7. Generally, historic heritage indicators should have the ability to:
 - Produce and simplify the most important information about the historic heritage environment;
 - Reduce the number of measurements required to give an ‘accurate’ representation of historic heritage outcomes;
 - Illustrate trends and allow comparisons;
 - Ensure responses are triggered when historic heritage thresholds are approached; and
 - Make information gathered by specialists more easily understood by the public, the media, resource users, and decision-makers.⁴
8. The NZHPT proposes that the set of historic heritage indicators used by the Australian National State of the Environment Programme should be adopted in New Zealand with some modifications and additions in light of the 2001 review of the Australian programme. The Australian and New Zealand Environmental and Conservation Council have endorsed these indicators in 1999.
9. Further modifications of the Australian set of indicators are also required to reflect New Zealand’s historic heritage legislation, policy context and monitoring experience. In particular, the indicators need to be closely aligned to the definition of historic heritage in the RMA.
10. The proposed draft indicators are organised according to four key resource management issues or information objectives:
 - Knowledge of the historic heritage resource.
 - Condition of historic heritage.
 - Protection of historic heritage by central and local governments.
 - Resources for conservation of historic heritage.

³ Prof Dirk Spennemann, ‘Your solution, their problem. Their solution, your problem’ Paper presented at Planning Institute of Australia Conference, Hobart, 2004

⁴ Adapted from WRC, *Wellington Regional Monitoring Strategy*, p 10

11. In relation to these information objectives, the draft indicators are as follows:

Draft Historic Heritage Indicators

- I.1 No. and distribution of identified historic heritage**
 - I.2 No. and type of historic heritage assessed using best practice standards**
 - I.3 No. of historic heritage destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished**
 - I.4 Proportion of historic heritage being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity**
 - I.5 No. of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage**
 - I.6 No. of historic heritage actively protected by formal statutory instruments**
 - I.7 Assessment of effectiveness of plan, resource consents and authorities relating to historic heritage**
 - I.8 Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage**
12. For each indicator, there are a subset of indicators relating to historic places (sites, structures), historic areas, sites of significance to Maori including wahi tapu, and archaeological sites.

| Draft Historic Heritage Indicators | | | | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------------|--|
| Issue | Indicator | | Information Sources | State (S), Pressure (P), Response (R) |
| Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | I.1 | No. and distribution of identified historic heritage | NZHPT | S R |
| | | | Local authorities | |
| | | | DOC | |
| | | | Iwi | |
| | | | NZAA | |
| | I.2 | No. and type of historic heritage assessed using best practice standards | NZHPT | S R |
| | | | Local authorities | |
| | | | DOC | |
| | | | NZAA | |
| Condition of historic heritage | I.3 | No. of historic heritage destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished | NZHPT | S P |
| | | | Local authorities | |
| | | | DOC | |
| | I.4 | Proportion of historic heritage being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity | NZHPT | S P |
| | | | Local authorities | |
| | | | DOC | |
| | | | NZAA | |
| Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | I.5 | No. of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage | NZHPT | R |
| | | | Local authorities | |
| | | | DOC | |
| | | | QEII Trust | |
| | | | Maori Land Court | |
| | | | Office of Treaty Settlements | |
| | I.6 | No. of historic heritage actively protected by formal statutory instruments | NZHPT | R |
| | | | Local authorities | |
| | | | DOC | |
| | | | Iwi | |
| | | | NZAA | |
| | I.7 | Assessment of effectiveness of plan, resource consents, and authorities relating to historic heritage | NZHPT | R |
| | | | Local authorities | |
| Resources for conservation of historic heritage | I.8 | Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage | NZHPT | R |
| | | | Local authorities | |
| | | | DOC | |

Chapter 2. Explanation of Draft SER Historic Heritage Indicators

2.1 Historic Heritage State

2.1.1 Issue: Knowledge of the Historic Heritage Resource

Indicator: I.1. Number and distribution of identified historic heritage

Description: Measures number and distribution of identified historic heritage items in New Zealand.

| I.1. No. and distribution of identified historic heritage | | |
|--|-------------------|---|
| Historic Heritage | Agency | Information |
| Places (including sites and structures) | NZHPT | No. of registered historic places |
| | Local authorities | No. of listed heritage places in district and regional plans |
| | DOC | No. of actively managed historic places |
| Areas | NZHPT | No. of registered historic areas |
| | Local authorities | No. of listed historic areas in district and regional plans |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | NZHPT | No. of registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas |
| | Local authorities | No. of listed sites of significance to Maori in district and regional plans |
| | Iwi | No. of sites listed in iwi inventories |
| Archaeological sites | NZAA | No. of recorded archaeological sites |
| | NZHPT | No. of archaeological sites registered as a historic place |

Rationale

13. At the core of New Zealand's cultural management regime is a system of listing of historic heritage. The lists define a place that is singled out on account of its heritage value. There are generally three main types of lists: statutory; regulatory; and community. New Zealand's only statutory list is the register of historic places, historic areas, wahi tapu, and wahi tapu areas. The register is a requirement of the Historic Places Act 1993. Local authorities and DOC prepare and manage regulatory lists or schedules that have legal ramifications in terms of rules within district or regional plans prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991 or conservation management strategies prepared under the Conservation Act 1987. In addition, there are a range of community lists which have no statutory basis or regulatory effect. These include lists such as the Rail Heritage Register.

14. Lists of historic heritage places reflect the values or objectives of the group or organisation which created and maintain them. Counting the numbers of listed places actually provides little information about changes to the historic heritage environment. This is because the large proportion of the historic heritage environment is not listed and the listings themselves are biased towards particular time, geographic and thematic categories. Numbers of listed places also do not indicate numbers of actual sites or places protected. Protection largely depends on either property status (i.e. reserves) or the quality of rules within regional or district plans.
15. Changes in the number of listed places do, however, reflect changes in government and/or community commitment to identify and protect historic heritage. The NZHPT's registration process and the RMA plan change process to add new listed items into district or regional plans requires formidable legal, informational, and consultative requirements. The processes also require substantial resources at both a central and local government level.
16. Other changes to listed places can reflect improved regulatory processes. For example, many surveyors and developers are more aware of the Historic Places Act with regard to archaeological authority requirements and often engage an archaeologist to carry out an archaeological assessment if requested by the NZHPT. Thus, most new additions to the NZAA Site Recording Scheme are the result of surveys associated with proposed coastal subdivisions or other developments.

Discussion

Historic Places (including sites and structures)

17. Historic places are generally buildings or individual properties. They may include residential, commercial, industrial, or public buildings and structures. The NZHPT register dates back to 1963 when the NZHPT began to establish a national list of historic sites and buildings. The structure of the list was formulated in 1969 with the classification of buildings into five categories A, B, C, D, and O (objects). This was changed to category I and category II historic places under the Historic Places Act 1993.
18. Category I historic places have 'special or outstanding historic or historic heritage significance or value. Category II places have 'historical or historic heritage significance or value.' The purpose of the Register is to inform the owners and the public about significant heritage places, and to assist in protection under the Resource Management Act 1991.
19. All district plans contain a schedule, list, or register of heritage places. These lists are often included in the appendices of the district plan. Some regional plans include lists of regionally significant heritage places.
20. The Department of Conservation's conservation management strategies identify historic resources of high significance that they actively managed by the Department of

Conservation. These sites are the subject of on-going DOC management and attention and are termed actively managed historic places. Most of the places listed are within the conservation estate.

Historic Areas

21. Historic areas registered under the Historic Places Act contain a number of interrelated historic places. These areas may include a small collection of historic buildings or an entire street. Local authorities have often adopted the term ‘conservation areas’ or ‘character areas’ to recognise and list historic areas. For example, the Wellington City district plan identifies areas such as Thorndon and Mt Victoria as character areas.

Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu

22. Iwi and hapu have been active in identifying and research sites of significance, including wahi tapu, for both the RMA and claims settlement processes. Some iwi and hapu have prepared iwi management plans or schedules that involve the identification and research of sites of significance. These sites may include maunga (mountains), awa (rivers), tauranga waka (canoe landing sites), urupa, marae, swamps, and other archaeological and non-archaeological sites.

23. Any places or areas sacred to Maori in the traditional, spiritual, religious, ritual, or mythological sense can be registered under the Historic Places Act as wahi tapu. Some district and regional plans also include a list of sites of significance to Maori or wahi tapu.

Archaeological Sites

24. Archaeological sites, defined by the Historic Places Act 1993, are places in New Zealand that were associated with human activity that occurred before 1900 (including wrecks) and are or may be able, through investigation by archaeological methods, to provide evidence relating to the history of New Zealand. Many archaeological sites, however, may be related to human activity post-1900 and these do not enjoy protection under the Historic Places Act 1993.⁵

25. Archaeological sites have been recorded by the NZAA since 1956. The sites include Maori archaeological sites (pa, midden, pits, etc), and other historic archaeological sites (goldmines, buildings, structures, tracks, etc). Archaeological sites are recorded by archaeological survey or as a result of discovery. There are few areas in New Zealand that have been covered by systematic archaeological survey and there is a need for improved information about the degree and extent of archaeological survey coverage in the country.

⁵ The NZHPT can declare any post-1900 archaeological site as coming within the definition of ‘archaeological site’ within the meaning of the Historic Places Act 1993 by notice in the *Gazette*. The Napier Prison Wall was gazetted by the NZHPT on 24 June 2005 and the NZHPT is investigating the gazetting of the Makatote Tramway, Erua.

26. The New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) Site Recording Scheme is a national inventory of archaeological sites and currently contains records of over 57,000 sites nation-wide. This list is only those ‘recorded’ sites. In any given area, there may be undiscovered or unrecorded sites.

27. A small number of archaeological sites are registered as historic places. These registrations were entered under a 1975 amendment to the Historic Places Act 1954. This section provided for a register of archaeological sites. The purpose of the register was for scientific use and for planning purposes at the local government level. Generally, registration of archaeological sites meant the landowner was made aware of the presence of a recorded archaeological site. Recently, the NZHPT has registered a number of archaeological sites as historic places.

2.1.2 Issue: Knowledge of the Historic Heritage Resource

Indicator: I.2. Number and type of historic heritage assessed using best practice assessment standards

Description: Measures change and extent of knowledge of the values of historic heritage in the New Zealand by measuring the proportion of identified historic heritage assessed using best practice assessment standards.

| I.2. Number and type of historic heritage assessed using best practice assessment standards | | |
|--|-------------------|---|
| Historic Heritage | Agency | Information |
| Places (including sites and structures) | NZHPT | No. of post-1993 registered historic places |
| | | No. of reviewed and upgraded registered historic places |
| | | No. of historic places, listed in heritage schedules, assessed using best practice assessment standards |
| Areas | NZHPT | No. of post-1993 registered historic areas |
| | | No. of reviewed and upgraded registered historic areas |
| | Local authorities | No. of reviewed and upgraded listed historic areas |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | NZHPT | No. of reviewed and upgraded registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas |
| Archaeological sites | NZAA | No. of upgraded recorded archaeological sites |

Rationale

28. This indicator analyses the changing proportion of places identified on registers or schedules which have involved the adoption of best practice heritage criteria and/or which were based on best practice assessment processes.
29. Many heritage lists (including the NZHPT register) contain places and sites that were listed without the use of systematic identification or significance assessment standards and methods. A key aspect of improved standards is the establishment of stated criteria or other bases for the assessment of heritage value. Examples of improved standards include section 23 criteria for registration of historic places and historic areas; guidelines for assessing significance (Vossler, 2001), criteria for inclusion in heritage inventories and district plan schedules. These standards require new listings or updated listings to contain information that indicates that the place or item does have heritage value. The information often includes photographs/plans, heritage fabric assessment, historical documentation, and an assessment of heritage value. The standards also outline the process by which heritage value is established, including consultation with building owners and other interested parties.
30. As stated in the Australian Environmental Indicators report, ‘an increasing proportion of identified places with or using best practice heritage assessment criteria or processes reflects an improvement in our understanding of heritage places.’⁶ The indicator also signals an improvement in the quality of the heritage register or list and its usefulness to assist with protective processes and mechanisms.

Discussion

Places and Areas

31. A large number of places currently on the NZHPT Register were listed before 1993 when processes to identify heritage significance were in their infancy. Generally, registrations after 1993 have been required to meet best practice heritage assessment standards and the NZHPT has been upgrading and reviewing a large number of pre-1993 registrations to ensure these places are reassessed using best practice assessment standards.
32. Heritage schedules in district or regional plans have been established by a range of methods. The minimal approach has been the adoption of the NZHPT’s registered historic places and historic areas and the inclusion of these places in the district plan without further assessment or analysis. Another common approach is the inclusion of registered historic places and historic areas with additional heritage places identified from local sources. Some local authorities have ensured best practice heritage assessment standards are adopted as criteria for the listing of items in the heritage schedule. These standards include the preparation of a heritage inventory, photographic recording, consultation with owners, and an assessment of the heritage values of each particular item. These

⁶ Department of the Environment, *Environmental Indicators for National State of the Environment Reporting, natural and historic heritage*, Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p 41

requirements provide key information about what each heritage item is; why it is listed in the district plan; and why it merits protection via rules.

Archaeological Sites

33. The NZAA recognises that some of the information about recorded archaeological sites may be problematic. The problems include locational data, site information, and condition. This situation means that the location of many archaeological sites identified by the NZAA and in the district plans schedules may not be accurate and the condition of such sites is largely unknown.
34. To improve this situation, the NZAA has embarked upon a national site recording scheme upgrade project. This project, partially funded by the Crown and local authorities, involves assessing all recorded archaeological sites in each district. This project is a collaborative venture between the NZAA, local authorities, iwi, and landowners. Further information about the upgrade project is available from the NZAA website (<http://www.nzarchaeology.org/>).

2.2 Historic Heritage Threats/Pressure

2.2.1 Issue: Condition of Historic Heritage

Indicator: I.3. Number of historic heritage destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished

Description: Shows the extent to which historic heritage has been reported as destroyed or severely modified during a set period.

| I.3. Number of historic heritage destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished | | |
|---|-------------------|---|
| Historic Heritage | Agency | Information |
| Places (including sites and structures) | NZHPT | No. of historic place entries removed from the register |
| | Local authorities | No. of resource consents issued to demolish and relocate a listed heritage place No. of resource consents issued to substantially modify a listed heritage place |
| Areas | NZHPT | No. of historic area entries removed from the register |
| | Local authorities | No. of resource consents issued to demolish and relocate a building or structure within a historic area |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | NZHPT | No. of wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas removed from the register |
| | Local authorities | No. of resource consents issued to damage or substantially modify a listed site of significance to Maori |
| Archaeological sites | NZHPT | No. of archaeological sites for which an authority has been granted to allow for modification, damage, or destruction |

Rationale

35. Historic heritage threats can be generally divided between building redevelopment threats, land development, and non-development or heritage decay.

36. Building redevelopment involves the development of land and activities such as demolition, relocations, and additions and alterations. These activities can harm heritage values as demolition may destroy heritage fabric associated with a site and relocation may harm the heritage context of a site. Also inappropriate additions and alterations may compromise the heritage integrity of a place.

37. Land development includes both urban expansion and rural development that includes subdivision, new housing, roading, landscaping and associated earthworks. Land

development can threaten historic sites and often recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites can be damaged by such development.

38. Non-development involves instances where there is little or no economic or social investment in existing buildings and structures. As a result there is little incentive to restore and maintain historic items.
39. Ideally, indicators should indicate if the damage or loss has been caused by natural causes, decay or neglect, human interventions permitted by the resource consent process, or by other activities such as forestry operations.

Discussion

Places, Areas, Sites of Significance to Maori

40. The link between the actual loss of historic places and listings status can be weak. This is because places may remain on the register or schedules long after they have actually been highly modified by removal or alterations or destroyed. The NZHPT, as part of the upgrade and review process, is seeking to improve this situation by ensuring places are removed from the register if they have been destroyed or have been severely modified to the extent that the continued presence of the item on the register cannot be justified.
41. Generally, nearly all local authority district plans in New Zealand require resource consent to demolish, relocate, or carry out substantial alterations and additions to listed buildings and items.
42. Clearly, the numbers of consents involving listed buildings and items can be determined. However, as found in the Australian SOE experience, counting numbers of consents provided little valuable information:

In the case of historic places, it appears at present that information relating to building approvals may not identify whether the particular proposal is beneficial or detrimental to heritage values. All the counting of building approvals would indicate would be a change in the rate of activity – more information would be needed to determine if that activity was detrimental to the condition of the historic environment.⁷

43. Outside the main urban areas, the number of resource consents issued per year involving listed buildings is not large and it may be possible to determine if the consent resulted in substantial and severe loss of heritage values. Within the urban centres, a sample approach is probably the most achievable and can be achieved as part of monitoring the outcomes of resource consent decisions (see indicator I.7 below).

⁷ Department of the Environment, *Environmental Indicators for National State of the Environment Reporting, natural and historic heritage*, Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p 43

Archaeological Sites

44. The NZHPT's archaeological authority database records authorities issued to damage, destroy, or modify archaeological sites. Not all authorities issued, however, actually involve damage or modifications to archaeological sites. For example, in the case of some section 12 archaeological authorities, the authority is issued because there is 'reasonable cause to suspect' that unrecorded archaeological sites may be uncovered by earthworks in an area – the actual work may avoid the archaeological sites. Archaeological authorities may also be issued to enable restorative or mitigation work to take place on archaeological sites and this work would have positive effects on the heritage environment. In addition, there is currently little capacity to monitor many archaeological authority conditions thus the actual result of authorities 'on the ground' is generally unknown. However, reports produced as a result of the conditions of the authorities may provide a starting point.
45. As with numbers of resource consents, further information would be required by a sampling strategy and monitoring of archaeological sites subject to archaeological authorities. This information should become available as part of the NZAA site recording scheme upgrade project.

2.2.1 Issue: Condition of Historic Heritage

Indicator: I.4. The proportion of historic heritage being in good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity

Description: Indicates the physical condition of the historic heritage using a regional sampling audit strategy.

| I.4. The proportion of historic heritage being in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity | | |
|---|-------------------|--|
| Historic Heritage | Agency | Information |
| Places (including sites and structures) | NZHPT | The proportion of registered historic places being in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity |
| | Local authorities | The proportion of listed historic places being in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity |
| | DOC | The proportion of actively managed historic places being in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity |
| Areas | NZHPT | The proportion of historic places within a selected registered historic area being in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity |
| | Local authorities | The proportion of historic places within a selected listed historic area being in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | NZHPT | The proportion of registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas being in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition and integrity |
| | Local authorities | The proportion of listed sites of significance to Maori being in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition and integrity |
| Archaeological sites | NZHPT | The proportion of recorded archaeological sites being in good, fair or poor condition based on physical condition and integrity |

Rationale

46. Sample surveys are a critical method of understanding the ‘state’ of heritage in a particular region or district. Surveys generally involve a brief visit to a place or area and the recording of information about the condition of the place and an assessment of its heritage integrity. These surveys are generally similar to the rapid assessments of condition and integrity adopted in the United Kingdom to understand the state of buildings at risk. In New Zealand, the survey method must also provide for historic areas, sites of significance to Maori, and archaeological sites.
47. Planning and conducting surveys can be a time consuming and expensive exercise. For this reason, any survey should cover the range of historic heritage types and be integrated with surveys to assess the effectiveness of plan, resource consents and archaeological authorities (see indicator I.7 below).
48. For all surveys, Appendix 1 contains a sample survey guide and sampling form.

Discussion

Place Surveys

49. The systematic monitoring of the condition of heritage places by survey has not been carried out at a national or regional level with the exception of the Auckland region. The Australian SOE indicators programme originally attempted to sample the ‘number of heritage places as being in good, average, and poor condition at a national level.’ However, after a review of this sampling programme in 2001, the indicators were amended to include factors such as integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity. These factors were included because it was found that while many buildings or structures were assessed to be in good physical condition, substantial alterations had undermined the integrity of the fabric:

An observation, particularly of commercial premises in urban centres and regional towns, is that they had retained good condition externally (except on their ground floor shop fronts in most cases), but their interiors were substantially modified, and while in good condition, had low internal integrity. Their historical associations and functional significance had been severely diminished as a result. There are, for example, few country town emporiums retaining their internal fittings and internal space characteristics.⁸

50. Other issues raised in the Australian survey included:

- Obtaining permission from owners to visit properties was time and resource consuming.

⁸ Michael Pearson et al, *Knowledge and Condition of Heritage Places and Objects*, Department of the Environment and Heritage, Canberra, 2001, p 34

- Many interiors of buildings were not accessible for survey (only 50% of all places with interiors were accessible).
- To ensure a representative sample was obtained, the survey selections requires planning (rather than random selection) to achieve a balance between rural, suburban and urban places and a balance between residential, commercial, public, industrial place types, and sites of significance to the indigenous people.
- Many remote heritage places were not sampled.
- It was originally planned that community groups would carry out the survey. This ideal, however, was not realised and professional heritage consultants completed the project.
- The survey of historic or conservation areas was difficult in terms of the adopted methodology which was generally designed to assess individual items (rather than groups of items and the relationships between these items in an area or landscape).

51. Despite these limitations, the Australian survey produced valuable documentation about the state of the heritage resource and raised issues relating to the loss of values through changes for new uses, loss of values as result of modernising alterations, threats from urban growth, the state of large former government buildings, the high integrity and good condition of residential buildings, and high maintenance issues with regard to churches.⁹

52. A survey was undertaken of a sample of registered historic places from each local authority area in the greater Wellington region during the summer of 2005. The survey was based on the Australian survey discussed above, though modifications were made to ensure its relevancy to the Wellington region's heritage environment. The survey guide is attached in Appendix 1.

53. In the Wellington region project, the sample of heritage buildings was developed to include a representative selection of places from each local authority area in the greater Wellington region. The sample included a variety of historic places, including commercial, residential and public buildings in a mix of rural and urban locations for each District. It was initially decided to survey 10% of the historic places registered with the NZHPT in each districts; however, this would have resulted in only 1 or 2 buildings in some District and over 30 in Wellington. It was instead decided to survey either 10% of registered buildings in each District as at 2004 numbers, or 5 historic places, whichever was greater.

Area Surveys

54. Measuring change within historic areas has been a neglected activity and there are few international examples of monitoring programmes of historic areas.

55. Information gathered from resource consents databases can provide some guide to change in conservation areas and landscapes. The Australia and New Zealand Heritage Chairs and Officials commissioned a report to examine issues associated with development

⁹ *ibid*, pp 37-38

proposal in heritage precincts.¹⁰ This research reveals that there is a general increase in the rate and magnitude of development proposals within conservation areas in both New Zealand and Australia. Counting numbers of resource consents issued relating to conservation or historic areas however provides little valuable information on the actual outcomes of the consent processes. It is the NZHPT's experience that most consents issued within conservation or historic areas relate to non-heritage related features or structures or involved minor alterations and additions.

56. The Australian and New Zealand Heritage Chairs and Officials report acknowledges the need for better monitoring of changes within conservation and historic areas. It recommends that:

A more detailed study is undertaken across all jurisdictions to track numbers of development proposals, time taken to process, method(s) used and outcomes achieved in order to more accurately determine how effective the methods currently being used are.¹¹

57. Recently, English Heritage has commissioned research to develop methodologies to guide the survey of England's conservation areas. This project involved three London conservation areas, Maryport in Cumbria and two undesignated 'control areas' – Saxon Drive in Ealing and South Maryport, Cumbria.¹² The English Heritage research involved a 'door to door' survey and a recording of individual building elements in a detailed system which concentrated on basic elements such as front elevations, chimneys, roof, walls, and windows. From this information, a survival rating was expressed as the percentage of original fabric that remained. In all, the project surveyed over 1000 buildings. The project highlighted the inherent difficulties in surveying conservation areas especially in terms of resources, the need for professional expertise, time requirements and substantial finance. Also the English survey questioned the need for such a detailed survey of each conservation area:

It is reasonable to question whether such a mechanistic approach is necessary in practice. A basic health-check of a conservation area can be performed empirically by a well-informed conservation professional with relative ease.¹³

58. New Zealand's conservation and historic areas tend to contain a diverse range of buildings and structures from different time periods and displaying a variety of architectural styles. NZHPT and local authority research in Napier and Hastings has focused on identifying heritage buildings within the central business districts. This research has revealed changes over time about what exactly constitutes a 'heritage building' as systems are improved and expanded to reflect changing society values.

¹⁰ National Heritage Managers of Approvals and Advice (NHMAA) Network (A sub-committee of the Australia and New Zealand Heritage Chairs and Officials, *Issues Associated with Development Proposals and Heritage Precincts, A Discussion Paper*, March 2005

¹¹ *ibid*, p iv.

¹² Eddie Booth and David Pickles, 'Measuring Change in Conservation Areas', *Context*, Vol 89, May 2005, pp 20-24 (for the full research paper see: www.english-heritage.org.uk/conservinghistoricplaces/conservationadvice/conservationareas)

¹³ *ibid*, p 24

59. For example, in Napier the research identified a number of post-World War II buildings associated with modern movement architecture. These buildings had not been identified on previous surveys focused on pre-World War II Art Deco buildings. In Hastings, a survey of heritage buildings in 1996 identified 85 heritage buildings mostly associated with Art Deco or Spanish Mission movements. A resurvey of the Hastings CBD in 2004 expanded the schedule to 125 heritage buildings.¹⁴
60. In New Zealand's major urban centres the state of historic townscapes is a growing issue as older parts of cities experience change driven by economic investment, transport, subdivision, and infill housing. Both Auckland and Wellington local authorities have commissioned research to identify changes in the historic townscape environment. Wellington's research has focused on the identification of historic residential townscapes in Thorndon, Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Oriental Bay, Berhampore, and Newtown. In 1998, Wellington City commissioned an Urban Design Evaluation of Mt Cook, Newtown and Berhampore. This research provided statistics of buildings in these areas built before 1919. It was found that in areas such as Mt Cook some 85% of residential houses were built before 1919. The research formed the basis of a consultation project with residents involving both survey and workshops and the Council has proposed a District Plan Change (Plan Change 38) which inserts new character areas into the District Plan with a discretionary rule that applies to the demolition of pre-1930 buildings.¹⁵
61. The NZHPT suggests that the experience of historic and conservation area and landscape research in New Zealand and overseas can be utilised to provide a framework for conservation area and landscape monitoring. The core elements of this framework would involve:
- The selection of a restricted number of defined historic or conservation areas and landscapes for survey. Due to the resources involved, it may only be possible to survey one area or landscape per region per annum.
 - Ideally, a control area that is not recognised as a historic area should be part of the survey project.
 - A basic 'desk top' survey be undertaken of the selected areas involving:
 - Geographical area and boundaries
 - Type and characteristics
 - Location, number, and extent of identified heritage features within area
 - Numbers of resource consents relating to subdivision, alterations and additions, signage, relocation and demolition

¹⁴ See: http://www.historic.org.nz/Register/register_HBproject.html

¹⁵ See: <http://www.wellington.govt.nz/plans/district/planchanges/planchange38.html>

- The basic ‘desk top’ survey should be followed by a physical survey to confirm the location, number and extent of heritage features within an area and provide information on the condition and integrity of the heritage features (as per the general survey described above).
- Ideally, the survey should be repeated on annual basis to provide an indicator of change from the base year data.
- To limit the scope of the survey, it may be necessary to confine the desktop resource consent analysis to number of demolished buildings relating to a period of time. For example, number of resource consents issued to demolish buildings built before 1940.
- In rural historic areas, the primary change indicator may be the number of resource consents issued to subdivide land within an area per annum.

Sites of significance to Maori and archaeological sites

62. With respect to sites of significance and archaeological sites, a similar survey format as used for places and areas can be adopted. However a survey of sites of significance to Maori and archaeological sites would focus on condition and integrity without a need to measure occupation, use and conservation activity. Surveys of sites of significance to Maori and archaeological sites must be conducted with close consultation with the tangata whenua and surveys of archaeological sites should be carried out by a professional archaeologist.

2.3 Historic Heritage Responses

2.3.1 Issue: Protection of historic heritage by Central and Local Government

Indicator: I.5. Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage

Description: Measures any change in the application of statutory protection for heritage places offered by the active use of heritage legislation and resource management legislation.

| I.5. Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|
| Historic Heritage | Agency | Information |
| Places (including sites and structures) | NZHPT | No. of NZHPT properties (historic places) |
| | | No. of NZHPT covenants (historic places) |
| | Local authorities | No. of historic place reserves managed for historic purposes under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act. |
| | DOC | No. of historic place reserves managed under the Reserves Act and Conservation Act |
| Areas | NZHPT | No. of NZHPT properties (historic areas) |
| | | No. of NZHPT covenants (historic areas) |
| | Local authorities | No. of historic area reserves managed for historic purposes under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act |
| | DOC | No. of historic area reserves managed under the Reserves Act and Conservation Act |
| | QEII Trust | No. of QEII covenants established to protect a historic area |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | NZHPT | No. of NZHPT covenants (wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas) |
| | Local authorities | No. of reserves managed to protect sites of significance to Maori under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act |
| | Maori Land Court | No. of Maori reservations established to protect sites of significance |
| | Office of Treaty settlements | No. of statutory acknowledgements relating to sites of significance in claim settlement legislation |
| Archaeological sites | NZHPT | No. of NZHPT covenants (archaeological sites) |

Rationale

63. This indicator attempts to measure any change in the application of statutory protection for heritage places offered by the active use of heritage legislation and resource management legislation. The long term conservation of historic heritage relies, to some extent, on the implementation of available legislative provisions 'on the ground.' For

example, the legislation may provide for a tool to protect historic heritage such as a covenant. However if covenants are never prepared or adopted as provided for in the legislation, there will be not positive heritage outcomes that can be linked to the covenant legislation.

Discussion

NZHPT Properties

64. The Historic Places Act 1993 empowers the NZHPT to ‘manage, administer, and control all historic places, buildings, and other property owned or controlled by the NZHPT, or vested in it, to ensure the protection, preservation, and conservation of such historic places, buildings, and other property.’¹⁶ As at 2005, the NZHPT manages and controls 60 historic properties nationwide.

NZHPT Heritage Covenants

65. The NZHPT can negotiate and agree with the owner of any owner (or lessee/licensee) of any historic place, historic area, wahi tapu, or wahi tapu area for the execution of a heritage covenant to provide for the protection, conservation, and maintenance of that place, area, or wahi tapu.¹⁷

Reserves Act 1977

66. The purpose of the Reserves Act 1977 is to provide for the preservation and management areas of New Zealand that possess, among other values, natural, scenic, historic, cultural, archaeological, biological, geological, scientific, educational, community, or other special features or value. The Act provides for the establishment of a range of reserves including recreation, historic, scenic, scientific, Government purpose, and local purpose reserves. It is an offence to damage any historic sites within any type of reserve classified under the Reserves Act.

Local Government Act 2002: Regional Parks and Reserves

67. Both the Auckland and Wellington regional councils own and maintain a regional parks network and these parks include a number of heritages and structures. Also local authorities own and manage a large number of reserves that have heritage significance.

Conservation Act 1987

68. The purpose of the Conservation Act 1987 is to promote the conservation of New Zealand’s natural and historic resources, and for that purpose to establish a Department of Conservation (DOC). The functions include the management of land for the conservation of historic resources, to advocate for the conservation of historic resources generally, and

¹⁶ sec 39(e) Historic Places Act 1993

¹⁷ sec 6(1), Historic Places Act 1993

to promote the benefits of the conservation of historic resources. It is an offence under the Conservation Act to interfere with or damage any historic or natural feature of, or on, any conservation area.

69. Conservation planning includes national general policies, conservation management strategies, and conservation management plans. The strategies include a number of objectives relating to historic resources. The focus of these objectives is the conservation of historic places on land managed by DOC which are of high historic significance.¹⁸

Heritage Orders

70. The Resource Management Act 1991 provides for a system of heritage orders for the purpose of protecting ‘any place of special interest, character, intrinsic or amenity value or visual appeal, or of special significance to the tangata whenua for spiritual, cultural, or historical reasons; and such area of land (if any) surrounding that place as is reasonably necessary for the purpose of ensuring the protection and reasonable enjoyment of that place.’¹⁹

71. A heritage order is a provision made in a district plan to give effect to a requirement made by a heritage protection authority. A heritage protection authority includes any Minister of the Crown, local authorities, NZHPT, and a body corporate that is approved as a heritage protection authority.

Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977

72. The Queen Elizabeth II Trust Act 1977 established the QEII Trust to ‘encourage and promote the provision, protection, and enhancement of open space for the benefit and enjoyment of people of New Zealand.’²⁰ Open space means any ‘area of land or body of water that serves to preserve or to facilitate the preservation of any landscape of aesthetic, cultural, recreational, scenic, scientific, or social interest or value.’²¹ The Act facilitated a system of open space covenants on private land. The general focus of the covenants has been to protect land with high natural values.

Te Ture Whenua Maori Land Act 1993

73. Historically, the Native Land Court and the Maori Land Court have established Maori reserves for historic purposes or to protect areas of significance to Maori. These sites are now managed under the Te Ture Whenua Maori Land Act 1993. Some of the places, mostly urupa, are vested in the Maori Trustee.

¹⁸ DOC, *Conservation Management Strategy, Vol 1 for Wellington, 1996-2005*, DOC, 1996, p 157

¹⁹ sec 189(1) RMA 1991

²⁰ Long Title, QEII National Trust Act 1977

²¹ sec 2, *ibid*

Claim Settlement Legislation

74. Any Maori person may make a claim against the Crown under the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975. As a result of Waitangi Tribunal inquiries and direct negotiations by the Office of Treaty Settlements, legislation has been passed providing for the settlement of Treaty claims. This legislation often provides for a range of statutory acknowledgements which give recognition to sites or areas of significance to iwi within specific rohe.

2.3.2 Issue: Protection of Historic Heritage by Central and Local Government

Indicator: I.6. Number of historic heritage actively protected by formal statutory instruments

Description: Measures any change in the effective implementation of statutory protection for historic heritage offered by the active use of heritage and resource management legislation.

| I.6. Number of historic heritage actively protected by formal statutory instruments | | |
|--|--|--|
| Historic Heritage | Agency | Information |
| Places (including sites and structures) | NZHPT | No. of conservation plans for NZHPT properties (historic places) |
| | Local authorities | No. of conservation plans for listed historic places |
| | | No. of heritage orders issued under the RMA |
| DOC | No. of conservation plans for actively managed historic places | |
| Areas | NZHPT | No. of conservation plans for NZHPT properties (historic areas) |
| | Local authorities | No. of conservation plans for listed historic areas |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | NZHPT | No. of conservation plans for registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas |
| | Local authorities | No. of conservation plans for listed sites of significance to Maori |
| | Iwi | No. of management plans for listed iwi inventory sites of significance |
| Archaeological sites | NZHPT | No. of conservation/management plans for recorded archaeological sites |

Rationale

75. While the legislation may provide methods to protect heritage places and a number of places may be listed or reserved for protection, there may be little information available to know if actual protection has been achieved. For example, despite a historic place being protected by a covenant or listing in a district plan, the place may be abandoned and left to decay. While information on this issue can be gathered by sample surveys (see indicators I.4 and I.7), it is also proposed to measure the number of historic heritage subject to a conservation plan.

76. A conservation plan is a specific plan for an individual building, site, or structure or a number of places within an area. The plan normally contains a historic heritage assessment, conservation or structural report, and a cyclical maintenance plan. Generally, the existence of a conservation plan indicates that the authority responsible is taking an active interest in a site or group of sites to ensure improved management and conservation.

77. With regard to sites of significance to Maori and archaeological sites, management plans are more common than conservation plans. Management plans contain recommended management actions for a particular site or place, including cyclical maintenance objectives.

2.3.3 Issue: Protection of Historic Heritage by Central and Local Government

Indicator: I.7. Assessment of effectiveness of plan, resource consents and authorities relating to historic heritage

Description: Measures any change in the effective implementation of district and regional plans, resource consents and archaeological authorities.

| I.7. Assessment of effectiveness of plan, resource consents and authorities relating to historic heritage | | |
|--|-------------------|---|
| Historic Heritage | Agency | Information |
| Places (including sites and structures) | Local authorities | The proportion of listed historic places for which resource consents had been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity, occupation and use |
| Areas | Local authorities | The proportion of historic places within a selected listed historic area for which resource consents had been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity, occupation and use |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | Local authorities | The proportion of listed sites of significance to Maori for which resource consents had been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity |
| Archaeological sites | NZHPT | The proportion of recorded archaeological sites for which authorities had been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity |

Rationale

78. Closely aligned to SER is the monitoring of the efficiency and effectiveness of policy statements or plans and the exercise of resource consents. Guidance on plan monitoring has been published by MFE and available on the Quality Planning website.²² Further, a substantial amount of research has been conducted by the Planning Under a Cooperative Mandate Project (PUCM) at the universities of Waikato, Auckland and North Carolina. The results from the first phase of this research project has been published as *Planning for Sustainability: New Zealand Under the RMA*.²³ With regards to historic heritage, Greg Mason at PUCM is completing a large body of research on the effectiveness of plans in relation to historic heritage. The NZHPT anticipates that when this research will become

²² MFE, *District Plan Monitoring, A Guide to Getting Started*, June 2000; Policy and Plan Effectiveness Monitoring, Guidance Note, QP Website (www.qualityplanning.org.nz).

²³ <http://www.waikato.ac.nz/igci/pucm/index.htm>

publicly available, this guidance can be revised and updated so to integrate the findings and recommendations of Greg Mason's research.

79. Heritage rules within regional and district plans are a key method of implementing statutory protection for historic heritage. To determine if regional and district plans are effective in the implementation of statutory mechanisms, an assessment is required of the quality of the heritage rules. Poorly designed rules will not result in the effective protection of heritage places and the converse is true that robust and comprehensive rules will result in effective protection of heritage places.

80. To assess the quality of heritage rules within regional and district plans, some key questions that form the assessment criteria are:

Resource Consent Information Requirements

- Does the plan have resource consent information requirements relating to historic heritage (historic places, areas, sites of significance to Maori, significant archaeological sites)?

Heritage Schedule

- Does the plan have a heritage schedule?
- Does the heritage schedule provide a comprehensive list of historic places, areas, sites of significance to Maori, significant archaeological sites?
- Does the plan include a list of criteria for inclusion of items into the schedule?
- Are the criteria for inclusion of items into the schedule comprehensive?

Heritage Rules

- Does the plan have any rules relating to historic heritage?
- Does the plan have any definitions relating to key historic heritage concepts and activities?
- Are alterations, additions, relocation, demolition, and damage regulated with regard to listed historic heritage items?
- Is subdivision and signage regulated with regard to listed historic heritage items?

81. The second aspect of monitoring is the effect of the exercise of resource consents and archaeological authorities.

82. There appears to be few examples of monitoring in New Zealand relating to historic heritage-related consent/authority monitoring. With regard to resource consents, one example, is the Wellington City Council monitoring project for the period June 2000 to December 2004 which reviewed the heritage effectiveness of the district plan. The following indicators were selected for the project:

- Number of listed buildings, objects, trees and sites of significance.

- Number of buildings and objects identified as meeting the District Plan criteria for protection but not currently listed.
- Number of buildings (incl. Heritage buildings) that are earthquake strengthened during the year.
- Resource consents granted under Rules 21.2.1, 21.2.2 and 21.1.3 in respect of additions and alterations.
- Professional assessment of the effect of approved resource consents for additions and alterations.
- Resource consent applications under Rules 21.3.1 for total or partial destruction of heritage.
- Resource consent applications for Rule 21.3.2 for tree destruction, removal or partial removal.
- Compatibility of design guides with heritage.²⁴

83. Generally the monitoring outcomes were not positive for heritage. With regard to a sample of 55 listed buildings that had resource consents granted, the following occurred:

- Heritage values were enhanced in 9% of cases
- Heritage values were not affected in 36% of cases
- Negative impacts to heritage values occurred in 55% of cases.²⁵

84. Based on the sample data, the report states that ‘we can infer that of the 143 listed heritage buildings granted resource consent since June 2000, 48 have had a more than minor loss of heritage values. This represents 10% of the entire list of heritage buildings and a rapid rate of loss for such a short period.’²⁶ The study also found the loss of heritage has been concentrated in the Wellington CBD with some 85% of resource consents issued since June 2000 located within the central area. The findings of this research have now formed part of the justification for changes to the district plan via Plan Change 43.²⁷

85. This guide proposes a similar survey format as recommended above (indicator I.4). The main modification for this indicator is that places for the survey are not randomly selected from all registered or listed historic heritage, but are randomly selected from those registered, listed or recorded places subject to a resource consent or archaeological authority decision. The intention is to provide evidence of the effect of the resource consent or archaeological authority decision with regard to the existing condition and integrity of the place.

²⁴ WCC, Draft District Plan Monitoring Programme, Effectiveness of the Plan relating to Heritage, June 2000 – December 2004

²⁵ WCC, Draft District Plan Monitoring Programme, Effectiveness of the Plan relating to Heritage, June 2000 – December 2004, p 6

²⁶ *ibid*, p 7

²⁷ WCC, Section 32 Report, Proposed Plan Change 43, Review of Heritage Chapter (www.wcc.govt.nz)

2.3.4 Issue: Resources for Conservation of Historic Heritage

Indicator: I.8. Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage

Description: Measures funds provided and allocated to owners of historic heritage (or community organisations and groups) for heritage conservation from central and local government sources.

| I.8. Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage | | |
|--|-------------------|---|
| Historic Heritage | Agency | Information |
| Places (including sites and structures) | NZLGB | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of historic places |
| | NZHPT | Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund grants for conservation of historic places |
| | Local authorities | Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of historic places |
| | DOC | Total amount of project funds granted for conservation of actively managed historic places |
| Areas | NZLGB | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of historic areas |
| | NZHPT | Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund grants for conservation of historic areas |
| | Local authorities | Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of historic areas |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | NZLGB | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of sites of significance to Maori including wahi tapu |
| | NZHPT | Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund grants for conservation of wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas |
| | Local authorities | Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of listed sites of significance to Maori |
| Archaeological sites | NZLGB | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of archaeological sites |
| | NZHPT | Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund grants for conservation of archaeological sites |

| | | |
|--|-------------------|--|
| | Local authorities | Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of archaeological sites |
|--|-------------------|--|

Rationale

86. The long term conservation of historic heritage is largely dependent on sufficient funding available to support research repair and conservation projects. While regulation may 'protect' a historic place from demolition or removal, if funding assistance is not available, the place may be subject to decay and neglect (demolition by neglect).

New Zealand Lottery Grants Board

87. The New Zealand Lottery Grants Board (NZLGB) is New Zealand's most important source of funding for heritage projects. The criteria for funding assistance are limited to either local authorities, churches, trusts, incorporated societies, or other community organisations.

New Zealand Historic Places Trust

88. In Budget 2003, the Government announced a national heritage preservation incentive fund to be administered by the NZHPT with an annual appropriation approved by Parliament of \$563,000 (GST inclusive). The purpose of the incentive fund is to assist private owners of heritage properties who are unable to access other funding sources such as the New Zealand Lotteries Board. The fund is restricted to owners of Category I historic places or places of national significance.

Local Authorities

89. Many local authorities have formalised a heritage policy or strategy and these strategies often include a grants or funding scheme for historic heritage. The NZHPT has carried out work on developing a guide to heritage incentive funding available from local authorities at district and regional levels.

Appendix 1

SER Historic Heritage Reporting: Background

In 1996, the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment reviewed historic and cultural heritage management in New Zealand. The review highlighted heritage at risk and the need for a national coordination and direction, including the need for the provision of 'high quality information and ongoing monitoring.'²⁸

For the purposes of the first national State of the New Zealand's Environment report, the Ministry for the Environment (MFE) measured the condition of historic heritage resources by counting the number of buildings, Maori sites and archaeological sites destroyed with the consent of the heritage agencies.²⁹ Since 1997, the MFE has expanded the National Environmental Performance Indicators Programme and part of this programme includes cultural heritage indicators. These indicators were developed with the assistance of a Maori Environmental Monitoring Group which provided input at a conceptual level. This initiative provided indicators related to Maori interests in the natural environment, but resulted in limited information with regard to Maori interests in the historic environment.³⁰

In late 1990s, MFE confirmed a large number of environmental indicators for air, fresh water and land and proposed indicators for terrestrial, freshwater, biodiversity, and the marine environment. This resulted in the identification of some 160 indicators. At this stage, the Government established the goals of the indicator program as 'to develop and use indicators to measure and report how well we are looking after our environment.' In particular to:

- To report regularly on the state of New Zealand's environment.
- To measure the performance of our environmental policies and laws.
- To better prioritise policy and to improve decision-making.³¹

MFE have now refocused on New Zealand's priority environmental issues and have identified the following goals:

1. The development of national environmental data which allows MFE to assess trends and emerging issues and that information is used to develop national policies and legislation.
2. The development of measures to monitor the effectiveness of national environmental policies to make sure they work.

²⁸ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, *Historic and Cultural Heritage Management in New Zealand*, 1996, p 95

²⁹ MFE, *The State of New Zealand's Environment*, 1997, p 2.21

³⁰ MFE, *Environmental Performance Indicators, Maori input into the Environmental Performance Indicators Programme*, Wellington, April 1999; Tuanuku Consultants, *Tohu Waotu Maori Environmental Performance Indicators*, Wellington, report for MFE, 1998; For a review see: McClean, R and Smith, T, *The Crown and Flora and Fauna: Legislation, Policies, and Practices, 1983-1998*, Waitangi Tribunal, 2001, pp 682-684

³¹ MFE, 'Environmental Performance Indicators Programme – General Information' (www.mfe.govt.nz)

3. The measurement of the effectiveness of actions being taken by people and public and private sector organisations to encourage greater awareness and action for the environment.
4. The assessment of whether the policies and actions are achieving the environmental results New Zealanders want.³²

The Australian National State of the Environment programme published natural and historic heritage indicators in 1998. The Australian programme aimed to produce a set of key indicators that would 'provide rigorous data describing the major trends in, and impacts on all important elements of Australia's heritage environment.'³³ The Australian programme selected indicators for natural and historic heritage that would satisfy a number of selection criteria including:

- Serve as a robust indicator of environmental change.
- Reflect a fundamental or highly valued aspect of the environment.
- Be either national in scope or applicable to regional environmental issues of national significance.
- Provide an early warning of potential problems.
- Be capable of being monitored to provide statistically verifiable and reproducible data that show trends over time and, preferably, apply to a broad range of environmental regions.
- Be scientifically credible
- Be easy to understand.
- Be monitored regularly with relative ease.
- Be cost-effective.
- Where possible and appropriate, facilitate community involvement.
- Contribute to the fulfilment of reporting obligations under international agreements.

The Australian heritage indicators were first published in 1998 and were refined with the publication of a review report in 2001.³⁴ It is noted the indicators include natural heritage and specific indicators relating to indigenous/aboriginal knowledge, including specific indigenous language indicators.

In 1999, the Australian and New Zealand Environmental and Conservation Council (ANZECC) endorsed a core set of ten historic heritage indicators largely based on the Australian heritage indicators. The ten indicators (P: pressure; R: response; S state) were:

1. Number and distribution of identified heritage items (places and objects S/R).
2. Number of heritage places assessed using best practice assessment standards (R).
3. Number of places destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished (P).

³² MFE, 'The Indicator' August 2004 (<http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/ser/the-indicator/the-indicator-aug-2004.html>)

³³ Department of the Environment, *Environmental Indicators for National State of the Environment Reporting , natural and historic heritage*, Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p 9

³⁴ Department of the Environment, *Implementing State of the Environment Indicators for Knowledge and Condition of Heritage Places and Objects*, Commonwealth of Australia, 2001

4. Number of places reserved for conservation purposes where heritage values have been seriously impaired by visitor use (S/P).
5. Funds provided for maintaining heritage values (R).
6. Amount of funding provided to heritage agencies responsible for heritage places and objects (R).
7. Number of conservation practitioners and training courses (R).
8. Community awareness of and attitudes towards heritage places and objects and their conservation (R).
9. The number of heritage places assessed (by sampling) as being in (i) good (ii) average and (iii) poor condition (S/P).
10. The number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic places (R).

The Auckland Regional Council has invested a substantial amount of resources in cultural-heritage related policy, cultural heritage database, advice and heritage monitoring. In March 2001, the Council developed a draft cultural heritage monitoring network that included a review of national and international cultural heritage monitoring practices.³⁵ The ARC draft indicators adopted the pressure, state, and response model with a particular emphasis on survey and reserve management.

| Draft ARC Cultural Heritage Indicators | |
|---|--|
| P,S, or R | Indicator |
| Pressure | Extent of pest and weed impact |
| | Extent of erosion impact |
| | Extent of natural hazards impact |
| | Extent of visitor impact |
| | Extent of fencing protection |
| | Extent of development impact |
| | Land use |
| | Adjacent landuse |
| State | Overall condition |
| | Extent of loss |
| | Speed of deterioration |
| | Integrity of place or area |
| Response | Extent of management impact on condition |
| | Percentage of recommended management actions carried out since last visit |
| | Percentage of places and areas formally protected |
| | Percentage of places and areas destroyed without resource consent approval |
| | Rate of monitoring resource consent process |

Other regional environment reports include statistics and survey information with regard to historic heritage. For example, the Taranaki Regional Council's *State of the Environment Report 2003*, provides information of historic places within Taranaki with a reference to number of places listed in district plans, on the NZHPT Register, recorded archaeological

³⁵ Lucy Mackintosh, *A Draft Cultural Heritage Monitoring Network for the Auckland Region*, ARC, March 2001

sites, and listed wahi tapu sites.³⁶ The report also provides a review of historic heritage-related protection measures and incentives.

At the district level, some reporting monitoring strategies and reports contain considerable information about historic heritage. For example, Kapiti Coast District Council's monitoring strategy includes a significant section on heritage and tangata whenua. The relevant monitoring objective is 'to monitor the extent to which the district's heritage features are identified and protected.'³⁷ The key indicators are:

- No. of trees/buildings/archaeological sites protected on the Heritage Register.
- No. of trees/buildings/archaeological sites placed on the Heritage Register in the past year through a Plan change.
- No. of resource consent applications involving the modification or destruction of a heritage feature.
- No. of archaeological authorities approved for damage or modification of archaeological sites per annum.
- No. and type of complaints received regarding existing or proposed Heritage features.
- Condition of Historic places and occurrence of modification outside resource consent process.
- Condition of 'high risk' heritage features.
- No. and survey of all historic sites threatened by urban development.³⁸

With regard to the 'Condition of Historic Places' indicator, the monitoring strategy states that the condition of historic places will be assessed every five years, while the condition of 'high risk' heritage features will be assessed annually.

Relevant indicators regarding tangata whenua include the 'No, type and location of Wahi Tapu sites protected in the District Plan' and 'No. of resource consents applied for that involve or affect culturally significant sites or heritage features.'

The Dunedin City Council's *Resource Management Monitoring Programme, Draft Monitoring Strategy*, outlines a number of monitoring requirements that have been prioritised by Council. Within the 'townscape' section, a number of monitoring indicators are relevant to historic heritage including:

- Monitor changes to the schedule of townscape and heritage buildings and sites, together with changes in the state of buildings and facades listed in that schedule.
- Monitor occupancy and type of use of heritage buildings.
- Monitor the costs of renovating a heritage building.³⁹

³⁶ TRC, *Taranaki- Our Place, Our Future, Report on the State of the Environment of the Taranaki Region*, 2003

³⁷ KCDC, *Capturing Our Environment – KCDC Monitoring Strategy*, August 2002

³⁸ *ibid*, p 69

³⁹ Dunedin City Council's *Resource Management Monitoring Programme, Draft Monitoring Strategy*, January 2001, p 42

In Christchurch City, the Council has published an environmental trends report for the Long Term Council Community Plan process. This report has selected two indicators as key information:

1. Total number of heritage buildings, sites and objects in the City
2. Number of heritage buildings, sites or objects at risk of loss or heritage value or demolition.⁴⁰

The Wellington City Built Heritage Policy of July 1998 contained a monitoring plan for 1998-2001. This monitoring plan involved the following indicators:

- Buildings in economic use.
- Resident and owner satisfaction with policy goal.
- Level of major disadvantage to owners from owning a listed building.
- Understanding of how Council protects listed heritage buildings.

In February 2000, Yvonne Legarth, Heritage Adviser for WCC, proposed a new set of indicators for the Built Heritage Policy. These draft indicators included:

- Number of building permits issued to demolish buildings in heritage inventory.
- Number of building permits issued to alter buildings in heritage inventory.
- Number of building permits and resource consents issued to relocate or demolish buildings on heritage schedule in the District Plan.
- Number of building permits and resource consents issued to alter buildings on heritage schedule in the District Plan.
- Number of buildings in the heritage schedule of the District Plan that remain authentic’.
- Number of heritage buildings in a neglected state.
- Number of heritage fund applications for restoration of buildings on the heritage schedule of the District Plan.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Christchurch City Council, *Christchurch City Environmental Trends Report 2003*, Christchurch, October 2003, p 87

⁴¹ Yvonne Legarth, WCC Internal Report to City Development and Business, 14 February 2000

Appendix 2

State of the Environment Report Historic Heritage Indicators Project Historic Heritage Indicator Sampling Form

Local Government Area.....

Place Name.....

Address.....

Site Type (circle one)

| | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Registered Historic Place | Listed Historic Place | Actively Managed Historic Place |
| Registered Historic Area | Listed Historic Area | Actively Managed Historic Area |
| Registered Wahi Tapu | Registered Wahi Tapu Area | Listed Site of Significance to Maori |
| Recorded Archaeological Site | | |

1. Does the place still exist? (circle one answer) Yes No Not Found/
Not Accessible
- What is the apparent condition of the place? (circle answers)
2. Exterior Poor Fair Good
3. Interior Not Accessible Poor Fair Good
4. What is the apparent integrity of the heritage values of the place? Low Medium High
5. Is the place occupied or actively used? Yes No Unknown
6. Does the use appear consistent with the heritage values of the place? Yes No Unknown
7. Has there been recent maintenance work or other works appropriate to its heritage values? Yes No
8. Is the place privately or publicly owned? Private Public Unknown
-

Brief comments (if necessary, eg: any perceived threats to the place)

.....
.....

Name of the person completing this form.....

Date.....

Draft State of the Environment Report Historic Heritage Indicators Explanatory Sample Survey Guidelines

The following guidelines are to assist recorders to make assessments of places, and to enable others to interpret those assessments. They relate to the list of questions addressed by recorders in carrying out the sampling project.

Judgement on Condition

Buildings and structures

Poor There are signs of damage from water penetration, rot, instability or structural failure of buildings, or erosion of major disturbance of sites. This might include the loss of a roof, fire damage, wall collapse or subsidence, major rising or falling damp damage, or major disturbance or damage to the site. Internally walls, floors, or joinery are missing, or in a dilapidated condition.

Fair A building is structurally sound, but has had inadequate maintenance and is in need of minor repair. Internally walls, floors and joinery are in need of minor repair, painting etc. A site retains its important features but these are in need of conservation action and maintenance.

Good A building is structurally sound, weather tight, and with no significant repair needed. Internally walls, floor and joinery are well maintained. A site has its important features well maintained.

Non-buildings: i.e. Sites of significance, archaeological sites

Poor There are signs of damage from earthworks or erosion and major disturbance of sites. This might include loss of major proportions of the site, the construction of non-heritage related structures on the site. The site may be suffering from uncontrolled vegetation growth.

Fair The site has inadequate maintenance and is need of repairs. There may be some minor damage or disturbance and there may be some uncontrolled vegetation growth. The site retains its important features but these are in need of conservation action and maintenance.

Good The site is well maintained and all significant visible features are subject to a program of repair and maintenance. There has been no damage or disturbance to the site.

Buildings and structures

Judgements on Integrity

Low A building has major elements, which would contribute substantially to its heritage values removed or extensively altered. Original cladding of walls or roof may have been replaced with newer materials or removed entirely; interiors may have been removed or destroyed, or re-arranged with the insertion of a new interior. A site has had important features (such as structures, machinery, archaeological deposits etc) removed, or a new structure covers the site.

Where the values of the place do not relate directly to fabric (such as in a place valued for association with an historic event), judgement must be made on the impact of changes in diminishing the ability of the viewer to understand the associations of the place.

Medium There has been some loss of important elements, but the site or building still retains sufficient original or historically associated fabric for its value to be understood and interpreted.

High The features that contribute to the value of the place are very largely intact and not compromised by significant removals, modification or additions.

Non-buildings: i.e. Sites of significance, archaeological sites

Low The site has major elements which would contribute substantially to its heritage values removed or extensively altered. Original significant features have been destroyed, partially destroyed or damaged. Activities, such as dumping and disposal, are carried out on the site that are fundamentally conflicting with the values of the site. The site is difficult to locate or identify.

Medium The site can be located and identified, but there has been some loss of significant features. Despite some damage, the site sufficient original or historically associated features for its value to be understood and interpreted.

High The site can be located and identified and the original and significant features that contribute to the value of the place are intact and not compromised by significant modifications.

Is the use of a place consistent with its heritage values?

Buildings and Structures

The best use for most heritage places is the continuation of their original use. For example the following list of possible continued uses would in most cases be consistent with their heritage values, unless major changes have been made.

- The use of a house or flat for residential use;
- The use of an office block for office accommodation;
- The use of an industrial site for the same industry;
- The use of a farm or property for pastoral or agricultural production;
- The use of military sites for defence purposes;
- The use of government buildings for continuing government functions;
- The use of military sites for defence purposes;
- The use of a bridge, railway or road for transportation;
- The use of a shop for retail sales etc.

New uses may also be consistent with the heritage values if they require minimal changes to the place, and are respectful of the values for which the place is important. Examples might include:

- The use of a warehouse for commercial or residential purposes;
- The use of an office block for medical chambers;
- The use of government buildings for low-impact commercial or community use;
- The use of a place for museum purposes.

Judgement of the compatibility of the use to a heritage place should be based on assessing if the significant fabric and non-fabric values of the place can be retained by such a use.

Sites of significance and archaeological sites

With regard to sites of significance to Maori and archaeological sites, compatible uses involve those activities that have minimal disturbance and uphold tikanga Maori values. In rural areas, compatible uses of archaeological sites will generally involve the maintenance of pasture by light stocking (sheep and goats as opposed to cattle and horses) and the control of vegetation. For sites of significance to Maori inappropriate uses may include the disposal of waste.

Assessing presence of maintenance works

It is sometimes difficult to decide if observed works are of a conservation nature. In this survey a generous interpretation of 'conservation works' is adopted, and would include obvious works such as replaced guttering, recent painting, and construction of sympathetic additions to allow new uses. For sites of significance and archaeological sites, maintenance works may involve coastal protection work, landscaping, and fencing.

Public versus private ownership

If it is useful to know if a place is in public or private ownership. This may not always be apparent to the recorder, so 'unknown' is an acceptable response. Public ownership would include ownership by central government, regional and local authorities, and by government owned bodies.

Sampling Abbreviations

D: Demolished or does not exist
NF: Not found or located

GCE: Good condition exterior
FCE: Fair condition exterior
PCE: Poor condition exterior
GCI: Good condition interior
FCI: Fair condition interior
PCI: Poor condition interior

LI: Low integrity
MI: Medium integrity
HI: High integrity

AU: Active use
NU: No use
CU: Compatible or consistent use
IU: Incompatible or inconsistent use

RW: Recent maintenance work
NW: No recent maintenance work

PR: Private
PU: Public

Appendix 3

Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators

Key:

- I.1 No. and distribution of identified historic heritage
- I.2 No. and type of historic heritage assessed using best practice standards
- I.3 No. of historic heritage destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished
- I.4 The proportion of historic heritage being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity
- I.5 Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage
- I.6 Number of historic heritage actively protected by formal statutory instruments
- I.7 Assessment of effectiveness of plan, resource consents and authorities relating to historic heritage
- I.8 Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators (All agencies) | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|-----|---|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| Historic Places (including sites and structures) | | | | | | | | |
| NZHPT | No. of registered historic places | No. of post-1993 registered historic places | No. of historic places entries removed from the register | The proportion of registered historic places being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and | No. of NZHPT properties (historic places) | No. of conservation plans for NZHPT properties (historic places) | | Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as NHPIF ⁴² grants for conservation of historic places |

⁴² National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund

Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators (All agencies)

| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
|-------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| | | | | conservation activity | | | | |
| | | No. of reviewed and upgraded registered historic places | | | No. of NZHPT covenants (historic places) | | | |
| Local authorities | No. of listed historic places in district and regional plans | No. of places listed in district and regional plan heritage schedules assessed using best practice standards | No. of resource consents issued to demolish and relocate a listed historic place | The proportion of listed historic places being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity | No. of historic place reserves managed for historic purposes under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act | No. of conservation plans for listed historic places | The proportion of listed historic places for which resource consents had been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity, occupation, and use | Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of historic places |
| | | | No. of resource consents issued to substantially modify a listed historic place | | No. of heritage orders issued under the RMA | | | |

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators (All agencies) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|-----|--|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| DOC | No. of actively managed historic places | | | The proportion of actively managed historic places being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity | No. of historic (place) reserves managed under the Reserves Act and Conservation Act | No. of conservation plans for actively managed historic places | | Total amount of project funds granted for conservation of actively managed historic places |
| NZLGB | | | | | | | | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of historic places |
| Historic Areas | | | | | | | | |
| NZHPT | No. of registered historic areas | No. of post-1993 registered historic areas | No. of historic areas entries removed from the register | The proportion of historic places within a selected | No. of NZHPT properties (historic areas) | No. of conservation plans for NZHPT | | Total amount of money approved by |

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators (All agencies) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| | | | | registered historic area being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity | | properties (historic areas) | | NZHPT as NHPIF ⁴³ grants for conservation of historic areas |
| | | No. of reviewed and upgraded registered historic areas | | | No. of NZHPT covenants (historic areas) | | | |
| Local authorities | No. of listed historic areas in district and regional plans | No. of reviewed and upgraded listed heritage areas in district and regional plans | No. of resource consents issued to demolish or relocate a building or structure within a historic area | The proportion of historic places within a selected listed historic area being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, | No. of historic area reserves managed for historic purposes under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act | No. of conservation plans for listed historic areas | The proportion of historic places within a selected listed historic area for which resource consents had | Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of historic areas |

⁴³ National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators (All agencies) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| | | | | integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity | | | been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity, occupation, and use. | |
| NZLGB | | | | | | | | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of historic areas |
| DOC | | | | | No. of historic (area) reserves managed under the Reserves Act and Conservation Act | | | |
| QEII Trust | | | | | No. of QEII covenants established to protect a historic area | | | |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | | | | | | | | |
| NZHPT | No. of registered wahi tapu and wahi | No. of reviewed and upgraded | No. of wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas | The proportion of registered wahi tapu and | No. of NZHPT covenants (wahi tapu and wahi tapu | No. of conservation plans for | | Total amount of money |

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators (All agencies) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|-----|--|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| | tapu areas | registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas | removed from the register | wahi tapu areas being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition and integrity | areas) | registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas | | approved by NZHPT as NHPiF ⁴⁴ grants for conservation of registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas |
| Local authorities | No. of listed sites of significance to Maori in district and regional plans | | No. of resource consents issued to damage or substantially modify a listed site of significance to Maori | The proportion of listed sites of significance to Maori being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition and integrity | No. of reserves managed to protect sites of significance to Maori under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act | No. of conservation plans for listed sites of significance to Maori | | Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of sites of significance to Maori |
| Iwi | No. of sites listed in iwi inventories | | | | | No. of management plans for listed iwi inventory sites of significance | | |
| Maori Land Court | | | | | No. of Maori reservations | | | |

⁴⁴ National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators (All agencies) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------|--|---|-----|-----|---|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| | | | | | established to protect sites of significance | | | |
| Office of Treaty Settlements | | | | | No. of statutory acknowledgements relating to sites of significance in claim settlement legislation | | | |
| NZLGB | | | | | | | | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu |
| Archaeological sites | | | | | | | | |
| NZAA | No. of recorded archaeological sites | No. of upgraded recorded archaeological sites | | The proportion of recorded archaeological sites being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition and integrity | | | | |

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators (All agencies) | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----|--|-----|---|---|--|---|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| NZHPT | No. of archaeological sites registered as a historic place | | No. of archaeological sites for which an authority has been granted to allow for the modification, damage or destruction | | No. of NZHPT covenants (archaeological sites) | No. of conservation or management plans for recorded archaeological sites | The proportion of recorded archaeological sites for which authorities had been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity | Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as NHPIF ⁴⁵ grants for conservation of recorded archaeological sites |
| Local authorities | No. of listed archaeological sites | | | | | | The proportion of listed archaeological sites for which resource consents had been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining | Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of archaeological sites |

⁴⁵ National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators (All agencies) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----|--------------------------------|-----|---|-----|-----------|--|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| | | | | | | | integrity | |
| NZLGB | | | | | | | | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of archaeological sites |

Agencies

Key:

- I.1 No. and distribution of identified historic heritage
- I.2 No. and type of historic heritage assessed using best practice standards
- I.3 No. of historic heritage destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished
- I.4 The proportion of historic heritage being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity
- I.5 Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage
- I.6 Number of historic heritage actively protected by formal statutory instruments
- I.7 Assessment of effectiveness of plan, resource consents and authorities relating to historic heritage
- I.8 Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators: NZHPT Information | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|-----|---|
| Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 | |
| Historic Places (including sites and structures) | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of registered historic places | No. of post-1993 registered historic places | No. of historic places entries removed from the register | The proportion of registered historic places being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity | No. of NZHPT properties (historic places) | No. of conservation plans for NZHPT properties (historic places) | | Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as NHPIF ⁴⁶ grants for conservation of historic places |
| | | No. of reviewed and upgraded registered historic places | | | No. of NZHPT covenants (historic places) | | | |
| Historic Areas | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of registered historic areas | No. of post-1993 registered historic areas | No. of historic areas entries removed from the register | The proportion of historic places within a selected registered historic area | No. of NZHPT properties (historic areas) | No. of conservation plans for NZHPT properties (historic areas) | | Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as NHPIF ⁴⁷ |

⁴⁶ National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund

⁴⁷ National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators: NZHPT Information | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 | |
| | | | being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity | | areas) | | grants for conservation of historic areas | |
| | No. of reviewed and upgraded registered historic areas | | | No. of NZHPT covenants (historic areas) | | | | |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas | No. of reviewed and upgraded registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas | No. of wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas removed from the register | The proportion of registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition and integrity | No. of NZHPT covenants (wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas) | No. of conservation plans for registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas | | Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as NHPIF ⁴⁸ grants for conservation of registered wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas |

⁴⁸ National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators: NZHPT Information | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--|-----|---|---|--|---|
| Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 | |
| Archaeological sites | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of archaeological sites registered as a historic place | | No. of archaeological sites for which an authority has been granted to allow for the modification, damage or destruction | | No. of NZHPT covenants (archaeological sites) | No. of conservation or management plans for recorded archaeological sites | The proportion of recorded archaeological sites for which authorities had been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity | Total amount of money approved by NZHPT as NHPIF ⁴⁹ grants for conservation of recorded archaeological sites |

Key:

- I.1 No. and distribution of identified historic heritage
- I.2 No. and type of historic heritage assessed using best practice standards
- I.3 No. of historic heritage destroyed or whose values have been severely diminished
- I.4 The proportion of historic heritage being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity
- I.5 Number of statutory mechanisms actively used to protect historic heritage
- I.6 Number of historic heritage actively protected by formal statutory instruments
- I.7 Assessment of effectiveness of plan, resource consents and authorities relating to historic heritage
- I.8 Funds provided and allocated for conservation of historic heritage

⁴⁹ National Heritage Preservation Incentive Fund

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators: Local Authority Information | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| Historic Places (including sites and structures) | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of listed historic places in district and regional plans | No. of places listed in district and regional plan heritage schedules assessed using best practice standards | No. of resource consents issued to demolish and relocate a listed historic place | The proportion of listed historic places being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity | No. of historic place reserves managed for historic purposes under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act | No. of conservation plans for listed historic places | The proportion of listed historic places for which resource consents had been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity, occupation, and use | Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of historic places |
| | | | No. of resource consents issued to substantially modify a listed historic place | | No. of heritage orders issued under the RMA | | | |
| Historic Areas | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of listed historic areas in district and regional plans | No. of reviewed and upgraded listed heritage areas in district and regional plans | No. of resource consents issued to demolish or relocate a building or structure within a | The proportion of historic places within a selected listed historic area being in a good, fair or | No. of historic area reserves managed for historic purposes under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act | No. of conservation plans for listed historic areas | The proportion of historic places within a selected listed | Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the |

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators: Local Authority Information | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 | |
| | | | historic area | poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity | | | historic area for which resource consents had been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity, occupation, and use. | conservation of historic areas |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of listed sites of significance to Maori in district and regional plans | | No. of resource consents issued to damage or substantially modify a listed site of significance to Maori | The proportion of listed sites of significance to Maori being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition and integrity | No. of reserves managed to protect sites of significance to Maori under the Reserves Act and Local Govt Act | No. of conservation plans for listed sites of significance to Maori | | Total amount of grant money approved by local authorities for the conservation of sites of significance to Maori |
| Archaeological sites | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of listed archaeological sites | | | | | | The proportion of listed archaeological | Total amount of grant money approved by |

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators: Local Authority Information | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|--------------------------------|-----|-----|---|-----|---|--|
| Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 | |
| | | | | | | | al sites for which resource consents had been granted being in a good, fair or poor condition and retaining integrity | local authorities for the conservation of archaeological sites |

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators: Department of Conservation | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------|-----|---|--|--|-----|--|
| Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 | |
| Historic Places (including sites and structures) | | | | | | | | |
| | No. of actively managed historic places | | | The proportion of actively managed historic places being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on physical condition, integrity, occupation, use and conservation activity | No. of historic (place) reserves managed under the Reserves Act and Conservation Act | No. of conservation plans for actively managed historic places | | Total amount of project funds granted for conservation of actively managed historic places |
| Historic Areas | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | No. of historic (area) reserves managed under the Reserves Act and Conservation Act | | | |

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators: Other Agencies (NZLGB, QEII Trust, Iwi, Maori Land Court, OTS, NZAA) | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|--------------------------------|-----|---|---|-----|---|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| Historic Places (including sites and structures) | | | | | | | | |
| NZLGB | | | | | | | | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of historic places |
| Historic Areas | | | | | | | | |
| QEII Trust | | | | | No. of QEII covenants established to protect a historic area | | | |
| NZLGB | | | | | | | | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of historic areas |
| Sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu | | | | | | | | |
| Iwi | No. of sites listed in iwi inventories | | | | | No. of management plans for listed iwi inventory sites of | | |

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators: Other Agencies (NZLGB, QEII Trust, Iwi, Maori Land Court, OTS, NZAA) | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------------------------|---|---|--------------|-----|---|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| | | | | | | significance | | |
| Maori Land Court | | | | | No. of Maori reservations established to protect sites of significance | | | |
| Office of Treaty Settlements | | | | | No. of statutory acknowledgements relating to sites of significance in claim settlement legislation | | | |
| NZLGB | | | | | | | | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of sites of significance to Maori, including wahi tapu |
| Archaeological sites | | | | | | | | |
| NZAA | No. of recorded archaeological sites | No. of upgraded recorded archaeological sites | | The proportion of recorded archaeological sites being in a good, fair or poor condition, based on | | | | |

| Summary Draft Historic Heritage Indicators: Other Agencies (NZLGB, QEII Trust, Iwi, Maori Land Court, OTS, NZAA) | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-----|-----|--|
| | Knowledge of the historic heritage resource | | Condition of historic heritage | | Protection of historic heritage by central and local government | | | Resources for conservation of historic heritage |
| | I.1 | I.2 | I.3 | I.4 | I.5 | I.6 | I.7 | I.8 |
| | | | | physical condition and integrity | | | | |
| NZLGB | | | | | | | | Total amount of money approved by NZLGB for conservation of archaeological sites |