

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

Hutt City Proposed District Plan  
Change 56: Enabling Intensification  
in Residential and Commercial Areas

---

**SPEAKING NOTES**

**CHESSA STEVENS – HERITAGE ASSESSMENT**

---

Dated 28 April 2023

## **Heritage Areas That Do Not Contain Individually Identified Heritage Buildings**

1. Refer paragraph 12 to 14 of my Evidence – particularly paragraph 14 which states:

*... it is not necessary for a Heritage Area to contain scheduled heritage items. There are areas where there may be no individual items that meet the criteria for scheduling alone, but where there is a consistency of building age, architectural style, materials, height, shape, site position, and site coverage that give the area physical heritage values. Often, this consistency is the result of development during a specific time period, or for a particular purpose, meaning that they also have historic and social heritage values.*

2. Note that a question similar to this was asked of HNZPT in their oral submission – particularly with relation to the Petone Foreshore Heritage Area and why it should be considered “heritage” under RMA s6(f) if it isn’t listed and has no listed buildings in it. Their response supported paragraph 14 (repeated above) of my Evidence with regards to the definition of “heritage areas”; and paragraph 34 of my Evidence where the heritage values of the Petone Foreshore Heritage Area are identified. In addition, I would make two further points:

- (a) The NZ Heritage list “is not a comprehensive database of all heritage” and this is recognised by HNZPT. This was articulated by Dean Raymond in his response to the question during HNZPT’s oral submission.

- (b) Under the HNZPT Act, there are specific criteria for assessing places for entry onto the NZ Heritage List. These are different to the criteria given in s6(f) of the RMA and the policy statements and district plans prepared under the RMA. The HNZPTA criteria are more specific.

## **Assessment of Beach and Bay Streets**

3. With reference to paragraphs 43 and 48-49 of my Evidence, while my review of the extent of the proposed Petone Foreshore Heritage Area may have been prompted by Laura Skilton’s submission, and while I agree with some of the

points raised in that submission, I have not *relied* on the assessment provided in her submission. I have conducted my own review; and my conclusion is that Beach and Bay Streets, to the extent shown in Figure 1 of my Evidence, have heritage values that are consistent with the values for which the Petone Foreshore Heritage Area is identified in accordance with Policy 21 of the RPS, being:

- (a) The area has high historic values as an example of some of the earliest residential development in Wellington.
  - (b) The area has high physical values derived from the consistent late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century subdivision patterns, and the integrity of its traditionally constructed late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century timber frame buildings. There is also high potential for further information about the past of Petone, Lower Hutt and New Zealand to be revealed through investigation by archaeological methods.
  - (c) The area has high social values, holding sentimental significance for the generations of people who have lived there, and being well recognised by the community as contributing to the shared history and identity of Petone.
  - (d) The area has high rarity for its intact late 19<sup>th</sup> and (predominantly) early 20<sup>th</sup> century residential buildings.
  - (e) The area features good examples of buildings of a particular age and type, conferring a high level of representativeness.
4. The Petone Foreshore Heritage Area as proposed does not include any individually scheduled buildings. Beach and Bay Streets, which are proposed for addition to the Petone Foreshore Heritage Area, do have individually scheduled buildings. However, with reference to above, this is irrelevant.

#### **Distinction Between “Character” And Heritage**

5. I refer to paragraphs 9 to 11 of my s42A Report which explains that the definition of “Heritage” used in the Heritage Inventory Review was taken

directly from Policy 21 of the Wellington Regional Policy Statement (RPS) with which Hutt City Council is required to comply.

### **Representativeness of Heritage Areas**

6. The overall package of heritage areas is representative of all of Lower Hutt's history from the arrival of European settlers in Petone in 1840 to the present day. Periods of significant development in Lower Hutt are, naturally, more strongly represented. These include: early settlement and establishment from as early as the 1840s - but predominantly the later decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century – through to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century; developments centred on the railways predominantly in the 1920s; and mid-century development post WWII through to the 1960s.
7. The Heritage Areas identified in PC56 cover the following timeframes/themes:
  - (a) Early Settlement (c.1860s to 1920s) – Petone Foreshore, Riddler's Crescent
  - (b) Early State Housing (1900s) - Heretaunga Settlement
  - (c) Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century Commercial – Jackson Street
  - (d) Railways (1910s-1930s) – Hutt Road Railway, Moera Railway
  - (e) Mid 20<sup>th</sup> Century State Housing (1940s to 1960s) – Hardham Crescent, Petone State Flats, Wainuiomata Terracrete Homes
  - (f) Mid 20<sup>th</sup> Century Civic – Civic Centre
8. I acknowledge that these areas do not take into account the values of tangata whenua, and not at any point do I wish to imply that I do not see these values as being essential to a full understanding of the historic heritage of Hutt City. Tangata whenua values were excluded from the Heritage Inventory Review undertaken by WSP and Ian Bowman as such values can only be assessed by tangata whenua themselves. Sites of significance to tangata whenua are being separately assessed, as explained by HCC Reporting Officers.

## Accounting for Modifications and Condition

### How Modification was Considered in Heritage Area Assessments

9. Where modifications had destroyed or substantially obscured the physical values of the building that aligned with the physical values of the heritage area and/or where modifications meant that the building no longer aligned with the historic or social values of the area (harder to define as generally intangible). For example, the Kainga Ora property at 87 Adelaide St was raised at the opening of the hearing. The recommendation made by WSP after reviewing the report prepared for Kainga Ora by Dave Pearson was for that property to remain in the Petone State Flats Heritage Area. This was because the modifications changed, but did not entirely obscure, the historic building, which can still be read within its context as sharing the values of neighbouring buildings in that area and/or as contributing to the values of that area. I support this recommendation.

### How Condition was Considered in Heritage Area Assessments

10. In an of itself, condition is not a defining criterion in assessing the heritage values of a place or area. The criteria in Policy 21 (appropriately) make no mention of condition as part of Physical Values:

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

- (i) **archaeological:** *there is potential for archaeological investigation to contribute new or important information about the human history of the district, region or nation.*
- (ii) **architectural:** *the place is notable for its style, design, form, scale, materials, ornamentation, period, craftsmanship or other architectural values.*
- (iii) **technological:** *the place provides evidence of the history of technological development or demonstrates innovation or important methods of construction or design.*

- (iv) **integrity:** *the significant physical values of the place have been largely unmodified.*
- (v) **age:** *the place is particularly old in the context of human occupation of the Wellington region.*
- (vi) **group or townscape values:** *the place is strongly associated with other natural or cultural features in the landscape or townscape, and/or contributes to the heritage values of a wider townscape or landscape setting, and/or it is a landmark.*

11. Condition is only a factor insofar as there may be features of a place that have been lost or modified through deterioration or remediation (temporary or permanent), and this loss or modification impacts on (diminishes) the architectural values, its integrity, or the extent to which it continues to provide evidence of history.
12. If a place is in such poor condition that a sound argument could be made that – on the basis of the extent of replacement required and the unavailability of like-for-like replacement materials – repairing it would result in a complete or near complete loss in authenticity or integrity such that it no longer had heritage value, then this may have a bearing on how condition is considered. However, this can only be determined through detailed condition assessment of a specific place.

### **Independence of Heritage Inventory Review and Evidence**

13. One submitter eluded to his having “inside information” about the Heritage Inventory Review conducted by WSP and Ian Bowman, and accused these parties of giving a predetermined assessment because of the criteria and “subjective scaling” used and, because the work was being prepared for and paid for by council, it was therefore “in favour of council” and was not independent. I refute whole heartedly the insinuation (or, indeed, the outright accusation) that the work undertaken by WSP and Ian Bowman was not independent; or that my Evidence is not independent and in accordance with the Code of Conduct.