

Preparation of Reports for Places Proposed to be Added to the Hutt City Council Heritage Inventory, 2024 - Methodology

Methodology Report

1. Introduction

The authors, heritage consultant Michael Kelly and conservation architect Russell Murray, reviewed the merits of 84 places proposed to be added to the Schedule of Heritage Buildings and Structures as part of the City of Lower Hutt Draft District Plan. This list comprised all the places proposed to be added to the District Plan that had been identified as having 'exceptional' or 'high' overall heritage value by the preceding project undertaken by WSP/Bowman in 2021-2023 (referred to subsequently as the **draft heritage inventory**). Places with lower overall values were not reviewed, but set aside for potential future consideration.

This review was undertaken in two stages between 18 April and 5 August 2024. The inventory reports that are the result of this review are the reports numbered H087 onwards.

2. Report compilation

Site visits were preceded, or sometimes followed, by the preparation of a history for each place, with the description and statements of significance prepared after the visits. The authors separately edited each inventory and the completed drafts were then reviewed by Andrew Banks, Boffa Miskell planner, on behalf of the HCC.

The reports are fully referenced, both to make it clear where the information has come from and to also allow anyone seeking to expand on this work to access those sources easily. In most cases, the footnotes included all the sources used, so where this occurred it is stated in the sources section. Included in those are a number of on-line sources. These are either links to the biographies of construction professionals or on-line references. It is noted that these links may become outdated over time, so the source place is also stated.

3. Prior inventories

The intention was to use any relevant information gathered for previous inventories to assist in the preparation of this work. This included the draft heritage inventory, along with the 2007-11 Inventory Review undertaken by Ian Bowman, Nicole van Ruler, Warwick Johnston, Roberta McIntyre, Elizabeth Pishief and Catriona McBride.

This information has been considered as part of undertaking this review. However, the review of the draft heritage inventory indicated that the majority of reports required a greater level of information and references than they had in order to support the addition of these places to the District Plan. Because of this, the majority of the inventory reports prepared as a result of this review have been prepared anew.

4. Research

Due to time constraints, the vast majority of research was undertaken via desktop. There were some exceptions to this, including some focussed research undertaken at the National Library and the consultation of a range of secondary sources.

Generally speaking, conducting desktop-based research is now much easier than it was in the past, with a range of on-line repositories, search engines and tools available to compile a reasonably coherent history in most cases. The most important sources, in no particular order, were as follows:

Certificates of title, survey plans and other instruments (Land Information New Zealand)

Street directories (these are scanned and searchable up to 1955 on ancestry.com; later dates are available on hard copy at the National Library)

Electoral rolls (these are scanned and searchable on ancestry.com)

Papers Past (National Library)

Building records and other archival material (a very useful amount of information is now accessible digitally at Hutt City Council Archives)

Family records compiled by genealogists (various sites)

Births, Deaths and Marriages (on-line search engine courtesy of Internal Affairs)

Archives New Zealand's digitised material – probates, images, correspondence, files etc.

Secondary sources

Biographies of design and construction professionals (mostly on-line and held by WCC, Te Ara and Engineering NZ)

Published histories of towns, boroughs and cities

5. Inventory report template

The inventory report template that has been used is similar to that used by the draft heritage inventory reports, except for the following changes:

- A 'Summary of Significance' was added to the beginning of each report to succinctly describe the significance of each place.
- The 'History' section has generally been expanded to include subsections covering the history of place, construction professionals and information sources.
- The 'Existing Listing/Scheduling Information' subsection under the 'Physical Description' section has been removed on the basis that this was not relevant to these reports (as none of the places were listed).

- The ‘surroundings’ criterion was not included in the ‘Evaluation’ section of the report. It was considered that the matters covered under this criterion would already be considered under the ‘physical values’ criteria (in particular, under the criterion ‘group or townscape values’), and as such, it need not be separately evaluated.
- The ‘tangata whenua values’ criterion was not included in the ‘Evaluation’ section of the report. This is because places with significance to tangata whenua are provided for separately under the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter of the District Plan.
- The ‘Recommendation’ section has been re-named ‘Place Information’, and the information under this section has been simplified to include identification information to support scheduling.

6. Levels of significance

The draft heritage inventory reports evaluated each criterion as having one of four levels of significance, being ‘None’, ‘Moderate’, ‘High’, and ‘Exceptional’. Upon review, this was considered to be overly complex. Instead, a three level system of ‘Low’, ‘Moderate’ and ‘High’ significance was adopted. A ‘high’ level of significance in any criterion generally (but not always) indicated that the place was worthy of scheduling. Appendix A sets out the general principles used to identify levels of significance under each criterion.

In addition to this, the draft inventory reports prepared by WSP/Bowman included an overall aggregated level of significance, along with aggregated levels of significance under each of the ‘Historical Values’, ‘Physical Values’ and ‘Social Values’ sets of criteria. The updated inventory reports do not include aggregated levels of significance, as there is no meaningful way to aggregate significance across diverse criteria. In any case, Policy 21 of the RPS does not require an aggregation to determination a place’s significance.

The draft heritage inventory reports also categorised individual places as having either national, regional or local significance. The updated inventory reports do not ascribe a geographical significance to each place. This is because the significance of each place in a local context was a principal focus of each evaluation, and ascribing geographical significance may be perceived as de-valuing places that are locally significant, but not regionally or nationally significant. In addition to this, identifying whether a place has national, regional, or local significance is not a requirement of Policy 21 of the RPS.

7. Constraints on inventory work

Accessibility

All properties were viewed from public property – the road or footpath generally – to reflect what is visible to the general public.

Some places were not accessible or visible from the road (or only partly visible) (e.g. the two ambassadorial residences). In those circumstances, building records, including permit and consent plans and historic and contemporary images were used to help with the description of the appearance and fabric of those places. For some cases, only a handful of images were

available, which constrained the preparation of physical descriptions somewhat. In some cases, the only source of relevant recent images was real estate agent websites of recent sales of the property.

Closer viewing of a number of places would enable expansion of the descriptions.

Building interiors were not generally viewed as there are no specific controls in the District Plan to protect interiors. However, the inventories note where the interior of the building might contribute further to its heritage value, as a point of reference for building owners.

Research sources

Most of the histories are long enough (800-1,200 words) to provide a reasonable understanding of the history of each place. In some cases, the available sources did not always produce the anticipated information, so some histories are more extensive than others. Inevitably, more could be found with more research, but in no case is there insufficient information to support a recommended listing. The general public or owners with a keen understanding of a place may provide material that will further flesh out histories.

Consultation

The Council notified the owner of each place proposed to be scheduled in the Draft District Plan. Where feedback was received from owners, this was taken into consideration. Due to the time available, no further consultation was undertaken except where this was requested by the owner.

8. Listing issues

In the course of the report preparation, various issues arose concerning the subject of a listing or the focus or extent of a listing. Where anomalies in listing extents were identified, those matters were resolved with the HCC. These are outlined in the Council's Section 32 report.

9. Insufficient heritage values for listing

1. Some places had insufficient heritage value to recommend listing. In some cases, this became evident during the initial phases of preparing the report and the work on the place was abandoned. Those places were:

Bodhinyanarama Monastery, 17 Rakau Grove, Stokes Valley
Building, 220 Jackson Street, Petone (George Apartments)

2. Places where reports were written to completion and, based on the significance assessment, the conclusion was reached not to recommend listing. These are:

412 Coast Road, Fairview Homestead
1357 Coast Road, Burdan Homestead
227 The Esplanade, Petone
47 Adelaide Road, Petone

Building, 230 Jackson Street, Petone
Building, 293 Jackson Street, Petone
Days Bay Changing Shed
Gibbs House, 391a Muritai Road, Eastbourne

Appendix A: Significance Thresholds

The following table summarises the thresholds used to evaluate the level of significance associated with each building, structure, or area under each criterion. The evaluation criteria are based on those set out in Policy 21 of the RPS.

| Criterion | Level of significance | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High |
| Historic values | | | |
| <i>Themes</i> – the place is associated with important themes in history or patterns of development. | The place represents historical themes that are not particularly important or it does not represent them in a compelling way. | The place represents historical themes that are somewhat important and / or represents them in a convincing way. | The place represents historical themes that are notably important. |
| <i>Events</i> – the place has an association with an important event or events in local, regional, or national history. | No significant event is associated with the place. | The place is associated with past events of some importance, locally, regionally or nationally. | The place is associated with significant past events of local, regional or national importance. |
| <i>People</i> – the place is associated with the life or works of an individual, group or organisation that has made a significant contribution to the district, region or nation. | The place is not associated with any person, group or organisation of historic importance. | The place is associated with a person, group or organisation of some historic importance in the district, region or nation. | The place is associated with a person, group or organisation of notable historic importance in the district, region or nation. |
| <i>Social</i> – the place is associated with everyday experiences from the past and contributes to our understanding of the culture and | The place has little or no association with everyday experiences from the past. | The place offers some insight into everyday experiences from the past and assists understanding of the culture and life of the area. | The place has a strong association with everyday experiences from the past and greatly assists understanding of the culture and life of the area. |

| Criterion | Level of significance | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High |
| life of the district, region, or nation. | | | |
| Physical Values | | | |
| <i>Archaeological</i> - there is potential for archaeological investigation to contribute new or important information about the human history of the district, region, or nation. | The place has only been occupied by humans since 1900, so it is not an archaeological site under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Any archaeology that may have been present has been destroyed by human activity. | The place pre-dates 1900 and there is a possibility that archaeology might be present. | The place contains a recorded archaeological site or the place pre-dates 1900 and there is a strong likelihood that archaeology is present. |
| <i>Architectural</i> - the place is notable for its style, design, form, scale, materials, ornamentation, period, craftsmanship or other architectural values. | The building is of no particular architectural value. | The building has some value for its architecture. | The building has significant value for its architecture. |
| <i>Technological</i> - the place provides evidence of the history of technological development; and/or demonstrates innovation or important methods of construction or design; and/or contains unusual construction materials. | The place exhibits conventional design and construction and materials typical of its time and still well-represented around the region. | The place exhibits some evidence of technological development, innovation or notable construction or design or the use of unusual construction materials. | The place exhibits strong evidence of technological development, innovation or notable construction or design or the use of unusual construction materials. |

| Criterion | Level of significance | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | Moderate | High |
| <i>Integrity</i> - the significant physical values of the place have been largely unmodified. This includes the retention of important modifications and/or additions from later periods. | The place is considerably altered from its original state. | The place retains the majority of its original or early features. | The place is largely authentic. |
| <i>Age</i> - the place is particularly old in the context of human occupation of the Wellington region. | The place is not old by regional standards – circa post-1920. | The place is old but not especially old by regional standards – circa late 19 th century to 1920. | The place is old by regional standards – circa pre-1880. |
| <i>Group or Townscape</i> - 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. | The place is isolated or is not part of a group of like places, or a historic townscape or landscape of interrelated features, or it has no particular presence in the townscape. | The place is part of a group of like places, or a historic townscape or landscape of interrelated features, or it has some presence in the townscape. | The place is part of an important group of like places, or a notable historic townscape or landscape of interrelated features, or has a particularly prominence in the townscape. |
| Social Values | | | |
| <i>Sentiment</i> - the place has strong or special associations with a particular cultural group or community for spiritual, political, social, religious, ethnic, national, symbolic, or commemorative reasons. | No association with a cultural or community group is known. | The place has some association with a cultural group or the wider community. | The place is strongly associated with a cultural group or the wider community. |

| Criterion | Level of significance | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | Low | Moderate | High |
| <i>Recognition</i> - the place is held in high public esteem for its historic heritage values, or its contribution to the sense of identity of a community, to the extent that if it was damaged or destroyed it would cause a sense of loss. | The place is not prominent or well-known by the community. | The place has some local prominence and is relatively well known in the local community. | The place is widely known, even regionally or national prominent. |
| Rarity | | | |
| <i>Rarity</i> - the place is unique or rare within the district or region. | The place is one of many like it. | The place is not common but not rare either. | The place is one of only a small number of similar places or the only one that exists. |
| Representativeness | | | |
| <i>Representativeness</i> - the place is a good example of its type, era or class it represents. | The place lacks physical integrity or the characteristics of a particular type, era or class. | The place has some physical integrity or displays some characteristics of a particular type, era or class. | The place has high physical integrity or displays most or all of the characteristics of a particular type, era or class. |