

## Selwyn District Council Proposed District Plan - Hearing Topic 08.0 Historic Heritage

### Statement of Evidence – Dr Ann McEwan, Principal, Heritage Consultancy Services

#### Introduction

- 1.1 My name is Dr Ann Elizabeth McEwan and I am a heritage consultant with over 30 years' experience in the field. I hold a PhD in architectural history from the University of Canterbury, am an experienced peer reviewer and expert witness, and a full member of ICOMOS New Zealand. Since I established Heritage Consultancy Services in 2006 I have undertaken the review of the built heritage schedules for the Thames-Coromandel, Waikato, Nelson, Waimakariri, Selwyn and Timaru district plans.
- 1.2 I am the author of the 'Heritage Issues' chapter in *Planning Practice in New Zealand*, edited by Caroline Miller and Lee Beattie (LexisNexis, 2017), which was given the John Mawson Award of Merit by the NZ Planning Institute in 2018, and was a Professional Teaching Fellow in the School of Architecture and Planning at the University of Auckland in 2015-16 and 2021.
- 1.3 I commenced work on the Selwyn District Council (SDC) built heritage schedule in June 2017. The bulk of the heritage assessments undertaken for SDC were completed by June 2018. The review of the heritage schedule was predicated upon the preparation of a thematic historic overview of the district by noted Canterbury historian Dr John Wilson and encompassed both the heritage schedule in the operative district plan and potential 'new' heritage items arising from public nominations and the identification of further items based upon the historic overview.
- 1.4 I devised the historic heritage record form (HHRF) for use by SDC in the Proposed District Plan (PDP). The new assessment criteria developed for use in the HHRF were adopted from those in the Christchurch District Plan, in order to give effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and foster a robust and consistent approach to the identification of historic heritage resources within the Canterbury region.
- 1.5 In addition to undertaking research and fieldwork during the heritage schedule review, I also attended a number of council-facilitated drop-in meetings to engage with heritage item owners and other key stakeholders. These sessions at various venues around the district created an opportunity to meet with the owners of heritage items, whether scheduled in the operative plan or recommended for inclusion in the PDP, and solicit nominations from members of the public. Once the recommended schedule had been prepared an additional round of meetings were held at SDC's offices in Rolleston to give owners the chance to discuss their concerns with me. Some of the submitters mentioned below attended these meetings.
- 1.6 The following evidence relates to those submissions to the PDP seeking amendments to the heritage chapter or HHRF for a particular heritage item, removal of an item from HH-SCHED2 in the PDP or the addition of heritage areas to HH-SCHED2.
- 1.7 I am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014 and affirm that I have no conflicts of interest in regard to the historic heritage of Selwyn District.

## **Submission DPR-0135.005 Lilley Family Trust**

- 2.1 The submitter seeks the deletion of item H210 from HH-SCHED2 in the PDP. The Rolleston Hotel has been assessed according to the criteria adopted by SDC (see HH-SCHED1) and while it is acknowledged that the Rolleston Hotel has been modified over time, I believe the building retains sufficient integrity and authenticity to merit scheduling as a historic heritage item. The setting of the heritage item has been limited to its immediate surrounds, rather than the land parcel as a whole; this then allows for development of the remainder of the site free from heritage considerations. Within the setting the intent of the plan is to protect the heritage item from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, which does not preclude future subdivision, use and development proposals from being granted. Without prejudice, any future resource consent that sought to undertake work at the rear (south) of the setting would likely be assessed as having a more minor effect than work undertaken in the vicinity of the principal (north-facing) elevation.
- 2.2 The hotel will be 90 years old this year; while not as old as some of the district's heritage items the building is of sufficient age to be able to locate it within the historical context of the district and assess its significance according to the criteria. Community identity and historic continuity are present in this case even though the hotel has been altered over time. As a functioning hotel for 90 years (in 2021) 'the Rolly' meets the criteria for cultural significance. Additions were not designed by the original architect, as is often the case with heritage buildings, but they were architecturally designed. 'Value' rather than 'significance' has been attributed to the technical and craftsmanship qualities of the building because it has been altered over time; I believe this provides the appropriate recognition of the original construction and detailing without overstating their importance. The building is a local landmark due to its location and age within the context of Rolleston township and State Highway 1. The potential archaeological values of the site are simply noted here to alert the owner to the possible implications of the Heritage NZPT Act on any future redevelopment of the site.
- 2.3 The proposal put forward by the submitter that a 'suitable plaque and interpretation board' would be more appropriate than scheduling of the Rolleston Hotel to identify the historic origins and contextual significance of the building will not give effect to RMA section 6(f). The Z Energy development proposal mentioned in the submission involves the retention of the hotel, with some internal alterations to the first floor; these would not be subject to the heritage provisions of the PDP, unless they involved changes to the exterior of the building.
- 2.4 The HHRF for the Rolleston Hotel has been amended to include historical information provided by the submitter regarding the alterations and additions noted in the HHRF (see Attachment 3). [For clarity it is noted that the architectural drawings provided by the submitter refer to the elevation overlooking SH 1 as the west elevation; it is more accurate to characterise this as the north-west elevation.]
- 2.5 I recommend that the submission be rejected, notwithstanding that the HHRF has been amended to include information supplied by the submitter. Furthermore, as the owner holds a Certificate of Compliance (CoC) for demolition, the matter of resource consent for demolition of the heritage item will only arise once the CoC has expired.

### **Submission DPR-0200.001 Walter Fielding-Cottrell**

- 3.1 The submission concerns the architectural description and assessment of the Mill house at Irwell (heritage item H416); this building is currently scheduled on the operative district plan.
- 3.2 The submitter provides very helpful information about various modifications made to the house over time, which are to be expected in a house of this age. The HHRF has been revised in light of the submission and further research undertaken by me (see Attachment 4). As can be seen from the revised report I now consider the building likely dates to c.1866. The architectural style descriptor has also been changed to 'colonial vernacular with Italianate detailing', in order to clarify the architectural style of the house.
- 3.3 The only way to fully resolve some of the technical matters the submitter raises, in regard to the vintage of heritage fabric such as the nails, windows and shingles, would be to engage a building archaeologist to undertake a full survey of the building. This input appears unwarranted given that the HHRF is a summary document intended to describe the building, its history and appearance in such a way as to aid recognition and inform both future consenting processes and funding applications, should either course be desired by the owners.
- 3.4 While I remain unsure about the degree of change the house has experienced, I am in general agreement with the submitter that 'the house is an early Canterbury settler house, much altered over the years but retaining an interesting character entirely of its own. This character and historic significance are further reinforced by the presence of the Irwell River (when it has water in it), the water race and the old mill buildings and structures across the road.'
- 3.5 I recommend that the submission be accepted in part in order to update the HHRF for the building.

### **Submission DPR-0205.023, 0205.024 Lincoln University**

- 4.1 The submitter requests in submission point 0205.024 that the 1991-92 addition made to Ivey Hall, including Memorial Hall, is excluded from scheduled item H30 in HH-SCHED2 of the PDP. As a consequential matter, submission point 0205.023 requests that the footprint of the scheduled item be shown in HH-SCHED2.
- 4.2 In response to these submissions a site visit to Lincoln University, in the presence of university staff, their consultant planners, a Heritage NZPT staff member and Andrew Mactier from SDC, was made on Thursday 15 July 2021. At that time the building was inspected from the exterior and the extent of setting reviewed.
- 4.3 As a result of the site visit I now recommend that the extent of setting be reduced in size, from that shown in the heritage report linked to HH-SCHED2 in the PDP, to omit the southern portion of the site. This reduction in extent recognises that the separate building, lean-to structure and carparking at the rear of Ivey Hall do not contribute to the heritage values of the building, notwithstanding the potential for archaeological

evidence to be present according to the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.

4.3 in the course of the site visit I confirmed that the building, including its later 20th century alterations and additions, should be scheduled in toto. The redevelopment of Ivey Hall in the late 1980s and early 1990s facilitated the ongoing use of the building and added a Post-Modern dimension to its architectural qualities. Just as JS Guthrie and Cecil Wood had done with their additions, Christchurch architectural practise Trengrove & Blunt reinterpreted the original Strouts design and at the same time created one of the period's most successful examples of facadism as a means by which to preserve and modernise a historic building. The HHRF has been amended (see Attachment 1) to reflect the findings of the site visit.

4.4 I therefore recommend that the submission be accepted in part, with the extent of setting amended but the building, including its later 20<sup>th</sup> century alterations and additions, retained in whole on the schedule in line with best practice. Consequentially there is no need to show the footprint of the scheduled item in HH-SSCHED2 because the whole of the building has been assessed and identified as the scheduled item.

#### **Submission DPR-0269.001 & 0269.011 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga**

5.1 The submitter requests that the definition (submission 0269.001) and rule (submission 0269.011) regarding maintenance and repair of items included in HH-SCHED2 of the PDP are amended to require date-stamping of all new materials that are not distinguishable from the original. This approach is not standard practice for district planning heritage provisions, is overly prescriptive and would place a considerable burden on the owners of heritage items.

5.2 The ICOMOS New Zealand Charter states, in regard to repair: *Repair of a place of cultural heritage value should utilise matching or similar materials. Where it is necessary to employ new materials, they should be distinguishable by experts, and should be documented.* I do not believe this conservation principle is in conflict with the wording in the PDP where maintenance or repairs are defined thus: 'to replace or mend in-situ, decayed or damaged heritage fabric using materials, including identical, closely similar or otherwise appropriate material, which resemble the form, appearance and profile of the heritage fabric as closely as possible.'

5.3 It is therefore my recommendation that the submission point be rejected.

#### **Submissions DPR-0290.004 & DPR-0290.006 Hamish Rennie**

6.1 The submitter requests that the concept of heritage areas be promoted in the PDP and that a heritage area at Irwell, encompassing St Mary's Anglican Church (scheduled item H418), the former Irwell School/Irwell Hall (scheduled item H403), and Sudeley Park, be identified and scheduled within HH-SCHED 2.

6.2 There are no heritage areas currently identified in the PDP but the policy at HH-P10 states that 'Council continues to investigate the identification and management of historic heritage areas, historic heritage landscapes, archaeological sites, and heritage

interiors'. This policy allows for the future assessment, according to the criteria, of a heritage area at Irwell.

- 6.3 I recommend that the submission be accepted in part, acknowledging that the plan does promote the concept of heritage areas and that the future implementation of HH-P10 could include consideration of a heritage area at Irwell as described by the submitter. At this time however it appears that the community values of the 'area' described by the submitter are more appropriately identified and promoted in the form of heritage interpretation to encourage the ongoing use and upkeep of the church, hall and park at Irwell.

#### **Submission DPR-0294.001 Steve & Jane West**

- 7.1 The submission requests that corrections be made to the ownership information contained within the 'History' section of the HHRF for the former Will Kennedy Hut & Shed (H159) at Arthur's Pass.
- 7.2 I recommend that the submission is accepted; the HHRF for this building has been amended accordingly. At the same time the relevant paragraph was edited slightly to improve the chronological sequencing of the narrative. The revised HHRF is appended to this report as Attachment 2.

#### **Submission DPR-0379.029 Jill Thomson**

- 8.1 The submitter has sought an amendment to the definition of relocation within the PDP. The wording in the PDP is thus: 'In relation to any heritage item [relocation] means to physically shift the location of a building within a property or to another property. Relocation includes permanently raising a building or structure above existing ground level but does not include the temporary raising of a building to replace foundations'. The Historic Heritage chapter provides rules for relocation of a heritage item within its setting (Rule HH-R5) and outside its setting (HH-R6). The activity status for relocation within the setting of the heritage item is Restricted Discretionary and the matters of discretion are provided at HH-MAT5.
- 8.2 Relocation of a building within its existing footprint could be described as an alteration if access steps are required after the relocation, for example. Alterations and Additions are also a Restricted Discretionary activity in the PDP (HH-R3) but, as can be seen from the Matters of Discretion for Alterations and Additions (HH-MAT3), there are distinct differences between the effects that would need to be considered in regard to either moving an item, either vertically or horizontally within its setting, or altering and/or extending it. While the potential for overlap between relocation and alterations and additions is acknowledged, these are distinct activities, and it is considered important that the definition of relocation provides for the temporary relocation of a building for foundation works.
- 8.3 It is my recommendation that the submission be rejected.

#### **Submission DPR-0467.001 Helen Reid**

10.1 The submitter has nominated her property to be scheduled as a heritage item in HH-Sched 2. Judging from the photographs supplied by the submitter, the cottage appears to be a single-storey vernacular building with a gabled roof and lean-to at the rear (west elevation). A trellised porch shelters the front door (east elevation) and, according to the submitter, the south end of the building was extended using flattened fuel drums in the post-war period. The submitter states the house dates to 1900.

10.2 The submission provides insufficient information to assess the building's potential heritage significance. Located at 1774 Great Alpine Highway (SH 73), the building appears to be in a very poor state of repair, which very likely undermines the authenticity and integrity of the building to such an extent that it would not meet the criteria for scheduling. HH-P1 in the PDP states: 'Schedule heritage items and their associated settings where the criteria in HH-SCHED1 are met, unless the physical condition of the heritage item is compromised to the extent that it can no longer retain its heritage significance.'

10.3 I recommend that the submission be rejected.

#### **Submission DPR-0473.001 Clare Ryan**

11.1 The submitter has nominated the Selwyn Huts as a site of historic and cultural significance. No heritage areas are currently identified in the PDP but the policy at HH-P10 states that 'Council continues to investigate the identification and management of historic heritage areas, historic heritage landscapes, archaeological sites, and heritage interiors'. This policy allows for the future assessment, according to the criteria, of a Selwyn Huts Heritage Area, or Areas, given that there are two groups of fishing huts located beside the Selwyn River; the submitter does not specify which cluster her submission relates to.

11.2 I recommend that the submission be accepted in part, on the basis that, while the Selwyn Huts appear to have potential heritage value, assessment of one or more Selwyn Huts heritage areas should be undertaken in the context of the implementation of HH-P10 across the district and in consultation with all affected parties.

#### **Attachments:**

Amended Historic Heritage Record Forms have been prepared in response to the relevant submissions. Changes to the HHRFs appended to this report, as attachments 1 through 4, appear as coloured text.

- Attachment 1. H30 Ivey Hall, including Memorial Hall, Lincoln University, Lincoln
- Attachment 2. H159 Former Will Kennedy hut and shed, Arthurs Pass
- Attachment 3. H210 Rolleston Hotel, Rolleston
- Attachment 4. H416 Mill house, Irwell



Dr Ann McEwan  
26 August 2021