

PRE HEARING MEETING - HEARING 14 - HISTORIC HERITAGE

Meeting between WDC representatives and HNZPT staff 31 March 2020

Attendees: WDC - Alice Morris(AM) and Ann McEwan (AMcE)
HNZPT - Robin Byron (RB) and Carolyn McAlley (CMcA)

Due to Covid-19 lockdown the meeting was conducted via a zoom conference call

Meeting commenced 2.30pm and concluded 5.10pm

Introduction:

The discussion followed the agenda that had been previously sent via email by AM.

AM introductions; the intent of the meeting was to discuss the buildings HNZPT are seeking to be included on Schedule 30.1 Heritage Items. To allow technical discussion between AMcE and HNZPT.

HNZPT requested that the Rangiriri Heritage Precinct be discussed.

AMcE set out how she had undertaken her assessments and the engagement parameters she worked under in preparing her 2016-17 report.

Research files for each building as these are not connected to the Heritage Reports for each scheduled building; but are available on request.

No on-site visits made; all visual work undertaken from the public domain.

The 2016-17 report and recommendations were presented to Council; there was consultation and Archifacts undertook a peer review of a selectin of buildings. However the version of schedule 30.1 in the notified proposed DP does not reflect AMcE's original recommendations/format and contains errors and omissions.

Building/Site discussion:

Brief discussion on the ability to undertake site visits under the lockdown circumstances difficult. HNZPT advise they have already been to all sites being discussed today; have photos and are familiar with the sites/buildings from the public realm.

Building	Meeting Commentary	
	HNZPT	WDC
Komakorau Hall, 50 Woodlands Road, Gordonton	site visit undertaken; it is no-longer on its original site; been incorporated into the school. Will not pursue this item for scheduling.	-
Former Post Office, 10	An attractive building; it has been relocated a number of times and no	-

Amber Lane, Puketaha	longer linked to original site. Will not pursue this item for scheduling.	
Former Burnett Residence, 11 Luff Place, Ngaruawahia	Agree, due to its relocation there are not the same connections to site. Will not pursue this item for scheduling.	It is scheduled in the ODP and HNZPT List; AMcE did not recommend its inclusion in the PDP due to its relocation .
Former FH Edgcombe Residence, 4250 Riverdale	A site visit undertaken; it is very original, especially the front and side facades and although there are additions to the back it has been maintained as a separate building as it only joins the original building in one area. Therefore, consider the external of the original building intact and has integrity; its location - facing the road and across to a reserve and the Waikato River provides strong context which is important. This item should be protected, and a 'B' ranking would be appropriate.	AMcE did not recommend scheduling; but did state if it was it should be considered a 'B' ranked item. AMcE agreed to review the HNZPT information and would undertake further research on FH Edgcombe to consider if there was further heritage context that she could consider further - however did state she didn't feel it was a strong candidate.
	ACTION: HNZPT to send information to AMcE AMcE to undertake a review	
Firth Industries Cottage, 92B Te Onetea Road, Rangiriri	HNZPT agreed with AMcE opinion - due to its 1881 age the archaeological Authority process would provide the right protection mechanism.	AMcE did not recommend scheduling as in her opinion the site has strong archaeological rather than built heritage significance. It is important to note the archaeological issues and the protection via the HNZPTA
Former Government Department Building, 78 Matangi Street, Matangi	Although a beautiful building, because of its relocation and now used for a private home and the original site is not in the Waikato will not pursue this item for scheduling.	-
Former Mines/King House, 14 Galileo Street, Ngaruawahia	HNZPT considers this building has high integrity. This building should be scheduled. Questioned why it has not continued to be scheduled; it is the best in the street; has good architectural integrity and contributes to the street. RB - the connection to person is not always the key matter of consideration - its originality as a villa and its architecture can elevate its importance as a very good example so context in aesthetics and architectural values is enough; without the need to have social or technical values. It has	AMcE gave some background - owner wanted is scheduled and it is located across the street from the WDC offices. AMcE's opinion - it does not meet criteria of heritage significance and heritage values. While noting past ownership, that was not notable. If it hadn't already been on the ODP she would not had recommended its addition. AMcE is of the opinion not to schedule and shouldn't just because the owner want it to be; and just because it is an example of a villa;

	got a lot of features worthy of protection.	does not consider there is adequate history and strong enough history to provide the depth of heritage values necessary for listing.
	ACTION: HNZPT will send their information to AMcE AMcE will review	
Former Gilmore Bros Shop, 11 Bow Street, Raglan	Acknowledged these buildings have been modified but together they contribute to the street and the town centre, being located on the corners of the main roadway. They also have a relationship with the Cat2 Listed Hotel over the road. Noted AMcE's focus of using the Raglan Design Guide as protection. It is the intersection and these two buildings that 'hold' the corner and is a key element of the character of the area to be protected. If the design guide provides such protection would agree they would not require scheduling.	AMcE described the 'historic character' and the possibility of a precinct. However, although not considering them historic, does not want them removed; considers there could be a need to be a review the design guide to protect context in a more holistic way when considering future development. In her opinion the Raglan Design Guide is the tool. The issue is to address 'historic character/design guidance to address the public realm.
AR Langley Building, 19 Bow Street, raglan		
Kosoof Building/Rimu House, 10 Main Street, Huntly	This building should be scheduled	Agreed; was identified for scheduling in 2016-17 report.
Former Marist Juniorate Training College building, 139 Dominion Road, Tuakau	This building should be scheduled.	Agreed; was identified for scheduling in 2016-17 report.
Taupiri Post Office and Postmasters Residence, 3 The Crescent, Taupiri	This building should be scheduled.	Agreed; was identified for scheduling in 2016-17 report.
Robinsons Boarding House, 79 Wilton Collieries Road, Glen Massey	This building should be scheduled. However, while the front is intact there has been modifications compromising the building (e.g. roof and dormer windows). Acknowledged if the building was scheduled that would afford it funding options. Any flooding risk could be resolved. HNZPT will further consider this buildings following AMcE's advice about mining linkages.	This was identified to be scheduled in the 2016-17 report; remains AMcE's recommendation. Noting that the flood risk issue is problematic and questions that risk, especially as the owners do not have the same concerns as raised by Council. The owners have restored the building. There are no other examples of mining history in Glen Massey; its relationship with the coal mine and

		its links to the past residents and activities in Glen Massey is significant.
	<p>ACTION: AMcE will send her research information to HNZPT HNZPT will review their position.</p>	
Former Huntly Railway Worker's Cottages, Harris Street, Huntly	Agrees with the precinct; accepts 'B' Ranking. It is important to recognise the collective values while ensuring modifications can our more easily (as a 'B' rather than 'A' ranking)	Recommended change to ranking (from 'A' in ODP to 'B') to be consistent with the railway houses in Ngaruawahia; and because they do not have the elevated significant for an 'A' ranking.
Ngaruawahia Centennial Memorial Rooms & Women's Rest Rooms	This building should be scheduled; and Council has a legal obligation to protect it rather than undermining its RMA requirements via planning provisions This building needs advocating for and protected.	Agreed; was identified for scheduling in 2016-17 report. And should not be managed as being "special". To defer to the owners wishes is difficult to defend under s.6 RMA
NZ War Memorial Heritage Inventory items	<p>Will not pursue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Otaua Hall • Tauwhare War Memorial Hall • Tuakau Service Memorial • Waikaretu War Memorial Hall • Te Uku Hall <p>The following should be scheduled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngaruawahia NZ War Memorial • Otaua War Memorial Bowling Green • Te Hoe Hall • Whatawhata Cemetery NZ Wars Memorial • Whitikaku Memorial Hall • Kariotahi School Roll of Honour <p>These need to be anchored into the DP to provide protection that is more robust than what is provided as a result of being identified as a national memorial under the Min C&H.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngaruawahia NZ War Memorial and Whatawhata Cemetery NZ Wars Memorial <p>AMcE not convinced all memorials should be scheduled; is of the opinion this does not have significant heritage value to be scheduled due to modifications. Considers the Min C&H and Burial Act affords appropriate protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Otaua War Memorial Bowling Green <p>AMcE agrees the gates should be protected but not the actual bowling green.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Te Hoe Hall <p>This has architect links - AMcE will review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whitikaku Memorial Hall <p>Agrees this should be scheduled</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kariotahi School Roll of Honour <p>The Hall the Kariotahi School Roll of Honour is in is scheduled so there is already protection.</p>
Rangiriri Cemetery Wall and Arch	HNZPT will pursue the protection of the cemetery as a whole. The gates are integral with the wall that encloses the cemetery so is a collective setting. Feels all of the site should be scheduled; and questions why there is to be reliance only on other types of protection such as the HNZPTA or	AMcE was tasked to schedule built heritage - so the structure is the gate while the setting is the cemetery. Schedule 30.1 focuses on the Wall and Arch in the setting , however as there have been burials in the cemetery since the 1860s it is an archaeological site, so the cemetery's protection should be via the

	<p>Burial Act. There should be a holistic approach to the protection of this site.</p>	<p>HNZPTA/Burial Act.</p>
<p>Rangiriri Heritage Precinct</p>	<p>Agree the hotel and cemetery are both significant features; however the area as a whole has be affected and as a result there is not much to constitute a precinct. But it would be good if there was recognition of a streetscape protect to improve setting and undo some of the existing paving etc to lift what as compromised the history of the area. Will pursue this matter and continue to look into the scope to consider options to get better setting however acknowledge not a heritage precinct.</p>	<p>AMcE recommended the removal of the ODP precinct rules as the hotel and cemetery wall are scheduled. There is nothing else that warrants a precinct. In her opinion there could be a design guide to manage good development outcomes but there should not be a heritage precinct.</p>