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Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of a built heritage monitoring study commissioned by Thames Coromandel District Council to assist with its review of the District Plan. The study evaluated the effectiveness of the current built heritage provisions by assessing the quality of outcomes arising from development proposals granted resource consent by the council. Resource consent is required under the Plan rules for additions/alterations to a scheduled heritage building, the demolition or removal of a scheduled heritage building, additions/alterations to a building located in a Heritage Policy Area, new buildings in a Heritage Policy Area, and the demolition or removal of a building in a Heritage Policy Area. The implementation process has also been examined to identify the factors that have promoted and hindered the achievement of positive heritage outcomes, as anticipated by the Plan.

A sample of 45 resource consents was selected for the study; 22 relating to properties in Thames and 23 concerning properties in Coromandel. Each of the properties was visited by an architectural historian and the consent outcomes were assessed against the relevant design criteria specified in the District Plan. Each consent was given an overall score to signify whether the development activities had enhanced, maintained or impacted negatively on the heritage values of the subject property.

The results in Thames showed that:

- 18% of consents enhanced heritage values. This was due to: 1) maintenance and preservation work being carried out to secure the buildings’ structural integrity and ensure their longevity; and 2) adaptive re-use of scheduled buildings that involved sensitive alterations that have enhanced the buildings’ architectural qualities.
- 36% of consents maintained heritage values (i.e. there was no discernable impact). This occurred when: 1) additions and alterations were of a very minor nature; 2) changes were largely unseen from the street; and 3) consents had a mix of positive and negative outcomes that on balance meant there was neither an enhancement nor a loss of values.
- 46% of consents led to a loss of heritage values, although this was largely of a minor and reversible nature. Common reasons for negative impacts were: 1) the use of materials that were not compatible with the subject building; 2) inappropriate siting of signage; and 3) features that were not in-keeping with the subject building.

In comparison, resource consents in Coromandel led to a greater loss of heritage values:

- 9% of consents enhanced heritage values (for similar reasons outlined above).
- 22% maintained heritage values (for similar reasons outlined above).
- 69% led to a loss of heritage values. These outcomes occurred when: 1) new buildings were overly large, poorly designed and/or sited, used inappropriate materials; 2) additions and alterations did not reflect the building’s style, form, scale, construction materials and finishes; 3) new buildings or alterations to existing buildings were at odds with the style, form, scale, construction materials and finishes of adjacent buildings; 4) buildings were demolished or removed from their sites.

A number of factors were found to have influenced the monitoring results, both positively and negatively. These were identified from analysis of documentation relating to the resource
consent applications, as well as through interviews with key informants involved in implementing the District Plan’s heritage provisions. These factors are summarised in the table below. The middle column illustrates the set of circumstances that promoted good outcomes for built heritage via Plan implementation. The right hand column reveals the range of factors that have impeded implementation.

## Summary of Factors Influencing District Plan Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Quality</th>
<th>Promotes Successful Implementation</th>
<th>Impedes Successful Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Large number of scheduled buildings and several HPAs identified</td>
<td>▪ Problems require resource consent for a range of activities</td>
<td>▪ Gaps in the regulatory framework mean some activities do not require consent and/or effects on heritage are not fully considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Design criteria provide guidance to owners and council</td>
<td>▪ Prescriptive implementation guidance limits TCDC’s ability to fully assess effects</td>
<td>▪ Unreliable fact base bringing into question the significance of scheduled buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity and Willingness of TCDC</th>
<th>Promotes Successful Implementation</th>
<th>Impedes Successful Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Staff involved in discussions with owners at an early stage</td>
<td>▪ Skilled staff able to accurately appraise effects</td>
<td>▪ Reactive response to resource consent applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Decision-makers committed to achieving quality outcomes</td>
<td>▪ Staff and decision-makers able to persuade owners to amend plans</td>
<td>▪ Inexperience and/or lack of awareness about heritage amongst planners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity and Willingness of Owners</th>
<th>Promotes Successful Implementation</th>
<th>Impedes Successful Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Personal motivation to protect heritage values</td>
<td>▪ Willing to undertake early discussions with councils</td>
<td>▪ Cost-based approach to commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ High quality applications from appropriately skilled advisors</td>
<td>▪ Lack of regard for and/or awareness of heritage values</td>
<td>▪ Lack of incentives and education initiatives to support regulatory methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Relations between TCDC and Owners</td>
<td>All of the factors in this column</td>
<td>All of the factors in this column</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Characteristics</th>
<th>Promotes Successful Implementation</th>
<th>Impedes Successful Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Significant heritage values</td>
<td>▪ Small-scale projects</td>
<td>▪ Large-scale projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Subdivision patterns</td>
<td>▪ Subdivision patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to the findings of the monitoring study, a series of recommendations are outlined to strengthen both plan quality and its implementation. While the recommendations do not constitute a new policy framework for the District Plan heritage section, they do indicate the areas that have impeded TCDC’s efforts to protect built heritage and provide suggestions as to the nature of the change required.

The table on the following page summarises the recommendations. The changes suggested aim to bolster the Plan’s regulatory methods in terms of their scope (i.e. range of effects addressed), strength (i.e. activity status) and implementation (i.e. extent of guidance offered). Other recommendations aim to support the regulatory framework by boosting owners’ capacity and willingness to comply with the Plan heritage provisions via education and incentives.
## Summary of Recommendations to Improve District Plan Quality and Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Plan Quality</th>
<th>Internal Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Increase the range of matters addressed by the heritage policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regulatory Framework**

- Change the activity status for new buildings in HPAs and external alterations to existing buildings in HPAs from controlled to restricted discretionary
- Change the activity status for demolition, removal or relocation of scheduled buildings from discretionary to non-complying
- Apply new rules, as discretionary restricted or discretionary activities, for: 1) subdivision of a site containing a scheduled heritage building; 2) the construction of buildings on a site containing a scheduled building; and 3) signage attached to a scheduled building or building within an HPA
- Consider introducing a rule for substantial interior alterations that affect the overall heritage values of a scheduled building

**Relationship Between Plan Sections**

- Retain and enhance the provisions for HPAs, and consider renaming
- Make clear in the Plan that the heritage provisions take precedence over the underlying zone provisions

**Implementation Guidance**

- Amend the design criteria by making them less prescriptive and ensuring they cover the full range of matters necessary for each development activity
- Improve information requirements for resource consent applications, including: full plans (showing existing and proposed elevations);

**Fact Base**

- Reassess the significance of buildings on the heritage schedule to ensure that they warrant specific protection
- Upgrade the level of information about buildings on the heritage schedule, including the reasons why they are significant
- Identify building interiors and building surroundings to be protected and include these on the District Plan Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Plan Implementation</th>
<th>Monitoring and Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular and thorough monitoring of compliance with resource consent conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Regulatory Incentives**

- Implement a range of incentives, including waiving resource consent fees, establishment of a heritage fund, provision of free advice
- TCDC to consider employing a heritage advisor

**Education**

- Undertake a range of education initiatives targeting different audiences/needs
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PROJECT OVERVIEW

Historic Heritage is a national planning issue. The 2003 Resource Management Act (RMA) amendments have elevated historic heritage to a matter of national importance (RMA s6(f)) as well as providing a definition of historic heritage where there previously was none. The balancing of historic heritage under the RMA is a particular challenge for councils currently grappling with the best way to identify, protect and manage heritage resources within their District.

The Thames-Coromandel District is an area that seems destined for growth both within its townships and eastern and western coastal communities. This ignites certain pressures on existing and as yet unidentified heritage sites and areas within the District to be protected against inappropriate use and development.

The current District Plan heritage provisions, which have been in place since 1997, had not previously been monitored for ease of use, effectiveness and outcomes. Thames-Coromandel District Council (TCDC) has therefore not know what changes may be required in order to improve heritage protection through the District Plan. Plan monitoring and evaluation is a key component of planning practice, and in New Zealand it is also a legal requirement for local authorities under section 35 of the RMA. The information provided from these activities enables councils to learn from their past experience and improve policies and practices so that desired environmental outcomes are realised.

On the whole, the heritage provisions have provided a good starting point for addressing the adverse effects of activities on heritage values, particularly considering that they were written when the ‘recognition and protection of the heritage values of sites, buildings, places or areas’ was only a section 7 matter in the RMA (now repealed). In doing so, TCDC has scheduled a large number of buildings, as set out in the heritage registers for Thames and Coromandel.\(^1\) It has also identified a range of built areas possessing collective or group historic value, as denoted by the Town Centre, Industrial and Housing Heritage Policy Areas (HPAs). As such, TCDC has attempted to provide a comprehensive regulatory framework for managing the effects of activities on built heritage.

TCDC’s commitment to heritage protection is further demonstrated by the commissioning of this monitoring report. To date, only two other councils in New Zealand have undertaken detailed studies of built heritage outcomes to inform about district plan effectiveness, both of which are larger and better resourced city councils (Wellington and North Shore). TCDC has also prepared a Heritage Strategy (2007), which sets out a range of actions to be undertaken by council in order to enhance outcomes for heritage in the district.

\(^1\) **Note:** referring to the list of heritage buildings identified for protection in the plan as a ‘Register’ risks confusing it with the NZHPT Register under the Historic Places Act 1993. To avoid this, the heritage list is referred to as a ‘schedule’ in this report, which is typical for most district plans.
Project Outline

The objective of the monitoring study has been to inform planning staff about the effectiveness of the built heritage provisions in the Thames-Coromandel District Plan, with respect to scheduled buildings and properties in the HPAs. In doing so, the project firstly identified the range of outcomes that have been achieved under the relevant heritage rules, and secondly examined the implementation process to identify the factors that led to good and poor outcomes. This information has enabled conclusions to be drawn about when and why the Plan was successful. To this end, the effect of the heritage provisions have been analysed (did they work as intended?), as well as the implementation process (has the plan been fully implemented?). This approach has provided robust data for considering Plan effectiveness.

Project Methods and Outputs

The specific steps involved in the monitoring project were:

1. Desk-based review of resource consent applications granted by TCDC, to determine the range of activities that have been consented. This information was provided by council in the form of a heritage consents database.

2. Selection of a sample of protected buildings based on analysis in 1. above. The sample is large enough to enable generalisations about Plan performance. It also contains a representative range of consented activities under the heritage rules.

3. On the ground assessment of consent outcomes compared to design criteria in the District Plan (by Dr. Ann McEwan, architectural historian) to see how closely the outcomes satisfy relevant criteria. Dr. McEwan used a 'structured observation schedule' based on the Plan’ design criteria to ensure a consistent appraisal of each consent (Appendix 1).

4. Review of consent documentation and interviews with key informants to identify the factors that influenced successful Plan implementation.

5. Collation and analysis of results.


Report Layout

The main body of the report is presented in three parts. Part 1 reveals the range of outcomes that have resulted from activities consented by TCDC in both Thames and Coromandel. It also includes discussion on the extent to which the consents satisfied the District Plan design criteria. Part 2 then examines the implementation process and highlights the factors that have helped or hindered the processing of resource consents, using examples from the monitoring data. Finally, Part 3 proffers a number of recommendations aimed at improving the quality of the District Plan provisions and to also strengthen Plan implementation.
PART 1: RESOURCE CONSENT OUTCOMES

The range of outcomes achieved from activities granted resource consent by TCDC is revealed in Part 1 of the report. The activities include:

1. Exterior additions and alterations to scheduled buildings, and demolition, relocation or removal of scheduled buildings.
2. Exterior additions and alterations to non-scheduled buildings in an HPA, and new buildings constructed in an HPA.

These activities require resource consent under the Thames-Coromandel District Plan heritage provisions, the first group as a discretionary activity, the second group as a controlled activity. The outcomes for the resource consents were assessed against the relevant design criteria contained in the District plan to determine the extent to which each activity achieved the stated criteria. In other words, the objective of the assessment was to measure how well resource consents granted by the council corresponded to the outcomes promoted by the Plan. The criteria are intended to assist resource consent applicants to design proposals that take cognisance of a building’s heritage values. The criteria also assist council officers in the decision-making process by providing a framework for assessing the merits of development proposals.

The District Plan applies different design criteria to resource consent applications in Thames and Coromandel. For this reason, Part 1 of the report presents the monitoring results in two main sections, each one canvassing the findings for these towns. In both sections the overall range of outcomes that has been achieved are outlined, and the extent to which applications satisfied the relevant design criteria is considered. Part 1 concludes with a short discussion about the similarities and differences between outcomes in the two townships, as well as observations about the applicability of the design criteria for assessing the effects of applications.

Monitoring Outcomes in Thames

Table 1.1 below shows the breakdown of sample buildings included in the monitoring study for Thames. It illustrates that a total of 22 resource consents were assessed, which related to 19 properties. The properties included 15 scheduled buildings and four sites located in an HPA. Most of the scheduled buildings in the sample (i.e. 12 or 80%) were also located within an HPA, predominantly the Town Centre Zone HPA. The sample of 22 resource consents selected for monitoring in Thames, including a description of the activity, is shown in Appendix 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Buildings in Sample</th>
<th># Scheduled Buildings</th>
<th># Scheduled Buildings in HPA</th>
<th># Non-scheduled Buildings in HPA</th>
<th># Resource Consents Monitored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINAL Built Heritage Monitoring Report, 30th November 2009
The outcomes arising from these resource consents were assessed against the District Plan design criteria (Appendix 1). The same design criteria apply to both scheduled buildings and properties in an HPA. For instance, an addition or alteration to a scheduled building is assessed against the same criteria as an addition or alteration to a building located in an HPA.

**Range of Resource Consent Outcomes Achieved in Thames**

Figures 1.1 and 1.2 below highlight the range of resource consent outcomes that resulted for the sample buildings. They show that consents led to an enhancement of heritage values for four of the buildings (all scheduled), which ranged from minor enhancements (a score of 1) through to a moderate enhancement (a score of 2 or 3). This represents 18% of the total sample in Thames.

The outcomes of a further eight resource consents received a neutral score of zero, which means that there was no discernable impact on the subject property’s heritage values arising from the activity. Four of the consents related to unscheduled properties located in an HPA, whereas the other three applications were for scheduled buildings. Thirty-six percent of consents in the Thames sample received a neutral score.

The remaining ten resource consents led to a loss of heritage values, which represents 46% of the Thames sample. As shown in Figures 1.1 and 1.2, most of these (8 out of 11) caused only a minor loss of heritage values (a score of -1). One consent led to a moderate loss (a score of -2) and one resulted in the total loss of a heritage values for the subject building (a score of -5). All ten consents related to scheduled buildings. Two buildings, Westpac Bank and Hotel Imperial, have had successive resource consents granted that resulted in a loss of heritage values. This indicates a cumulative impact of development on these buildings.
The activities that led to the range of outcomes described above and the reasons for the scores given are now discussed in detail.

*Heritage Values Enhanced*

There are two main reasons why the following four consents were given positive scores, thereby illustrating that they had enhanced the buildings’ heritage values. First, two consents involved work to preserve the long-term integrity of the buildings and, second, two other consents resulted in sensitive alterations to scheduled buildings that have enhanced their architectural qualities.
This resource consent involved repiling the *St Georges Church Hall* (Photo 1). It achieved a minor enhancement of the building’s heritage values (score = 1) because it secured the structural integrity of the building. 

*Note:* On the inventory form the hall has extra French doors in the elevation shown adjacent, which have now been removed. It is unclear when this occurred and there is no record of a resource consent being granted. Also, a proposal exists to construct a building between the hall and the neighbouring St Georges Church so as to provide a connection between the buildings. This assessment does not consider the effect of either of these activities.

Similar to the above example, a resource consent was granted for structural repairs to the *Tararu Cultural Centre* (Photo 2). This involved replacement of piles and bearers, preservation of joists, an external drainage channel around the perimeter of building, and ventilation in new base boards. The drainage works were necessary to minimise damage from flooding. The work was guided by a conservation plan and received funding from the Lotteries Commission. The outcome has led to a minor enhancement of the building’s heritage values (score = 1).

The major elements of the consent for the *Corinthian Lodge* (Photo 3) involved the addition of a conservatory on the north elevation to provide an entrance to the building, the addition of vertical strip windows in the Martha St (east) façade, and skylights and internal deck in roofline. Interior alterations were also carried out to adapt the building for office use. While the original use of the building has changed, the consent outcome reflects a thoughtful architectural interpretation that has been carried out to a high standard. A conservation plan was prepared for the building and the conservation architect who wrote it also peer reviewed the resource consent plans to ensure consistency. The outcome has led to a moderate enhancement of the building’s heritage values (score = 2).
Ironically, the resource consent application that led to the best outcome in Thames was of poor quality with little supporting information and plans. The activity involved the redesign of a ground floor shop at 710 Pollen St (now Chequers Café, Photo 4)). The work included the replacement of an aluminium shop frontage with ‘colonial timber shop front to match’ (quoted from application). The finished work has symmetrical and well-proportioned windows, and uses appropriate materials, colour schemes and signage. The design of the new shop is well-matched to its neighbour (#712), which had already been sympathetically modified. The outcome represents a moderate enhancement of the building’s heritage values (score = 3).

**Heritage Values Maintained**

A number of factors contributed to the neutral outcomes. First, several additions and alterations were of a very minor nature so that they have had a negligible impact on either the subject site or the character of an HPA. Second, work arising from a number of consents was largely unseen from the street, i.e. by being confined to the side or rear of the property. Lastly, some consents have had a mix of positive and negative outcomes that on balance meant there was neither an enhancement nor a loss of values (i.e. the ‘swings and roundabouts’ effect). A number of consents incorporate a mix of these factors.

This consent was for a new dwelling at 204 Davey St, which is in the Housing Zone HPA and sited at the rear of the scheduled Carnegie Public Library (Photo 5). The small 2-bedroom (67m²) dwelling was built for tenancy as part of Thames Pensioner Housing Trust. It has used materials appropriate to the housing in the street (weatherboard cladding, iron roof, wooden joinery), it is of a compatible design and scale with its neighbours, and it has a uniform front yard. A detractor is the light coloured concrete driveway which stands out from the darker footpath and neighbouring driveways.

Two consent outcomes that maintained heritage values involved construction of garages in an HPA. This example involved the demolition of two garages and replacement with one larger garage adjacent to Thames Fire Station in the Town Centre Zone HPA (Photo 6). The garage is not constructed from traditional materials; however it is unobtrusive from the street (sited behind the fire station house) and is surrounded by more modern buildings that are also constructed of non-tradition materials (compared to original buildings in the HPA).
The consent for the *Thames Workingmen’s Club* involved the erection of a small shade sail (24m²) to provide shelter over a parking and storage area (Photo 7). The shade sail is relatively minor in terms of scale and impact on the building, and can be easily reversed. It is located on an addition to the original building and is largely unobtrusive. However, while it is a cheap solution to a minor shelter problem, it does nothing to signal an appreciation of heritage values.

An atypical proposal involved the construction of an emergency generator building at 97 Richmond St (in the Housing Zone HPA, Photo 8) as part of the Thames stormwater upgrade. It is sited on the un-built side of Queen St and so has no immediate neighbours. It is a functional, small scale structure in a classical vestigial design, which does not detract from the wider environment. No information was available as to the site’s previous use and whether there may be archaeological, wahi tapu or other historical values associated with it.

Loss of Heritage Values

As mentioned, the loss of heritage values arising from consents was of a minor nature, and much of the work could be reversed. Common reasons for these impacts include:

- the use of materials that are not compatible with the subject building;
- inappropriate siting of signage; and
- features that are not in-keeping with the subject building, e.g. bifold doors and windows, unpainted joinery.

An exception is a consent that removed a scheduled building from its site and indeed from the Thames-Coromandel District. In this case, the heritage values of the building have been lost and it is unlikely to be put back in its original context.
This example concerned the removal of a single garage located behind the house at 306 Richmond St and its replacement with a double garage to the side and rear of the dwelling (Photo 9). A small extension was also undertaken at the rear, although this is unseen from the street. Attention is drawn to the garage due to its large scale, and its proximity to the house means it competes with it visually. The garage’s placement has also led to a loss of open space to the east. The impact would have been lessened if the gable faced the house to allow a view of the corrugated iron roof, thereby echoing the verandah. Materials used are non-traditional, i.e. metal cladding.

The Thames Club has had external alterations undertaken at the rear and sides of the building involving the insertion of French doors to create a new foyer, replacement of windows with aluminium bifold doors to provide access to the garden (Photo 10), and the addition of a small store room (Photo 11). There was a mix of positive and negative elements to the consented work. On the negative side, the use of aluminium joinery is incompatible with the age and style of the building, and the French doors have been varnished rather than painted. Positively, the store room design has taken on a traditional lean-to form and wide weatherboards have been used in-keeping with the original part of the building (an aerial and air conditioner box on top of the storeroom are a detraction however). The changes largely affect a later addition to the building, not the original. Overall, the outcome has had a minor adverse impact on the buildings heritage values (score = -1).

The application included few details about the proposal and no AEE was evident. The extent of consented changes had to be gleaned from the plans, which were well drawn but did not include existing elevations to contrast the proposed alterations/additions. Historic photos would also have assisted.

This consent was granted to attach two signs to the façade of the former Rural Bank building (now ACC, Photo 12). One sign, a light box set at right angles to the building, has had no effect as it is not attached to heritage fabric and is unobtrusive. The façade sign, however, is prominently located above the entranceway and obscures the ornamental flash relief. Moreover, the design and colour scheme of the sign is not compatible with the building. A minor loss of values has resulted from the poor quality signage on a high quality classical façade. It is reversible, however. Note: while not part of the assessment, the need for maintenance of the façade is evident.
This consent was carried out by TCDC and involves the installation of a ramp to provide disabled access to the Carnegie Public Library (Photos 13 and 14). The provision of disabled access is entirely appropriate and has been well located along the side and rear of the building. However, there is a low-quality ‘feel’ to the finish of the ramp and railing. The metal railing is incompatible in terms of colour and materials. Moreover, the reflective concrete path is highly visible and is not matched to the existing footpath (it needed aggregate mix to darken it). Overall, there has been a poor material choice and the overall finish does not reflect the high quality of the scheduled building. A minor loss of heritage values has resulted (score = -1).

The Westpac Bank Building has had three resource consents granted under the current District Plan. They were for the insertion of an ATM machine (1998), the installation of a fixed frame awning above the automatic teller machine (1999) and signage on the façade (2003). The first two consents were assessed as having a minor adverse effect on the building’s heritage values (each consent scored -1, Photos 15 and 16).

While the ATM has been fitted neatly inside an existing window opening it does close the window off and partially undermines the building’s window symmetry. It also uses materials and a corporate colour scheme that is not entirely complimentary to the building.

The fixed canopy is confined to the window opening and maintains views of the fanlight. However, it interrupts the flatness of the façade and introduces a new straight-edged form in contrast with the window headers. Therefore, it does not maintain the building’s window symmetry. The materials used for canopy are also new to the building. It is possible that placement of the ATM and canopy into the middle recessed window bay may have lessened the canopy projection.

The outcomes represent a cumulative negative impact on the building, although the effects are not permanent as the work could be reversed.
As with the Westpac Building, the Imperial Hotel has had several consents granted for exterior alterations. The first (1998) involved the re-instatement of two corner doors (previously filled in) and the replacement of aluminium windows with bi-fold timber joinery, including lowering the sill heights (Photos 17 and 18). The window symmetry has been partially undermined by the cutting down of the windows. The introduction of different window/door design and the unpainted joinery is conspicuously out-of-keeping with the remainder of the building. The latter aspect can be simply rectified through painting.

The second consent (2001) was to cut-down an existing window on the Sealey St East façade (Photo 19) and replace it with a solid double timber door (the green door). While there has been an attempt to maintain the proportion of the opening it has again resulted in the alteration to the building’s original fenestration. Once more, the new door is of a different style (the original entranceway on Pollen St could have been used as a guide to all new frames and doors). Both consents led to a loss of heritage values; the first consent was scored at -2 and the second at -1. The impact of the consents is cumulative and so overall the outcome represents a moderate loss of heritage values for the building (-3).

There are a number of compliance issues associated with this building. Firstly, the plans for the first resource consent indicate the cut-down windows would match the existing window style, whereas the actual windows are different. Secondly, the plans indicate that the new window and door joinery would be painted to match the existing windows, which has not occurred. Thirdly, the plans for the second consent indicated a solid double door would be used whereas the actual door is a single door (however the opening is narrow so it is difficult to see how double doors would have fitted in the first place). Fourthly, the end window on the Sealey St East façade has also been cut down to form a door (in this case unpainted timber) but seemingly without consent.

The worst outcome for a sample building in Thames occurred when the former Thames Plunket Rooms was relocated from its original site in Queen St (Photo 20) to a rural property in Pipiroa (Hauraki District) in 2000 (Photo 21).
The consent process did not identify the building’s heritage values in a useful and timely fashion – an assessment of the building’s values was required as a condition of consent, i.e. it was carried out after the decision to remove the building had been made. The relocation has resulted in the total loss of the Plunket Rooms to the Thames-Coromandel District. The building is now divorced from its context and former use given it is located in a paddock behind a dwelling in Pipiroa, presumably for use as secondary accommodation (Photo 21). It is a case too of the building being considered in isolation of its surroundings, as on its original site it stood in close proximity to a playground and Thames Band Rooms, which are relevant to the building’s broader historic and cultural heritage values.

**Residential Buildings in Thames**

As noted earlier, the District Plan includes separate design criteria for residential and commercial buildings in Thames. The criteria relate to both additions and alterations (scheduled buildings and properties in an HPA) and new buildings within an HPA. Altogether there were seven resource consents for residential buildings in Thames. The next section considers the extent to which consent outcomes satisfied the relevant design criteria for these buildings.

**Correlation between Resource Consent Outcomes and District Plan Assessment Criteria**

Figure 1.3 (following page) illustrates how closely the resource consents granted by TCDC correspond to the design criteria for residential buildings. The graph represents the proportion of consents that achieved the design criteria in full, in part, or not at all. It also shows when it was not possible to tell if a criterion had been met, typically because there was insufficient information included with the application or on the plans. Not all criteria were relevant to each consent and this too is reflected in Figure 1.3.

Two criteria have been satisfied in all relevant consents: criterion 9 relating to the location of additions at the side or rear of buildings; and criterion 18 for front yards that are in-keeping with neighbouring properties. A further two criteria have been partially satisfied in most relevant consents, namely whether traditional building forms with details extracted from the original have been used (criterion 13) and whether the form and character of the original building incorporates elements resembling the proportions and materials of the original (criterion 15). Criterion 5 was a mixed bag (was the use of synthetic “low maintenance” materials, such as imitation brick or stone, avoided?); half of the relevant consents avoided such materials whereas the other half did not. For five criteria, it was either not possible to tell if the consents had been satisfied or else they were not relevant to the proposal (numbers 1, 7, 8, 11 and 16). For instance, none of the consents in Thames for residential buildings involved utilization of the roof space (criterion 11). There are no obvious trends for the remaining criteria, a reflection perhaps of the relatively small number of consents involved (seven).
District Plan Design Criteria 1-19 for Figure 1.3 above:

1. Were original decorative features (such as decorative glass, ornate sawn and turned timberwork, pressed steel and plaster work) retained?
2. Were verandahs and porches kept open?
3. Were the original windows and doors retained?
4. Were wooden frames replaced with aluminium frames?
5. Was the use of synthetic “low maintenance” materials (such as imitation brick or stone) avoided?
6. Were the use of pressed metal tiles and raised profile and other modern profiles of roofing iron on cottage, villa and bungalow roofs avoided?
7. Were wooden ornament, verandah posts, friezes, balustrades, roof trims and painted timber window frames retained where present?
8. Where these were damaged or missing were they replaced to match the original patterns?
9. Have extensions been confined to the rear or sides of the building?
10. Are extensions obvious from the street?
11. If the existing roof space has been utilized, was it high enough without changing the exterior of the building?
12. Do additions to the roof match the proportions of the original house?
13. Have traditional building forms with details extracted from the original been used?
14. Have existing details been reproduced?
15. Where an exact reproduction is not attempted, has the form and character of the original building been matched with new elements resembling the proportions and materials of the original?
16. Have existing door and window openings been retained?
17. Have new openings been kept to a minimum?
18. Are front yards in keeping with neighbouring properties?
19. Are garages behind or beside the house, or as close to the street frontage and as far away from the house as possible?
Outcomes for Residential Buildings in Thames

The overall outcomes for residential buildings in Thames are presented in Figure 1.4 below. They show that only two resource consents (or 29%) led to a loss of heritage values, whereas five consents (or 71%) did not. This compares favourably with the total findings for Thames, where 50% of consents led to a loss of heritage values. Figure 1.5 illustrates that of the two consents that did impact negatively the effects are reversible for one building, but are unlikely to be reversed for the other.

![Figure 1.4: Have Resource Consents for Residential Buildings in Thames Led to a Loss of Heritage Values? (n=7)](chart)

![Figure 1.5: Is the Loss of Heritage Values for Residential Buildings in Thames Permanent or Unlikely to be Reversed? (n=2)](chart)

Commercial Buildings in Thames

This section considers the monitoring results for commercial buildings in Thames. The majority of resource consents in the Thames sample relate to this category; 68% (or 15) of the consents were for commercial buildings. The term ‘non-residential’ is a more accurate reference for these buildings as they do not all have a commercial focus (e.g. St George’s Church Hall and the Thames Workingmen’s Club).

Correlation between Resource Consent Outcomes and District Plan Assessment Criteria

Fourteen resource consents involved external additions and alterations to commercial buildings in Thames. Figure 1.6 (following page) reveals the extent to which these 14 consents achieved the relevant District Plan design criteria. The most striking observation is that the
Figure 1.6: Did Resource Consents for Commercial Buildings in Thames Achieve Relevant District Plan Design Criteria? (n=14)

District Plan Design Criteria 1-22 for Figure 1.6 above:

1. Is the new building one-and-a-half or two storeys?
2. If one-and-a-half storey, is it composed of an appropriately designed parapet?
3. Is the frontage of the new building a similar height to nearby buildings?
4. Are building frontages constructed at the street reserve boundary with no setbacks? (except the western side of Cochrane and Pahau Streets)
5. Does the building occupy the full width of the site at the street frontage (except where an alleyway for pedestrian access is provided)?
6. Do verandah facades have a solid appearance with window openings following the proportions of solid to void?
7. Have long facades been broken into bays with solid wall punctuated with windows or groups of windows arranged symmetrically across the 1st storey façade?
8. Are facades visually subdivided into a ground floor, fenestrated first floor and a capping element?
9. Are windows symmetrical and proportioned with the historic buildings of the area?
10. Has the rhythm of solids to voids in the facade been organised in symmetrical proportions, alternating strong and weak elements in the façade?
11. Has timber construction been used?
12. Have the heritage guidelines, including colour schemes and building diagrams been followed.
13. Do buildings provide parapets and cornices?
14. Do colour schemes emphasise and complement the architectural character and detailing of a heritage building? (Heritage colour schemes are preferred)
15. Where appropriate, do buildings define the corner?
16. If an infill building, have verandahs been provided?
17. Are verandahs continuous with adjacent verandahs?
18. Are signs on buildings integrated with the architectural design of the building and the street?
19. Have large scale above verandah signs and advertising structures been used?
20. Have large parts of the first floor facade, especially the windows, been covered?
21. Do shop fronts in infill buildings have recessed doorways to provide extra window display space and create a space for people to shop without disturbing the pedestrian traffic flow?
22. Are decorations on buildings in the Grahamstown area simple or robust?
criteria were not applicable to the consented activities in most circumstances. For instance, criterion 12 was not applicable because the council has not prepared the necessary heritage guidelines. As well, criteria 1, 2, 3, 7, 15 and 16 relate to the construction of new commercial buildings, but there were no such consent applications in the Thames sample. This indicates that there have not been a lot of new commercial buildings constructed within the Town Centre Zone HPA in Thames since the District Plan was proposed. It also demonstrates that scheduled heritage buildings along the main street have not been demolished over this time, as this would result in the construction of new buildings.

The criterion that has been satisfied the most (no. 11) shows that timber construction has been used in more than half of the relevant consents. The criterion relating to whether the colour schemes emphasises and complements the architectural character and detailing of a heritage building (no. 14) has been achieved in 21% of consents, achieved in part in 42% and not achieved in 33% of consents.

**Outcomes for Commercial Buildings in Thames**

Figure 1.7 below shows that, in sum, consents for commercial buildings in Thames led to a loss of heritage values in 53% of cases, whereas 47% of consents did not (this includes the fourteen consents discussed above plus the one involving the removal of the Thames Plunket rooms). Thus, not only is there more pressure to develop non-residential buildings than residential (due to the greater number of consents granted), but also commercial development is slowly undermining the qualities that have led the buildings to be protected in the first instance, albeit to a minor extent only in most instances.

Another contrast with the results for residential buildings is that the negative effects of consented activities are unlikely to be reversed in 62% of cases (Figure 1.8 following page). This indicates that more substantial changes are being made to commercial buildings that make their reversal either impossible due to loss of heritage fabric or impractical due to cost.

Figure 1.7: Have Resource Consents for Commercial Buildings in Thames Led to a Loss of Heritage Values? (n=15)
Figure 1.8: Is the Loss of Heritage Values for Commercial Buildings in Thames Permanent or Unlikely to be Reversed? (n=8)

- Yes: 62%
- No: 38%
Monitoring Outcomes in Coromandel

Table 1.2 below shows the breakdown of sample buildings included in the monitoring study for Coromandel. It illustrates that a total of 23 resource consents were assessed, which related to 17 properties. The properties included 15 scheduled buildings and two unscheduled properties located in an HPA. Just over half of the scheduled buildings in the sample (i.e. 8 or 53%) were also located within the Town Centre Zone HPA. The sample of 23 resource consents in Coromandel, including a description of the activity, is shown in Appendix 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.2: Breakdown of Sample Buildings in Coromandel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Buildings in Sample</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of Resource Consent Outcomes Achieved in Coromandel

Figures 1.9 and 1.10 below present the range of resource consent outcomes that resulted for the sample buildings. They show that consents led to an enhancement of heritage values in two cases (both scheduled buildings); one led to a minor enhancement of values (a score of 1), the other to a moderate enhancement (a score of 2). Together, these represent 9% of the total sample in Coromandel.

The outcomes of five consents received a neutral score of zero, which means that the heritage values of the subject property were unaffected by the activity. Each consent was for a scheduled building. In total, 22% of consents in Coromandel received a neutral score.

The remaining 16 resource consents led to a loss of heritage values, which represents 69% of the Coromandel sample. As shown in Figures 1.9 and 1.10, the extent to which heritage values were undermined was more pronounced than in Thames:
- five consents were assessed as causing minor loss only (scores of -1);
- six consents had a moderate impact (scores of -2 and -3)
- five consents led to a significant loss of heritage values (scores of -4 and -5) and their eligibility for scheduling may be reviewed as a result.

![Figure 1.9: Resource Consent Outcomes in Coromandel (n=23)](image)
The activities that led to the range of outcomes described above and the reasons for the scores given are now discussed in detail.

**Heritage Values Enhanced**

The reasons why the following two consents were given positive scores are the same as for the Thames sample. The first consent involved work to preserve the long-term integrity of the building and the second resulted in sensitive alteration to scheduled dwelling that has enhanced its architectural qualities.
The effect of this consent, granted in 2002 for the TCDC Area Office, is similar to the outcomes for the St George’s Church Hall and Tararu Cultural Centre in Thames. The work involved securing the structural integrity of the building, including reproofing, repairing/replacing areas of the subfloor structure, repairing external timber work, and reconfiguring the sealed parking area to drain stormwater away from the building. The building was also painted to match earlier colours revealed from scrapings (Photo 22). All work was based on recommendations in a Condition Report completed Burgess and Treep Architects in 2000. Overall the outcome represents a minor enhancement of heritage values (score =1).

The second consent that led to an enhancement of heritage values was for Karamana Homestead. Granted in 1998, it concerned the addition of two on-suite bathrooms to each of the existing guest bedrooms on eastern side of house (Photo 23). The addition was extended along this side of the house as a veranda. As well, the rear of the building was converted back to a covered porch arrangement, which was the previous form of this part of the dwelling (this aspect of the application was not visible). The addition is of a similar height, size and proportion to the dwelling, and is constructed of appropriate materials (weatherboard, iron roof, timber verandah posts). The moderate positive outcome recognises the sensitive addition as well as the removal of ‘infill’ at the rear. The planting to obscure the addition as outlined in the consent application has achieved its purpose.

Heritage Values Maintained

Again, consents that had neither a positive nor negative impact on heritage values were similar in nature to those in Thames. They were of a very minor nature and/or they were largely unseen from the street and/or they had both positive and negative aspects (i.e. the ‘swings and roundabouts’ effect). A number of examples are elucidated below.

A second consent was granted for the TCDC Area Office in 2005, this time involving the replacement of a window with French doors in the kitchen of a post-1990 addition to the building (Photo 24). The alteration has maintained the height, size and proportion of the modern addition, which is sympathetic to the original structure. The materials and colours used, and detailing of the French doors are also complimentary. Overall the alteration has had no effect on the building’s heritage values.
As shown in Figure 1.10 (above), the majority of resource consent outcomes had a negative impact on heritage values, a number of which were significant. These outcomes occurred when:

- new buildings (including accessory buildings) were overly large, poorly designed and/or sited, used inappropriate materials;
- additions and alterations did not reflect the building’s style, form, scale, construction materials and finishes;

The resource consent granted for a dwelling referred to as *Four Oaks* (1699 Rings Rd) involved the demolition of two sheds to accommodate an addition to the rear of the dwelling. The application also included the construction of a stand-alone garage which is discussed under the next heading. The addition is inconspicuously sited at the rear of the dwelling (Photo 25). It is large in size but the height, proportion and materials used is in-keeping with the cottage. Overall, the addition has maintained the buildings heritage values. Pre-consent photos of the rear elevation, including the sheds (which may have contributed to the property’s heritage values), would have assisted in assessing more fully the impact of the addition.

This resource consent was for a new storeroom/office building erected in the back yard of the property occupied by *Weta Design* (Photo 26). The building’s height, size, proportion and design is in-keeping with the subject site and also in relation to neighbouring buildings. As a result, the building has had no discernible impact on heritage values. Evidence for the use of the site previously would have been useful, e.g. if both commercial and residential activities were taking place here the new building would equate to a loss of outdoor area/living space. The information provided with the application was minimal.

This consent for 222 Watt St involved alterations to an original two-room minor’s cottage (re-roofing, insertion of new windows), as well as the demolition of a corrugated iron lean-to and construction of a new weatherboard lean-to for kitchen, dining and living (Photo 27). According to TCDC and NZHPT, the condition of the cottage was very poor and the work was considered necessary to ensure its retention. The overall score of zero balances the retention of the cottage against the loss of the early lean-to, the loss of the corrugated iron cladding, and the additional window openings. Fifty-percent of resource consent fee was waived by TCDC.

*Loss of Heritage Values*

As shown in Figure 1.10 (above), the majority of resource consent outcomes had a negative impact on heritage values, a number of which were significant. These outcomes occurred when:

- new buildings (including accessory buildings) were overly large, poorly designed and/or sited, used inappropriate materials;
- additions and alterations did not reflect the building’s style, form, scale, construction materials and finishes;
- new buildings or alterations to existing buildings were at odds with the style, form, scale, construction materials and finishes of adjacent buildings;
- buildings were demolished or removed from their sites.

These poor outcomes are illustrated in the following resource consents.

These two consents are similar in that they involve the construction of accessory buildings adjacent to scheduled buildings. The first relates to a carport erected in front of an existing garage at 316 Wharf Rd (Photo 28). The carport does not relate well to the scheduled dwelling or its wider surroundings in terms of form (e.g. monopitch roof) or choice of materials. Overall, it has had a minor negative impact on the dwelling by making car-parking more visually prominent (score = -1). The resource consent application did not include elevations or details of proposed materials.

The second consent, for the property Four Oaks at 1699 Rings Rd, concerns a garage located in the front and side yards (Photo 29). The form of the garage is better matched to the dwelling and surroundings, although it has introduced a new element to the streetscape as it is the only detached garage close the street. Overall, the garage changes the relationship of the house to the street and has had a minor adverse impact (score = -1).

A point to note about both examples is that consent is not required under the District Plan for new buildings on the property of a scheduled building. Consent was required for the first example only because the carport encroached on the side yard and exceeded the site coverage. The proposal for the new garage was part of an application for a rear addition to the house, which did require consent under the heritage rules.

This consent involves the construction of a new mixed commercial/residential building at 112 Wharf Rd, which is a prominent location on one of Coromandel’s main streets. The site is in the Town Centre Zone HPA. The ground floor is occupied by two commercial units and the first floor has two residential units (Photo 30). A small dwelling located at the rear of the property was demolished to make way for the development.

Aspects of the design that comply with the district plan are that it addresses the street, occupies the full width of the site, and expresses its own identity while also reflecting the built character of the surrounding environment. However, the height, size, proportion and scale of the new building are only partially in-keeping with adjacent buildings (it is similar in size to the neighbouring Admiral Arms hotel and the Star and Garter further up the street).
A resource consent for the Coromandel Café was granted in 1999 for the construction of a new verandah (Photos 32 and 33). The building is not scheduled but is located within the Town Centre Zone HPA. It is not clear when this building was constructed, although it appears to have been an electrical shop in 1965.

The materials used for the verandah are in-keeping with its neighbours, i.e. timber posts and iron roof. However, the height and proportion of the verandah is only partially in-keeping with the building and adjoining shops. It is larger and higher than its immediate neighbours and is somewhat disruptive in the streetscape as a result. The bullnose form of the verandah is also an entirely new element; there are no other bullnose verandahs in the town. According to the application, the design was based on a verandah on a building in Thames (719 Pollen St), rather than those adjoining the Cafe. Sheet cladding has also been used on the underside of the verandah, rather than weatherboard or iron. Overall, the consented work has had a negative impact on the subject building and streetscape (score = -2).

There have been other significant alterations to the building as well since 1999, including changes to the ground floor exterior, fenestration and parapet. There is no information on the property file to suggest that resource consent was applied for or granted for the work.

This example demonstrates the cumulative impact multiple consents can have on a scheduled building, in this case Assay House, which occupies a prominent corner site in the centre of Coromandel (Photos 34 and 35). Four consents have been granted for the building, two retrospectively as the work was already underway or completed before TCDC became involved. A third consent was required for internal alterations.
The scheduled property at 234 Tiki Rd is the former vicarage for the Anglican Church nearby (Photo 38). Extending between the Church and the vicarage is a small cemetery. It is difficult to see the scheduled dwelling because a new house has been erected in the front yard following a subdivision in 1993 (Photo 36). The inventory form states that the house and gardens were often used for Saturday afternoon garden parties and that it was still used as a vicarage until very recently.

Resource consent was granted in 2007 to alter the single residence into two units, remove the rear additions (modern), and restore the verandah. This aspect of the work had not been undertaken at the time of assessment. However, a more significant aspect of the application that was well underway was the construction of a 12 unit accommodation block to the rear of the house, occupying the back yard (Photo 37). This much larger development did not require consent under the existing heritage rules, as it did not physically affect the scheduled dwelling.

Altogether, the four consents involved: 1) retrospective consent to construct a mezzanine floor in the rear third of the building; insert new windows, a new door and a low deck at the rear of the building; construct an external stairway leading to the mezzanine; 2) converting the building to a Café, including a small extension to house a chiller and toilet; 3) interior alterations to widen an existing opening in the wall between the Café and lounge; and 4) retrospective consent for an accessory building (a shipping refrigeration container).

The most obvious outcome is the fencing (Photo 34) erected to screen the container, but which extends up to the building and largely hides the small extension made to house the chiller/toilet. The fencing is oversized and does nothing to complement the heritage values of the building or its site. The container that necessitated the fence has been removed – perhaps the fence could be taken down as a consequence. Overall, the consents have had a moderate impact on the building (score of -2), but this is largely reversible.
The scheduled building at 205 Hauraki Rd was granted consent to raise the building by approx 1.6m to comply with Environment Waikato’s recommended 100 year flood level. It was discovered at this time that the building had been extensively modified without consent, including the replacement of wooden cladding with plastic cladding, and replacement of wooden joinery with aluminium (outlined in Consent Decision). In the council’s view, “enforcement action would not be appropriate for the unauthorised alterations given that the historic character of the building would be reduced by the raising of the floor level” (quoted from Consent Decision). The dwelling had been highly altered at the time it was scheduled (Photo 40), which brings into question the justification for scheduling in the first place.

The council planner was right in that raising the building has significantly undermined what remained of the building’s heritage values (Photo 39). Further, the reason for scheduling the building in the first place is not clear. The poor outcome, which has been given a score of -4, reflects both consented and unconsented activities.

About the only original feature – the chimney – was demolished when the dwelling was raised.

Positive aspects of the work include the use of materials (weatherboard cladding, iron roof) and roof form that are appropriate to the site and vicinity. However, the size of the accommodation block is considerably greater in relation to the dwelling and neighbouring houses. The new building is also largely out-of-place in a residential environment, although there are motel cabins situated nearby. The site coverage has been increased significantly, which is particularly relevant given the former use of the gardens for Church functions. Overall, the consent has led to a moderate negative impact on the dwelling’s and property’s heritage values (score = -3).

An important historic landscape comprising the Church, cemetery and vicarage has been compromised by multiple elements, not just the consented activity, including subdivision and construction of new dwellings.
These final four examples reflect the worst outcomes in Coromandel. Two of the consents involved the demolition of scheduled buildings – *The Bizarre* and *Kahakaharoa Cottage*. A third consent related to the demolition of the *Moehou Tearooms*, which burnt down in suspicious circumstances before the application had been approved. The fourth example involved the relocation of a scheduled dwelling without resource consent from 444/448 Wharf Rd to 87 Whangapoua Rd.

The Bizarre: The inventory form states that the original early 1900s two-storey building on site was burnt down in 1929 and replaced by the single storey building in 1930 (Photo 41). The Bizarre thus represented the depression-era commercial economy, which provided an interesting new note in the Coromandel historic heritage story. Reasons given for the demolition were that it was in a poor condition, that it was an unpleasant building to be in due to cold and safety concerns, and the costs of restoration would be high. The owners of the building had wanted to demolish the building some years previously, but the heritage assessment from council’s advisor at the time recommended keeping the building and spending money to carry out necessary repairs and maintenance at a fraction of the cost of rebuilding. This obviously did not happen and consent was granted three years later for the demolition.

Kahakaharoa Cottage: A similar situation led to the demolition of this cottage (Photo 43). The condition of the building had deteriorated and when the owner applied to demolish the dwelling the council’s assessment was that: ‘The building is in a severe state of disrepair and Council’s Building Department have declared the building fit for condemnation and technically unsafe for habitation after a safe and sanitary inspection was undertaken’ (from TCDC Planners Report). NZHPT undertook a site visit and assessment and were of the opinion that given the state of disrepair that there was little point in a heritage assessment being required or that the building be restored (the building was not registered by NZHPT). The building had deteriorated notably since Photo 43 was taken in 1993 and some temporary repairs had been made to the house using asbestos sheet cladding, which compromised the architectural and structural authenticity of building.
Former Moehau Tea Rooms: The site occupied by the Moehau Tearooms was proposed for a mix use development, with three commercial units and 19 residential apartments within the Town Centre Zone HPA. The proposal involved the demolition of the building in Photo 45, which was scheduled in the District Plan. The scale of the proposal meant that the application was publicly notified and TCDC declined consent on the basis that the proposed development was out of keeping with the site and surroundings in terms of its scale and intensity of use. The owner appealed to the Environment Court, but in the meantime the scheduled building was destroyed in a fire. As indicated in Photo 45, the façade of the Tearooms had already been modified and the interior was also substantially altered.

Dwelling, 444/448 Wharf Rd: The dwelling in Photo 47 was removed from its site by the owner and relocated to a property on Whangapoua Rd, despite it being scheduled in the Plan. It is not clear why a resource consent was not required by TCDC, especially given that the owner submitted a building consent application first. This would typically alert TCDC planners to the proposal and initiate contact with the owner to ensure compliance with the District Plan. It is possible that TCDC planning staff were not regularly checking building consent applications at this time (staff now check all building consents). The dwelling has been substantially added to in its new location (also without consent).
Residential Buildings in Coromandel

As was the case in Thames, the outcomes arising from these resource consents were assessed against the District Plan design criteria (Appendix 1). Unlike Thames, the criteria for Coromandel are not separated into residential and commercial categories. However, for consistency and to enable comparison between Thames and Coromandel, the results below are divided into outcomes for residential and commercial buildings.

Correlation between Resource Consent Outcomes and District Plan Assessment Criteria

The design criteria relate to effects arising from external additions and alterations and new buildings. Altogether, there were ten resource consents for residential buildings in the Coromandel sample involving these activities. Figure 1.11 (following page) shows the extent to which the outcomes correspond to the relevant design criteria. As with the Thames results, it was not always possible to tell if a criterion had been met and not all criteria were relevant to each consent.

Six criteria were satisfied in 50% or more of relevant consents. These relate to whether:
- the building was set back from the street boundary (criterion 1);
- the building addresses the street (criterion 2);
- additions and new buildings are generally of a similar height, size and proportion (criterion 7);
- additions and new buildings maintain the scale of adjacent buildings (criterion 8);
- roofs are pitched, single plan sloping away from the street front, hipped or lean to (criterion 9);
- materials are typical of those used in Coromandel township e.g. timber, corrugated iron and plaster finished masonry (criterion 17).

Three criteria were partially satisfied or not satisfied at all in 50% or more of relevant consents. These concern whether:
- new buildings have regard to the characteristics of the overall Coromandel township and in particular the site's immediate environment, i.e. neighbouring buildings (criterion 4);
- new buildings express their own identity while respecting the pattern and character of the immediate and overall environment (criterion 5);
- site coverage has been varied with site size and between localities to reflect historic size, and between localities to reflect historic local patterns of development (criterion 14).

Criterion 16 was not applicable because TCDC has yet to produce the colour guidelines, and criteria 3, 11 and 12 were not applicable because they relate to commercial buildings.

---

2 Coromandel also has a large number of criteria relating to colour schemes and signage for commercial buildings. However, resource consent is not required for painting and none of the resource consent applications in the Coromandel sample involved signage. As a result, these additional criteria have not been used. The design criteria for additions and alterations include a criterion for colour schemes so this aspect has been considered.
Figure 1.11: Did Resource Consents for Residential Buildings in Coromandel Achieve Relevant District Plan Design Criteria? (n=10)

District Plan Design Criteria 1-17 for Figure 1.11 above:

1. Is the building set back from the street boundary?
2. Does the building address the street?
3. Does the building occupy the full width of the site (unless there is a pedestrian pathway no greater than 1.2 metres)?
4. Do new buildings have regard to the characteristics of the overall Coromandel township and in particular the site’s immediate environment, i.e. neighbouring buildings?
5. Do new buildings express their own identity while respecting the pattern and character of the immediate and overall environment?
6. Do new buildings respect the surrounding types of construction, range of materials, and colours?
7. Are additions and new buildings generally of a similar height, size and proportion?
8. Do additions and new buildings maintain the scale of adjacent buildings? (They should not be the tallest or lowest building in the street)
9. Are roofs pitched (at no less than 25 degrees), single plan sloping away from the street front, hipped or lean to?
10. Do the proportion of openings, e.g. doors and windows to solid wall, recognise the proportions of those elements in neighbouring buildings?
11. Are distinct connected building elements in neighbouring buildings, e.g. shop front, verandah and parapet, included in new buildings and additions?
12. Do all retail shops (existing or new) have a verandah running the full width of the building and covering the full width of the footpath? (Except where there is no evidence of their having existed)
13. Does the use of similar building forms, e.g. parapets, verandahs and roofs maintain the existing built rhythm?
14. Has site coverage been varied with site size and between localities to reflect historic size, and between localities to reflect historic local patterns of development?
15. Has subdivision been permitted that intensifies traditional local densities?
16. For new buildings and additions/alterations to existing buildings, have exterior colours including roofs, been selected from the range of colours described in the colour guidelines?
17. Are materials typical of those used in Coromandel township e.g. timber, corrugated iron and plaster finished masonry? (Use of materials typical of neighbouring buildings will help to maintain their sense of character)
Outcomes for Residential Buildings in Coromandel

The overall outcomes for residential buildings in Coromandel are highlighted in Figure 1.12 below. The graph includes the ten consents discussed above as well as the two involving the demolition of Kahakaharoa Cottage and the non-consented removal of the residential dwelling from 444/448 Wharf Rd. Eight resource consents (or 66%) led to a loss of heritage values, two consents (or 17%) had a partial impact, and two consents had no adverse effect.

Figure 1.13 illustrates that the negative effects of the majority of consents are unlikely to be reversed (9 out of 10, or 90%). The monitoring results reveal that outcomes for residential buildings are considerably poorer in Coromandel compared with those in Thames.
Commercial Buildings in Coromandel

This final section of Part 1 outlines the monitoring results for commercial buildings in Coromandel. The criteria are the same as those used to assess outcomes for residential buildings because, as mentioned, the District Plan does not distinguish between building types as is the case for Thames.

Correlation between Resource Consent Outcomes and District Plan Assessment Criteria

Nine resource consents in the Coromandel sample concerned additions/alterations and new buildings. Figure 1.14 (following page) reveals the extent to which they achieved the relevant District Plan design criteria.

As with the residential buildings in Coromandel, several of the criteria were satisfied in 50% or more of relevant consents. These relate to whether:
- the building was set back from the street boundary (criterion 1);
- the building addresses the street (criterion 2);
- materials are typical of those used in Coromandel township e.g. timber, corrugated iron and plaster finished masonry (criterion 17).

Four criteria were partially satisfied or not satisfied at all in 50% or more of relevant consents. These had regard to whether:
- the building occupies the full width of the site (criterion 3);
- additions and new buildings are generally of a similar height, size and proportion (criterion 7);
- the use of similar building forms, e.g. parapets, verandahs and roofs maintain the existing built rhythm (criterion 13);
- site coverage has been varied with site size and between localities to reflect historic size, and between localities to reflect historic local patterns of development (criterion 14).

One criterion, relating to whether subdivision had been permitted that intensified traditional local densities (no. 15), was not applicable as none of the consents for commercial buildings involved subdivision. Again, criterion 16 was not applicable due to the absence of the colour guidelines mentioned.
Figure 1.14: Did Resource Consents for Commercial Buildings in Coromandel Achieve Relevant District Plan Design Criteria? (n=9)
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District Plan Design Criteria 1-17 for Figure 1.14 above:

23. Is the building set back from the street boundary?
24. Does the building address the street?
25. Does the building occupy the full width of the site (unless there is a pedestrian pathway no greater than 1.2 metres)?
26. Do new buildings have regard to the characteristics of the overall Coromandel township and in particular the site's immediate environment, i.e. neighbouring buildings?
27. Do new buildings express their own identity while respecting the pattern and character of the immediate and overall environment?
28. Do new buildings respect the surrounding types of construction, range of materials, and colours?
29. Are additions and new buildings generally of a similar height, size and proportion?
30. Do additions and new buildings maintain the scale of adjacent buildings? (They should not be the tallest or lowest building in the street)
31. Are roofs pitched (at no less than 25 degrees), single plan sloping away from the street front, hipped or lean to?
32. Do the proportion of openings, e.g. doors and windows to solid wall, recognise the proportions of those elements in neighbouring buildings?
33. Are distinct connected building elements in neighbouring buildings, e.g. shop front, verandah and parapet, included in new buildings and additions?
34. Do all retail shops (existing or new) have a verandah running the full width of the building and covering the full width of the footpath? (Except where there is no evidence of their having existed)
35. Does the use of similar building forms, e.g. parapets, verandahs and roofs maintain the existing built rhythm?
36. Has site coverage been varied with site size and between localities to reflect historic size, and between localities to reflect historic local patterns of development?
37. Has subdivision been permitted that intensifies traditional local densities?
38. For new buildings and additions/alterations to existing buildings, have exterior colours including roofs, been selected from the range of colours described in the colour guidelines?
39. Are materials typical of those used in Coromandel township e.g. timber, corrugated iron and plaster finished masonry? (Use of materials typical of neighbouring buildings will help to maintain their sense of character)
Outcomes for Commercial Buildings in Coromandel

The overall outcomes for commercial buildings in Coromandel are highlighted in Figure 1.15 below, including the nine consents outlined above and two consents for the demolition of the former Bizarre building and the Moehau Tearooms.

The figures show that eight resource consents (or 73%) led to a loss of heritage values, whereas three consents (or 27%) had no adverse effect. Figure 1.16 illustrates that the effects of three-quarters of consents (6 out of 8) are unlikely to be reversed.

![Figure 1.15: Have Resource Consents for Commercial Buildings in Coromandel Led to a Loss of Heritage Values? (n=11)](image)

![Figure 1.16: Is the Loss of Heritage Values for Commercial Buildings in Coromandel Permanent or Unlikely to be Reversed? (n=8)](image)
PART 2: DISTRICT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

In Part 2, the implementation process is considered with regard to the factors that promote or prevent good outcomes being achieved. Implementation relates to the legal requirement for owners to apply for resource consent under the District Plan heritage provisions, and the obligation on TCDC to assess such applications and make decisions about their compliance with the Plan.

From a theoretical point of view, district plans have been characterised as ‘conformance-based’, which means that council decisions on consent applications should be in conformity with plan provisions. The conformance-based view of plan implementation assumes that the plan represents a clear understanding about the issue or problem in question and its causes, and that the plan methods (rules and non-regulatory instruments) are necessary and sufficient for countering the issue or problem. The goal of monitoring resource consent outcomes and evaluating the effectiveness of the Plan is to determine whether these assumptions have played out in practice. An important component of such an evaluation is to understand how and why the implementation process influenced Plan effectiveness.

Three types of data have informed Part 2 of the report: 1) the monitoring outcomes set out in Part 1; 2) analysis of documentation relating to the resource consent process where available (i.e. applications, TCDC reports and decisions, and written advice provided by council’s heritage consultant); and 3) interviews with three key informants, namely a TCDC resource consent planner with experience applying the heritage provisions, council’s heritage consultant who assesses applications and advises TCDC as to their suitability, and a former representative of the NZHPT who has provided comments on proposals affecting buildings registered under the Historic Places Act 1993.

Factors that Influence Plan Implementation

Planning researchers have identified several key ingredients that are influential in ensuring a district plan is implemented in practice. Research in Wellington and North Shore, which investigated the implementation of district plan provisions for built heritage, confirmed that these factors did influence the quality of outcomes achieved via the resource consent process. The same factors have influenced achievement of outcomes in Thames and Coromandel, as

4 In general, the amount of information available on the property files was limited. Therefore, the consent documentation did not provide as rich a source of information about implementation as had been anticipated.
Table 2.1: Factors Influencing District Plan Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. District plan quality</td>
<td>Plan quality relates to the extent to which:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- historic heritage issues are clearly identified and communicated in the District Plan;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the cascade of Plan provisions (i.e. issues-objectives-policies-methods-outcomes) are internally consistent and mutually reinforcing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Plan provisions have been developed using a sound fact-base;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Plan provisions are comprehensive and sufficiently strong to address the worst effects arising from development activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- implementation guidance is provided in the Plan to assist both consent applicants and council personnel in understanding and applying the heritage provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Capacity and willingness of TCDC to heritage provisions</td>
<td>Council capacity relates to the human and monetary resources available for implementing the heritage provisions. In terms of staff, aspects such as the number of planners, their education level and degree of technical knowledge are relevant. As well, adequate funding is required in order to implement non-regulatory methods, as well as providing on-going training to staff. Commitment, on the other hand, refers to the dedication of staff, including planners, their managers and politicians, to achieving the goals of the Plan. Commitment is also reflected in the willingness of a council to adequately fund the implementation effort and to enforce the plan provisions through the development control process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capacity and willingness of owners to comply with heritage provisions</td>
<td>Applicant capacity is a measure of the knowledge owners have of the Plan and its intentions, as well as the resources at their disposal to execute Plan policies in practice, such as by engaging consultants with necessary technical knowledge. Applicant commitment to comply with the Plan is characterised by their feelings of responsibility for designing a proposal that avoids or at least minimises adverse impacts. Commitment can also be demonstrated through an applicant's willingness to pay for specialist input in the planning and design of a development proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Negotiations between TCDC and owners</td>
<td>Negotiations that occur between council personnel and owners during the resource consent process can secure better outcomes than might otherwise be realised, especially if an owner seeks the views of the council at an early stage. Negotiations between NZHPT staff, TCDC and owners can also lead to improved outcomes. Any of the other factors described here can strengthen or weaken the council's negotiation position, e.g. quality of heritage provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Characteristics of the development for which consent is required</td>
<td>Characteristics of a development can affect outcomes, including the type, scale and location of the subject building, the type and scale of the project, and the quality of the development site e.g. its heritage significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The extent to which each of these factors has influenced the outcomes achieved under the heritage provisions is now explained. Recommendations are made in Part 3 for addressing identified limitations.

1. District Plan Quality

This is the largest section because the quality of the District Plan provisions is of paramount concern when it comes to heritage protection (and other Plan issues). Several aspects of the District Plan framework for heritage protection have constrained TCDC’s ability to secure good outcomes. These include:

- weaknesses in the internal consistency of heritage provisions;
gaps in the regulatory framework, namely inconsistencies in the activity status afforded to activities, the lack of controls for new buildings on a site containing a scheduled building, and the lack of provisions to protect the broad range of heritage values set out in the RMA; 
conflicts between the intentions of the heritage provisions and those of the underlying zone; 
prescriptive implementation guidance, including insufficient information requirements for resource consent applications, and formulaic design criteria that do not enable a full assessment of effects on heritage values; 
an unreliable fact base to support the scheduling of many buildings, as reflected by a lack of historical research.

These shortcomings in the District Plan framework are highlighted below and illustrated with monitoring outcomes where relevant.

Weaknesses in Internal Consistency

A scoping study commissioned by Environment Waikato identified that the heritage provisions in the Plan lack internal consistency due to weak policies that are both limited in number and short on detail. The role of policies in RMA plans is to outline the agreed course of action required to achieve the objective(s). Plan methods in turn state the particular techniques to be used to implement the policies. The existing heritage objective in the TCDC District Plan is:

To conserve, protect and enhance the buildings, items, streetscapes, trees, landscape features, archaeological sites and Wahi Tapu, which are of recognised significant cultural, historic, architectural, aesthetic, scientific or special heritage value in the District and to ensure that new works do not compromise those values.

The single objective is to be achieved by the following two policies:

1. To provide for the effective protection of objects, sites, places and buildings with heritage value.
2. To enhance and promote heritage values wherever possible throughout the District.

While case law has determined that policies may be flexible or inflexible, broad or narrow, or highly specific, having detailed policies is advantageous for a couple of reasons. First, they can provide clear guidance to resource consent applicants and council decision-makers about the intentions of the plan in achieving the heritage objective. This helps to create certainty about council’s stance on heritage protection and the means by which it intends to secure it (i.e. it strengthens the Plan’s implementation guidance).

---

Second, the objectives and policies form part of an important test under section 104D of the RMA in relation to non-complying activities. This test specifies that a consent authority may grant a resource consent for a non-complying activity “only if it is satisfied that either (a) the adverse effects of the activity on the environment... will be minor; or (b) the application is for an activity that will not be contrary to the objectives and policies” of a plan and/or proposed plan. It is therefore imperative that a plan’s objectives and policies are clearly stated and comprehensive to enable section 104D to be applied transparently and defensibly.\(^{10}\)

At present the heritage rules do not include non-complying activities, but this may change following the District Plan review as TCDC reconsiders its rules in light of the monitoring results and 2003 RMA amendment (discussed below).

**Gaps in the Regulatory Framework for Heritage Protection**

The current heritage provisions remain unchanged since the District Plan was notified in 1997. Therefore, the review needs to consider how to respond to the monitoring results as well as the increased status afforded to historic heritage by way of the 2003 RMA amendment, which elevated the sustainable management of historic heritage to a matter of national importance (s6(f)).

The District Plan rules make a range of activities permitted, controlled or discretionary. Permitted activities relate to ‘minor work’ on the exterior or interior of scheduled buildings and buildings in HPAs where the interior has not been identified for protection. Controlled activities relate to new or relocated buildings and external alterations to buildings in the HPAs. Discretionary activity status is applied to a range of activities including exterior and interior (where identified) alterations to scheduled buildings and the demolition, relocation and removal of scheduled buildings and those in HPAs. A couple of points can be made about this regulatory framework.

**Controlled Activity Status**

Controlled activity status has been shown in previous monitoring projects to be an ineffective rule category for protecting heritage values, both for individual heritage items listed on a district plan schedule\(^{11}\) and for heritage resources situated in a precinct or zone similar to the Heritage Policy Areas.\(^{12}\) The main issue is that controlled activities cannot be declined and the matters that a council can impose conditions on are limited. This is because the RMA anticipates that any adverse effects arising from controlled activities will be no more than minor; the Act provides for stricter activity status’ for activities that can cause more significant effects.

---

\(^{10}\) The current Government proposed in the Resource Management (Simplifying and Streamlining) Amendment Bill to remove the non-complying activity status from the RMA, but it has since decided to retain it following opposition from submitters.


The TCDC monitoring project also identified outcomes arising from controlled activities that caused a loss of heritage values, including the two shown in Photos 49 and 50 below (and discussed in Part 1). These related predominantly to accessory buildings sited conspicuously in the front and side yards of residential properties, and additions/alterations to non-scheduled commercial buildings in the Town Centre Zone HPA that were not in-keeping with the subject building and/or adjacent buildings. On the whole the degree of adverse effect was minor to moderate, but the potential exists for a proposal that would lead to a significant loss of heritage values, such as construction of a large-scale building or the substantial alteration of a small scale building within an HPA.

Inconsistencies in Activity Status
In relation to scheduled items, the Plan does not sufficiently distinguish between the degree of adverse effects arising from alterations compared to the demolition, relocation or removal of buildings. In other words, while both activities require consent as a discretionary activity the demolition, relocation or removal of a scheduled item has the potential to completely destroy its heritage values. This is contrary to the rules for the HPAs that provide a stronger activity status for demolition, relocation or removal (discretionary) compared to external alterations (controlled).

The monitoring results clearly show that demolition or removal of scheduled buildings has led to a total or significant loss of heritage values in all circumstances. On the other hand, while additions and alterations have also caused a loss of heritage values, they have been of a lesser scale and can be reversed in many instances. Moreover, several consents for additions and alterations led to an enhancement of heritage values, something that is practically impossible to achieve via demolition or removal.

Lack of Controls for Certain Activities
It is important that the District Plan anticipates all activities that may be undertaken in the district that could have a negative impact on heritage values. In this regard, a number of activities are not fully captured by the existing rules: subdivision of a site containing a scheduled building; new buildings on a site containing a scheduled building; and signage.

The 2003 RMA amendment specifically refers to inappropriate subdivision as an activity that councils must control in order to protect historic heritage. While the Plan includes a general
rule for subdivision in an HPA (a controlled activity or discretionary if the standards are not met), there does not appear to be a similar rule applying specifically to subdivision of land containing a scheduled heritage item.

However, subdivision and subsequent development of properties containing a scheduled heritage building can be detrimental and cause the loss of:

- the original curtilage associated with a heritage building or buildings;
- surroundings that contribute to an item’s heritage values (e.g. gardens, open space);
- outbuildings associated with the use of the primary building (e.g. sheds, stables);
- historical or visual associations between heritage items (e.g. heritage landscapes); and
- historical patterns of development (e.g. site size, building density).

This is a particular issue in Coromandel where residential sections are typically large and so provide more opportunity for subdivision.

Evidence from monitoring illustrates that these effects have occurred in Coromandel. The front yard of the former vicarage at 234 Tiki Rd was subdivided off before the District Plan came into effect and it has had a significant negative impact on the scheduled building (Photo 51). It is not clear that the Plan provisions would be able to prevent this happening again without a specific rule addressing subdivision of this kind. The second example in Photo 52 below relates to the site of the former Kahakaharoa Cottage, 1210 Rings Rd (demolished in 2007). A resource consent was granted in 2000 that allowed the rear yard of the section to be subdivided to provide for the new dwelling shown. The consent decision made no reference to the fact that the site contained a scheduled heritage building, nor did it appraise the effects of the subdivision on the property’s heritage values. In any event the subdivision was assessed as a controlled activity and so council was obliged to grant it.

Associated with the issue of subdivision is the lack of a rule dealing with new or relocated buildings on the site of a scheduled heritage item. Photos 53 and 54 below demonstrate the effect new accessory buildings can have on the heritage values of a scheduled building. In particular, they can compete visually with the house if they are sited too close, are disproportionately large, or poorly designed and finished. They also reduce the amount of open space around a dwelling and so impact on the context of the site and wider streetscape (if located in a historic precinct). The potential also exists for larger buildings to be constructed,
for instance if a scheduled building is destroyed by fire or allowed to be demolished (such as the house in Photo 52 above that replaced Kahakaharoa cottage). In this case a new building would be erected as a replacement and the Plan currently has little control over matters of siting, design etc with regard to impacts on heritage values.

The third activity that is not clearly dealt with by the heritage provisions is signage. The rules do not state that signage is an activity that requires resource consent under the heritage rules, although it is noted in the Definitions section that “External alterations to a building includes the addition, relocation and enlargement of signs”.

There was evidence that signage in Coromandel has not been undertaken in accordance with the signage criteria in the District Plan (although it is possible that the signage was installed prior to notification of the Plan). Two examples are given below: the first relates to Richardson’s Real Estate (Photo 55), which has a vast amount of signage on the sides of the verandah, on the façade beneath the verandah, and on top of the parapet. The second example shows large signs on top of the verandah for Gold Diggers liquor outlet (Photo 56). It would be useful if the Plan rules clearly stated that signage such as this requires resource consent to ensure that the appropriate assessment process is followed.
Not all Heritage Values are Protected
There are two notable gaps in the range of built heritage values identified in the District Plan Schedule and therefore protected by the rules, namely the lack of building interiors and building surrounds identified in the heritage schedule.¹³

While the Plan rules require resource consent for alterations affecting listed interiors there are currently no interiors identified on the heritage schedule, which renders the rule superfluous unless interior features to be protected are added. TCDC’s heritage consultant pointed out that intact original building interiors and/or features have been lost over time as a result. For instance, the former drapery shop shown in Photo 57 below (now the Star and Garter Hotel) retained its original shop fittings up until recently and, consequently, reflected a haberdashery from the 19th Century.

![Photo 57: Former Draper’s Shop](image)

![Photo 58: Former Moehau Tearooms](image)

Another point about interiors made by Council’s heritage consultant is that interior changes can undermine the overall integrity of a scheduled building. In this regard, he referred to the former Moehau Tearooms (Photo 58 above) which he said had undergone substantial interior alterations including the cutting out of the timber floor structure to replace with a concrete floor and the removal of the wall and ceiling structure.

The RMA definition of historic heritage includes the surroundings associated with a heritage item as an aspect to be protected. With regard to scheduled buildings, the District Plan largely takes an ‘object-oriented’ approach to regulation, which means that consent is only required when physical changes to the structure are proposed. This means that changes occurring on the site of the scheduled item, but not physically affecting the structure, do not trigger a rule under the heritage provisions. This issue and its outcomes are illustrated in the discussion above on subdivision of and new buildings on a site containing a scheduled building. Suffice to say that currently the Plan rules reflect a limited view of what contributes to a building’s heritage

¹³ There are also no sites with archaeological or Māori heritage value identified in the District Plan despite there being rules in place to protect them. This anomaly is being addressed by current research to identify such sites for inclusion on the Schedule.
values. As a result, the full range of effects of a proposal on a scheduled building cannot be fully taken into consideration in the resource consent process.

Conflicts between Plan Sections

A conflict exists between the District Plan heritage provisions and the outcomes they seek to achieve, and the provisions and outcomes specified in other sections in the Plan, particularly those relating to the Town Centre Zone. This arises because the standards within the Town Centre Zone provide for large-scale development on any site within the zone, regardless of whether it contains a heritage building or is located within an HPA. Because the underlying zone provisions are aimed at commercial activities, which typically use a site intensively in order to capitalise on the available space, they can enable developments that significantly undermine the heritage values of scheduled buildings or the built character protected by an HPA.

For instance, in the Town Centre Zone HPA in Coromandel, the permitted height is 12 metres, even though the vast majority of buildings within the zone are single storey. Similarly, the standards allow for 100% site coverage and full occupation of a site’s frontage. As a consequence, owners considering development on a site in the Town Centre Zone HPA expect to be able to use the site to its full potential as provided by the zone standards, but without necessarily considering the effects on heritage values.

Two examples in Coromandel amply highlight this situation. The first relates to a new building at 112 Wharf Rd comprising two retail outlets on the ground floor and two residential units on the first floor (Photos 59 and 60 below). The proposal was amended following advice from council’s heritage consultant, but the overall outcome was influenced by the more permissive underlying zone standards. The consent was granted but a group of local residents sought a judicial review in the High Court over the application’s non-notification. They believed the scale and design of the building was inappropriate and should have been open to public submission. In his affidavit to those proceedings, council’s resource consent planner stated that:

...heritage impacts are just one of the broad planning assessment that was required in this case... many of the relevant provisions in the District Plan are somewhat contradictory. The general provisions of the Plan often sit very uncomfortably with the specific heritage provisions, which is far from ideal from the perspective of a consents planner... However, I must take the Plan as it stands, and assess proposals against it, a task due to the state of the Plan, that involves making planning judgements, and balancing competing considerations.

Council’s heritage consultant also provided an affidavit in which he stated that “The proposal as approved is generally consistent with the relevant district planning controls, although its final design, in my opinion, is a “wooden” response to the heritage character controls”.

14 This issue was evident more in Coromandel than in Thames. For instance, none of the resource consents for the Thames sample buildings involved new buildings in the Town Centre, whereas there were several such consents in Coromandel.
The second example relates to a development directly over the road from 112 Wharf Rd at 145 Wharf Rd. In this case, the site contained a scheduled building – the Moehau Tearooms – as well as being located in the Town Centre Zone HPA (Photo 61). The proposal was for a large scale tourist accommodation complex. This time the application was notified. Frustration resulting from the conflicting guidance set out in the various sections of the Plan is evident in the submission by the Coromandel/Colville Community Board on the resource consent application:

We note that the applicant and his planner seem to have totally ignored all of the requirements of the Heritage Policy Area and based his application on the Proposed District Plan only, without the Heritage overlay, despite being told by the Board that we would expect that it did meet all the criteria of the District Plan.

The application was declined by TCDC and the applicant appealed the decision to the environment court. However, the building burnt down in suspicious circumstances before the Court proceedings were concluded.

Compounding the problem is the fact that the District Plan does not specify whether or not the heritage provisions hold sway over other sections in the Plan. In other words, there is no clear hierarchy between the Town Centre (and other) Zone provisions and the heritage provisions, and so TCDC planners are left to find a balance between the two which, as demonstrated in the above examples, can be to the detriment of the heritage values the Plan seeks to protect.
Prescriptive Implementation Guidance

As outlined in Part 1, the District Plan sets out design criteria for Thames and Coromandel, which provide resource consent applicants and council staff guidelines by which to assess the effects of proposals. Some areas for improvement in the design criteria are listed below:

- Thames criteria refer only to commercial and residential buildings, whereas there is a greater range of building types than that, especially non-residential buildings, e.g. churches, school buildings, community buildings etc;
- Criteria for commercial buildings in both Thames and Coromandel relate predominantly to main street shops and so do not adequately assess effects of buildings located elsewhere;
- Criteria tend to be prescriptive or absolute, and do not adequately provide for differences between building styles and their setting;
- Criteria do not enable a full appraisal of the range of activities being undertaken;
- Criteria could be more clearly stated.

Key informants reinforced the findings in Part 1 that compliance with the design criteria does not necessarily promote good outcomes. TCDC’s heritage consultant described the criteria as overly prescriptive and written as though all buildings are the same, which he believes cannot lead to good design. Essentially, he considered the design criteria end up being ‘tick boxes’, e.g. form, wooden joinery, roof angle etc, rather than a full and focused assessment of the effects of a proposal. Consequently, in the heritage consultant’s view, a poor outcome results even though developments can meet these requirements and, over time, this has led to a “slow blanding of the environment and removal of [buildings] that made a point of difference”.

Council’s resource consent planner echoed these sentiments, including the tick box nature of the criteria. In his experience, the criteria are too concise for discretionary activities; they have fixed parameters rather than providing a more fluid, high level approach to assessing effects. This in turn makes it difficult to request changes to, or even decline if necessary, applications that will undermine the heritage values of a site.

Unreliable Fact Base

A further area requiring attention relates to a lack of historical information about the buildings on the schedule, for instance an explanation of why they have been scheduled, details as to the particular features/aspects of a building are special and should be retained and conserved. This information is invaluable for owners considering a development proposal as it can raise their awareness about and appreciation of their building, as well as indicate which elements of a building can be changed without undermining its overall integrity. There are advantages for TCDC planners too, who can use the information in negotiations with owners and to accurately determine the effects of consent applications.

Another point, made by council’s resource consent planner, is that it is not readily obvious why some of the buildings have been scheduled. This can be problematic when considering development proposals for buildings that were already highly modified prior to scheduling. In these cases, it can be difficult to justify why an application seeking substantial alterations, or even demolition or removal, should not be approved. In other words, a schedule containing buildings of questionable merit can undermine council efforts to protect heritage.
2. Capacity and Willingness of TCDC

TCDC’s commitment to implementing the Plan’s heritage provisions can be demonstrated in a number of ways. First, the council engages a specialist conservation architect to assist with development proposals affecting heritage buildings. The heritage consultant assesses resource consent applications received by the council and advises TCDC planning staff on the merits or otherwise of proposals. Council staff are then able to use this information in the decision-making processes. Consequently, the heritage consultant’s input improves the capacity of council officers to make informed decisions about the likely effects of development proposals and generally strengthens TCDC’s position in negotiating changes with owners.

Second, several examples from the resource consent monitoring showed that TCDC is prepared to reduce the resource consent fees paid by applicants when it involves a scheduled building. This typically took the form of a part-waiver (50%) of the total resource consent fee. Such a waiver acknowledges the costs to owners in applying for resource consents, although it is best applied when the owners demonstrate a sound understanding of the heritage values of their building and are undertaking developments that maintain or enhance those values. This was the case for 222 Watt Street (Photo 62) below, where the owners retained and modified a rundown cottage that was otherwise vulnerable to demolition.

There are a number of areas where TCDC’s commitment to heritage protection and management can be bolstered, which in turn would assist in securing better heritage outcomes. The need for non-regulatory incentive-based methods is obvious from the monitoring results. Provision of assistance to landowners is a well-recognised method for raising an owner’s understanding of the means by which heritage can be protected/conserved, as well as encourage them to do so through financial and other incentive-based support. While a Heritage Assistance Fund had been established by TCDC since 2005/2006 (at $15,000 per annum), this has recently been withdrawn. In response to tight economic constraints due to current financial conditions, the councillors voted to abolish the fund in 2009.

Furthermore, TCDC has not initiated a heritage education programme or published material to assist owners considering making changes to scheduled buildings or those in an HPA. Such education initiatives are widely recognised for supporting regulatory protection (i.e. Plan rules), as they can raise owners’ and the public’s awareness of local history, the heritage
values that are evident in the built environment, and in doing so increase their motivation to protect them.

This is not an issue about District Plan quality, i.e. non-regulatory methods not being recognised in the Plan. As illustrated below, the Plan outlines a broad range of non-regulatory methods aimed at enhancing heritage outcomes, including financial incentives and education.

Section 430: Heritage Resources

- Require conservation plans to guide any major restoration and alteration of any item on the Heritage Register
- Establish a Heritage Committee to:
  1. Promote and advocate for heritage;
  2. Report on or review applications for Plan Changes and resource consent applications;
  3. Maintain the Heritage Registers;
  4. Commission other activities relating to heritage protection, such as education and information to the public, and archaeological surveys;
  5. Administer heritage funds.
- Establish a District heritage assistance fund to provide financial assistance for resource consents required under the District Plan and to encourage other conservation work. These funds are administered by the Heritage Committee.
- Provide regular advice clinics by people with heritage conservation expertise, on heritage conservation generally.
- Waive building and resource consent application fees and consider waiving or reducing District Plan development standards relating to such matters as carparking and financial contributions (DIF’s) so as to encourage heritage conservation.
- Maintain a strategy for the interpretation of the District’s heritage in accordance with the principles of the ICOMOS NZ Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value.
- To consider rates relief for registered heritage items in accordance with the relevant rating legislation.
- Subject to available funding, facilitate or enable community partnerships that will promote the Heritage objectives of the District Plan and the ICOMOS NZ Charter.

These methods have also been identified in TCDC’s Heritage Strategy (2007) as actions to be taken by council to improve heritage outcomes. The issue is therefore one of council commitment to providing adequate resourcing so that the broad range of methods above can be implemented. If actioned, these non-regulatory methods would greatly assist TCDC staff in working with owners.

A second area of council performance that could be bolstered to improve heritage outcomes is district plan monitoring and enforcement. There are two issues in this regard. First, activities granted consent under the heritage rules have not always been executed according to the conditions placed on the consent. These areas of non-compliance have not been identified by council monitoring staff, even when a site visit has been undertaken. An example of this, shown in Photo 63 below, involves the Imperial Hotel in Thames which has had multiple consents granted for alterations to the exterior. Conditions of consent set out that the window trim and frames were to be painted in a specified colour. However, the windows have been
varnished, which stands in contrast to the rest of the building. The design of the new windows is also contrary to the design shown on the plans included in the application.

A second monitoring and enforcement issue relates to activities being undertaken without resource consent. This is particularly notable in Coromandel where scheduled buildings have been altered – and even removed in one instance – initially without resource consent. The dwelling at 205 Hauraki Rd (Photo 64) was reclad and the window joinery changed from timber to aluminium without consent. The exterior of the Coromandel Café (Photo 65) has been altered since the Plan has been in force, but no resource consent for the work was evident on the property file. Successive owners of Assay House (Photo 66) have undertaken work to
the building without resource consent and, in the first case, TCDC did take enforcement action in the Environment Court. The Court, however, discharged without conviction (although the owner was required to pay TCDC’s costs). The dwelling in Photo 67 was removed from its site by the owner and relocated to a property on Whangapoua Rd where it was substantially altered, all without resource consent. Thames is not exempt from this issue; French doors were removed from the side of St Georges Church Hall (Photo 68) seemingly without consent, although in this case the work enhanced the building’s heritage values.

Other examples of unconsented work were revealed from the monitoring project, but are not discussed here. Suffice to say a more rigorous monitoring and enforcement programme by council would help ensure conditions of consent are upheld and non-consented work is stopped as early as possible. The latter is a more challenging task as it relies on TCDC staff being alerted as the work is being carried out. Council have already improved their monitoring capacity by increasing the number of staff working in this area. Staff also scrutinise all building consent applications for compliance with District Plan provisions.

3. Capacity and Willingness of Owners

On the whole, the capacity of applicants to design proposals that achieve good heritage outcomes is low, as evidenced by the poor quality of applications and plans, and the negative outcomes that have resulted in many instances. Evidence from the monitoring project suggests that poor applications are common, including those with minimal or no description of the activity, minimal or no assessment of effects, poorly drawn plans and/or incomplete plans, e.g. not showing all affected elevations or existing elevations with which to compare changes.

A part of the problem is that proposals are not being designed by appropriately qualified architects who understand how to alter and adapt heritage buildings in ways that retain their special qualities. Council’s heritage consultant considers this to be a reflection of a cost-based approach to development, particularly for commercial buildings, rather than a more outcome-focused approach. While council does get external advice on proposals, this occurs only once an application has been submitted and after the owners have already settled on a particular scheme. This means that TCDC and its heritage consultant are often only able to react to proposals rather than being involved from the earliest stages so that they can influence proposals.

Two examples demonstrate the high quality outcomes that can result from well-informed and detailed applications. The first relates to the Corinthian Lodge in Thames (Photo 69), which has been adapted to a new use in a sensitive manner. A conservation plan was prepared for the building by a suitably qualified conservation architect. The changes to the building were designed by a well-respected architectural firm specialising in built heritage, and the design took into account the recommendations in the conservation plan. As an added safeguard, the person who wrote the conservation plan peer reviewed the resource consent application to ensure it was consistent.
The second example, for the TCDC Area Office in Coromandel (Photo 70), involved significant maintenance on and preservation of the building’s fabric. The need for the work was first identified in a Condition Report prepared by a conservation architect and the recommendations were adopted and carried out by TCDC in accordance with it.

The willingness of applicants to comply with the District Plan’s heritage objective is called into question by the considerable number of non-consented activities undertaken, as outlined above. This may be due, however to a lack of owners’ awareness and understanding about Plan provisions; owners are possibly not even aware that their property has been identified and scheduled for protection.

Council’s heritage consultant also pointed out in an interview that building owners have a desire to use their commercial buildings in a way that offers them a reasonable livelihood. Over time Coromandel has become a popular tourist and recreation destination and the uses of buildings have changed to support this economic base. As a consequence, there might be wider community support for new development that is larger in scale and intensity than found in the original town centre. The strong pressure for development in the Coromandel town centre has been disproportionate to its physical scale. The challenge for TCDC is to manage this change while maintaining the town’s historic character. In this regard, council’s heritage consultant observed that certain sites are appropriate for development as they can absorb a greater degree of change than elsewhere, but these are not necessarily the sites proposed for development.

4. Negotiations between TCDC and Owners

All the factors discussed here influence how negotiations between owners and TCDC are carried out, including:
- the quality of the District Plan in terms of its comprehensiveness, consistency, clarity and level of guidance provided;
- the capacity of council staff to understand heritage issues, identify effects and negotiate suitable outcomes;
- the availability of non-regulatory incentives to encourage enhancement of heritage values; and
the capacity and willingness of owners to comply with the plan and enter into discussions with TCDC early on.

When interviewed, the conservation architect engaged by TCDC expressed concern about limitations in the District Plan, as well as a lack of education and incentives to encourage retention and enhancement of heritage values. This in turn has diluted the extent to which conservation advice has enabled positive outcomes to be achieved. Thus, the current heritage management framework can be strengthened to ensure that TCDC staff and advisors are in a sound position when it comes to implementing the Plan provisions and negotiating the detail of proposals with owners to ensure they lead to high quality outcomes.

5. Characteristics of the Development

The characteristics of a development and the development site itself can influence how well the District Plan is implemented. Key factors in this regard include the:

- heritage significance of a place – the more significant the more likely there will be support to protect it;
- prominence of a place – whether it is conspicuous and/or sited amongst a group of heritage buildings;
- scale of the proposal in relation to the size of the building;
- compatibility between the former or existing and proposed use of a building;
- topography of a site and what opportunities or constraints this may provide;
- subdivision pattern, for instance many of the residential properties in Coromandel are large compared to Thames and so are more likely to be subdivided and/or have extra buildings erected;
- built character of an area, the ‘soft’ merging of the commercial zone into the residential environment in Coromandel as opposed to the ‘harder’, more defined commercial area in Thames.

Summary of Factors that have Influenced Implementation of the District Plan Built Heritage Provisions

Part 2 of the report has identified the factors that influenced the implementation of the Thames-Coromandel District Plans’ built heritage provisions. These factors are summarised in Table 2.2 (following page). The middle column illustrates the set of circumstances that promoted good outcomes for built heritage via Plan implementation. Conversely, the right hand column reveals the range of factors that have impeded implementation. The ways in which these factors work to influence the resource consent process are not necessary straightforward or uniform, and they are not all brought to bear in a single development proposal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.2: Summary of Factors Influencing District Plan Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Quality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Large number of scheduled buildings and several HPAs identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Rules require resource consent for a range of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Design criteria provide guidance to owners and council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Capacity and Willingness of TCDC</strong></th>
<th><strong>Capacity and Willingness of Owners</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Staff involved in discussions with owners at an early stage</td>
<td>▪ Personal motivation to protect heritage values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Skilled staff able to accurately appraise effects</td>
<td>▪ Cost-based approach to commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Decision-makers committed to achieving quality outcomes</td>
<td>▪ Lack of regard for and/or awareness of heritage values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Staff and decision-makers able to persuade owners to amend plans</td>
<td>▪ Poor applications from unskilled advisors, or ‘DIY’ attempts from property owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Reactive response to resource consent applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Inexperience and/or lack of awareness about heritage amongst planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Lack of incentives and education initiatives to support regulatory methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Lack of monitoring and enforcement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Relations between TCDC and Owners</strong></th>
<th><strong>Development Characteristics</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ All of the factors in this column</td>
<td>▪ Significant heritage values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Small-scale projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Subdivision patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Large-scale projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Subdivision patterns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3: RECOMMENDATIONS

This final part of the report sets out a suite of recommendations aimed at improving the quality of the District Plan built heritage provisions and their implementation. The recommendations are informed directly by the findings of the monitoring project (Part 1) and the appraisal of Plan implementation (Part 2), including the perspectives shared by the three key informants who participated regularly in the resource consent process. Consequently, the recommendations are spelt out concisely so as to avoid repetition, and they are summarised in Table 3.1 at the end of Part 3.

The recommendations are not intended to constitute a new policy framework for the District Plan heritage section. Instead, they indicate the areas that have hampered TCDC’s efforts to protect built heritage and provide suggestions as to the nature of the change required. Consultation with and involvement from a range of people and agencies is necessary to consider the recommendations and shape them into a form suitable for inclusion in the District Plan.15

Part 3 is separated under two section headings: 1) District Plan Quality, which deals with recommendations relating to the content of the Plan and; 2) District Plan Implementation, which is concerned with actions and activities that could be taken by TCDC to support and enhance the effectiveness of the heritage provisions and thus the outcomes that follow.

District Plan Quality

Consistent with the factors identified in Part 2, the recommendations relating to District Plan quality aim to strengthen the following matters:

- Internal consistency;
- Regulatory framework;
- Consistency between Plan sections;
- Level of implementation guidance;
- Reliability of the fact base.

Strengthened Internal Consistency

The current two heritage policies in the Plan are insufficient for capturing the breadth of actions the council can take to achieve its objective of heritage protection. The following topics are suggested to assist with developing the District Plan’s heritage policies further. They are reinforced by many of the methods already espoused in the heritage section of the Plan and therefore will strengthen the Plan’s overall internal consistency. They are also congruent with advice provided by the NZHPT.16

15 Such as councillors, council staff and council advisors, community board members, property owners, representatives from NZHPT, Environment Waikato, Historical Societies etc.

- Identification and assessment of the significance of the district’s heritage resources.
- Inclusion of heritage resources and their values to be conserved, protected and enhanced in the district plan (e.g. on a Heritage Schedule).
- Inclusion of rules in the district plan that reflect the potential for activities to cause adverse effects.
- Requirement that assessments of environment effects accompanying resource consent applications be carried out by suitably qualified specialists.
- Building the capacity of council decision-makers to adequately assess the effects of resource consent applications through regular training.
- Requirement that resource consent applications must satisfy relevant assessment criteria.
- Encourage conservation, protection and enhancement of heritage values by offering financial incentives and/or advice to heritage owners.
- Liaise with tangata whenua, NZHPT, EW and other groups/agencies.
- Raise public awareness about the district’s heritage and promote its protection.
- Monitor plan implementation and the outcomes arising from the resource consent process.
- Change plan provisions when monitoring reveals that they are not effective in conserving, protecting and enhancing heritage resources.

The Matamata-Piako, South Waikato and Waikato District Plans include detailed heritage policies addressing these matters and they may assist in redrafting the TCDC District Plan policies.

Comprehensive Regulatory Framework

The current heritage provisions remain unchanged since the District Plan was notified in 1997. Therefore, the review needs to consider how to respond to the increased status afforded to historic heritage by way of the 2003 RMA amendment, which elevated the sustainable management of historic heritage to a matter of national importance. Three areas of change are recommended below: 1) improving consistency in activity status used; 2) regulating a broader range of activities; and 3) recognising and protecting a broader range of historic heritage values.

**Consistency in Activity Status**

The District Plan makes external alterations to buildings in an HPA and construction of new buildings in an HPA a controlled activity. However, the outcomes showed that these activities can cause negative effects on heritage values. Controlled activity status has also been shown to be an ineffective rule category for protecting heritage values in Wellington, Auckland, and North Shore cities, and the respective councils have taken steps to remove controlled activity status. It is recommended that TCDC does the same by making the construction of new buildings in an HPA and the external alterations to existing buildings in an HPA at least a restricted discretionary activity.

Second, in relation to scheduled items, the District Plan does not sufficiently distinguish between the degree of adverse effects arising from additions/alterations and the demolition, relocation or removal of buildings. In other words, while both activities require consent as a discretionary activity the demolition, relocation or removal of a scheduled item has the potential to completely destroy its heritage values (as was demonstrated in the monitoring
outcomes in Part 1). This is contrary to the rules for the Heritage Policy Areas that provide a stronger activity status for demolition, relocation or removal (discretionary) compared to external alterations (controlled).

*It is therefore recommended that TCDC make the demolition, relocation or removal of a scheduled building a non-complying activity.*\(^{17}\) The advantage is that it would signal to resource consent applicants that such activities are contrary to the plan’s intention (which is to retain such buildings) and is likely to be granted only in exceptional circumstances. It also ensures the section 104D test is carried out by a local authority when considering such an application.\(^{18}\)

**Broader Range of Activities to be Regulated**

It is important that the District Plan anticipates all activities that may be undertaken in the district that could have a negative impact on heritage values. In this regard, a number of activities are not captured by the existing rules, which were shown in the monitoring results to undermine heritage values.

**Subdivision**

*It is recommended that a rule specifically addressing the subdivision of a property containing a scheduled item be included in the Plan.* In the NZHPT’s (2009, p.55) view,\(^{19}\) subdivision should be either a discretionary or non-complying activity. Subdivision controls relating to heritage items need to be supported by detailed assessment criteria to assist in assessing the effects of consent applications.

The District Plan does allow for ‘conservation lots’ to be created in rural and coastal zones as part of the subdivision process, which according to TCDC staff\(^{20}\) can and have been used to protect heritage items, typically archaeological sites, but presumably also buildings (although there was no evidence of this in the monitoring outcomes).

**New buildings on the site of a scheduled item**

*It is recommended that a new rule is included in the district plan that requires consent for new buildings on a site of a scheduled building so that potential effects on heritage values and alternative proposals can be considered.* Such a rule needs to be sufficiently strong to enable council to decline consent if the effects are likely to be significant (i.e. at least a restricted discretionary activity), and supported by detailed assessment criteria.

The effect of new buildings on the heritage values of scheduled items was also identified as an issue in Wellington City following monitoring, as well as for properties in a built heritage

---

\(^{17}\) The same applies to the total destruction of an archaeological or wāhi tapu site, which is currently a discretionary activity; the council could also consider changing this to a non-complying activity.

\(^{18}\) Waikato councils that apply a non-complying activity status to demolition/relocation/removal/destruction of scheduled items include Hamilton, Hauraki, Matamata-Piako, Otorohanga, Waikato and Waitomo District Plans.


zone in North Shore City. Both councils have bolstered their heritage provisions for new buildings as a result and their rule structure and wording may assist TCDC in considering this matter further.

**Signage**
While the definition of external alteration refers to signage as an activity requiring resource consent, this is not obvious to someone reading the heritage section of the Plan. Therefore, in order to make it clearer in the Plan that signage requires consent, *it is recommended that either:*

- A new rule dealing with signage is added in the heritage section; or
- The existing rule for external alterations (to a scheduled building and a building in an HPA) makes explicit reference to signage.

**Values to be protected**
Currently the District Plan schedule does not identify interiors that contribute to a building’s heritage values, despite there being a rule for this purpose. *It is recommended that TCDC undertake a project to work with owners to identify interiors and interior features for scheduling.* This is a very delicate area to pursue given that it involves people’s private spaces and might ultimately restrict what an owner can do inside their home or building.

A different issue is the risk to a scheduled building’s integrity following substantial interior alterations. While issues of structural safety are something dealt with under the Building Act, TCDC may want to consider a new rule that would require resource consent when a certain percentage of the interior (for instance 50% or more) was proposed to be demolished or significantly altered. This would enable the council to consider any effects on the heritage values of the building as a whole and to determine whether its inclusion on the heritage schedule would be jeopardised as a result. An alternative option is to change the wording of the existing rule for interior alterations to the same effect.

*It also recommended that TCDC undertake a project to identify the surrounds associated with scheduled buildings.* This could involve identification of important areas of open space, view shafts, and structures and trees associated with a building and/or the historical use of the site. The recommendations above regarding subdivision and new buildings are also aimed at ensuring the surrounds associated with a scheduled building are considered in the development process.

**Consistency between Plan Sections**

*Two recommendations are made to improve consistency between Plan sections: first, strengthen the provisions for the HPAs; and second, make it clear in the Plan that the heritage provisions take precedence over the provisions and assessment matters of the underlying zone.*

The Heritage Policy Areas recognise the group value of buildings and the interrelationship between buildings in terms of how an area has developed over time. Thus, the role of the HPA is to protect the heritage values of a readily defined area, rather than any specific building. The provisions relating to scheduled buildings should ensure that the most significant structures are
protected. In this way the HPAs and heritage schedule work simultaneously and symbiotically. It is therefore recommended that HPAs are retained and that the provisions relating to them are strengthened (as already indicated by other recommendations in Part 3). TCDC might consider renaming HPAs to ‘heritage precincts’, ‘historic areas’, ‘heritage conservation areas’ or another appropriate name to give them a strong identity. TCDC may choose to review the extent of the HPAs to ensure they include all built elements that contribute to the heritage values of the whole.

**Implementation Guidance**

As stated in Parts 1 and 2, many of the design criteria were not relevant to the applications that were assessed for the monitoring project. Also, even though certain design criteria were met, it did not guarantee a good outcome. **It is therefore recommended that more focused criteria are developed that:**

- can be applied to the range of buildings that are protected by the Plan (e.g. not just commercial and residential);
- recognise buildings are located in differing settings (e.g. not all commercial buildings are main street shops);
- are flexible so as to take account of differences between buildings (e.g. age, style, scale) and differences between locations (e.g. not all main street shops occupy the full width of their sites);
- enable a full appraisal of the range of activities that are being undertaken, even by grouping criteria by activity, e.g. additions and alterations, new buildings, demolition or removal, subdivision etc.

Appendix 4 includes the assessment criteria developed by Wellington and North Shore City Councils in response to the built heritage monitoring results.\(^ {21} \) They represent a broad range of criteria that enable a comprehensive base from which to assess the effects of applications. These assessment matters can be grouped under six broad headings:

- Extent of change – to direct change to where it is least intrusive and obvious.
- Historical and architectural integrity – to ensure the special qualities of a heritage building or area are retained and reflected in development. The aim is to allow only those changes that are authentic to the subject building.
- Setting/streetscape – to consider the effects of a proposal beyond the subject site to determine whether there are cross-boundary impacts.
- Authenticity of materials and craftsmanship – to retain historic fabric and minimise its loss, as well as to ensure that new work respects the materials and building practices of the heritage building.
- Signage – to specifically target effects of signage.
- Subdivision – to specifically target effects of subdivision.

\(^ {21} \) The assessment criteria developed by these two councils is recommended as they are the only other councils to undertake an outcome monitoring study for built heritage to inform the plan changes. Therefore, the changes made are based on knowledge about the effectiveness of previous provisions, including usefulness of assessment criteria. Other district plans will have assessment criteria that are worth referring to as well.
Wellington and North Shore Cities assessment criteria, as well as consideration of these broad headings, might assist TCDC in amending the current design criteria.

A second area that TCDC can improve is the information requirements for resource consent applications. It is recommended that the District Plan is more specific about the range of information needed in a resource consent application. The current requirements in the District Plan are as follows:

**842 SITE AND LOCALITY CHARACTERISTICS**
A description of the land involved and its location. Such a description should be in sufficient detail to show:
- the location, type and extent of any evidence of human activity prior to 1900, i.e. archaeological sites, historic sites (as identified in an archaeological site survey) and the location of any heritage building or structure of site of significance to tangata whenua.
- Details of any relevant heritage inventory or conservation plan that may have been prepared for the heritage item.

**843 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL**
A description of the proposed activity, including:
- for heritage buildings where alteration to the building fabric is proposed, details of existing and proposed materials and construction methods.

**846 HERITAGE RESOURCES**
Where an application will affect an archaeological site:

1.1 Applicants should prepare an archaeological assessment report in order to determine the effects of the proposal and to provide for the avoidance, remedy, and mitigation of adverse effects. Applicants should check with the NZ Archaeological Association file keeper and with iwi for previous surveys, the presence of recorded sites and the likelihood of unrecorded sites. Where no recent archaeological survey has been conducted for a particular property or area, an archaeological site survey should be undertaken by a suitably qualified archaeologist in order to determine the effects of the proposal and recommend a suitable course of action.

This could be strengthened, in particular by requiring that all applications include:
- Clearly drawn plans showing all necessary elevations, a site plan, cross sections, specifications etc. The plans should clearly distinguish the existing situation from the proposed one and accurately show the proposed changes. Photomontages, where possible, are an excellent way of representing the proposed activity.
- An accurate and suitably detailed assessment of effects including:
  - a detailed description of the proposal;
  - an outline of the values for which the building is recognised (historical, architectural etc);
  - identification of the building fabric that is significant;
  - an outline of the changes that are proposed to the building and an explicit discussion on how these will impact on the building’s values/fabric;
  - details about materials and colours to be used and why they have been chosen, and methods to be followed in undertaking the work (e.g. when enlarging window openings to accommodate doors); and
- a discussion of alternatives and why the proposal is the best option.

The use of a conservation plan could be mandatory for large scale proposals affecting scheduled buildings. In addition, North Shore City Council has proposed that a 'site and context analysis' be included in applications relating to development in the built heritage zone, as follows:

*Note: A site and context analysis will need to be submitted which shows that the form, mass, proportion and materials of the additions and alterations are sympathetic to the original house on the site, and the architectural styles predominant in the street. The detail required will be in accordance with the scale of the works and their effects. This analysis may include plans, elevations and photographs of the subject site and all other buildings which contribute to the streetscape in the immediate vicinity. This analysis will form part of the assessment of effects...* (Plan Change 21 Decision Report)

It is suggested that TCDC consider a similar requirement for applications affecting buildings in the HPAs, particularly large scale applications, so that an assessment of effects on the wider environment can be undertaken. The full provisions for a site and context analysis as proposed in Plan Change 21 is set out on Appendix 5.

**Reliability of the Fact Base**

Work is currently underway to assess the appropriateness of buildings on the schedule, to identify new buildings for scheduling, and to update information about the significance of buildings. The information to emerge from this project should enhance the quality and reliability of information about scheduled buildings and assist in their protection.

**District Plan Implementation**

Two activities currently not being carried out, education and the provision of incentives, have the potential to provide the greatest gains regarding heritage outcomes. The deteriorated state of a building was a common reason why owners sought to demolish scheduled buildings, as well as being the justification given by TCDC in granting consent. This situation needs to be addressed by council as a matter of urgency and the use of non-regulatory incentives and education is a crucial step to take.

Education is a powerful tool to make owners aware of the heritage values of their buildings, their legal obligations under the District Plan with regard to gaining resource consent for certain activities, and also to provide guidance and technical advice. Education can also build civic pride and community support for heritage protection, which in turn can influence the choices owners make when developing their properties. Financial incentives would also assist council in encouraging owners to develop their properties sensitively and to go through the appropriate processes to do so. Consistent bad press in national and regional media often paints the RMA and district plan processes as overly-bureaucratic, lengthy and costly. The challenge for TCDC is to demonstrate that this is not the case by offering juicy carrots (incentives and education) with the stick (plan rules)!
Non-Regulatory Methods

*It is recommended that the range of non-regulatory incentives proposed in the District Plan is funded and implemented,* including:

- heritage assistance funds to encourage conservation work;
- advice clinics by people with heritage conservation expertise;
- waiver of building and resource consent application fees;
- rates relief for scheduled heritage items.

It is important that a wide range of non-regulatory methods are promoted in the plan to avoid a ‘one size fits all’ approach. This is because different methods will appeal to different landowners depending on their circumstances. Furthermore, in the interests of fairness, non-regulatory methods need to be applied so that they do not advantage particular landowners or types of heritage.

Given the strong historic legacy in Thames-Coromandel and the significant amount of involvement council has in heritage matters, it is suggested that TCDC considers employing a heritage advisor. Such an advisor could fulfil a range of roles, such as early consultation with owners on development proposals, assessment of resource consents, development of policy, developing education material and undertaking education programmes. Research has demonstrated that better heritage outcomes are realised when a council employs heritage advisors.\(^{22}\)

Education

*In support of the non-regulatory incentives, it is recommended that a range of education initiatives are undertaken to build awareness about heritage values and the means to protect it.* Specific education initiatives include:

- provision of educational material on significant sites, such as heritage inventories, brochures, posters and postcards;
- provision of design guidelines to illustrate and promote sympathetic development;
- establishment of heritage walks and trails, usually outlined in pamphlets, for people to learn about the history of an area;
- heritage recognition programmes, which include the installation of a plaque or interpretation panel to indicate the significance of a building or site;
- awards programmes for owners or community groups who have undertaken successful protection or enhancement projects;
- annual heritage festivals with a range of events to celebrate and promote a town’s history.

As with non-regulatory incentives, it is important that a variety of education methods are adopted and that they focus on providing education opportunities to different audiences and at different scales, e.g. targeted programmes for individual owners of heritage (e.g. provision of design guidance), as well as broader programmes aimed at public education (e.g. heritage trails and festivals).

Summary of Recommendations

Table 3.1 below summarises the recommendations made in Part 3 of the report. The changes suggested aim to bolster the Plan’s regulatory methods in terms of their scope (i.e. range of effects addressed), strength (i.e. activity status) and implementation (i.e. extent of guidance offered). Other recommendations aim to support the regulatory framework by boosting owners’ capacity and willingness to comply with the Plan heritage provisions via education and incentives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Plan Quality</th>
<th>Internal Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the range of matters addressed by the heritage policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regulatory Framework**

- Change the activity status for new buildings in HPAs and external alterations to existing buildings in HPAs from controlled to restricted discretionary
- Change the activity status for demolition, removal or relocation of scheduled buildings from discretionary to non-complying
- Apply new rules, as discretionary restricted or discretionary activities, for: 1) subdivision of a site containing a scheduled heritage building; 2) the construction of buildings on a site containing a scheduled building; and 3) signage attached to a scheduled building or building within an HPA
- Consider introducing a rule for substantial interior alterations that affect the overall heritage values of a scheduled building

**Relationship Between Plan Sections**

- Retain and enhance the provisions for HPAs, and consider renaming
- Make clear in the Plan that the heritage provisions take precedence over the underlying zone provisions

**Implementation Guidance**

- Amend the design criteria by making them less prescriptive and ensuring they cover the full range of matters necessary for each development activity
- Improve information requirements for resource consent applications, including: full plans (showing existing and proposed elevations);

**Fact Base**

- Reassess the significance of buildings on the heritage schedule to ensure that they warrant specific protection
- Upgrade the level of information about buildings on the heritage schedule, including the reasons why they are significant
- Identify building interiors and building surroundings to be protected and include these on the District Plan Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Plan Implementation</th>
<th>Monitoring and Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular and thorough monitoring of compliance with resource consent conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Regulatory Incentives**

- Implement a range of incentives, including waiving resource consent fees, establishment of a heritage fund, provision of free advice
- TCDC to consider employing a heritage advisor

**Education**

- Undertake a range of education initiatives targeting different audiences/needs