
REPORT 3
(1215/52/IM)

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to seek approval for revised heritage assessment criteria to be used when listing items in Wellington City Council's District Plan and when including items in Wellington City Council's heritage inventory.

2. Executive Summary

This report sets out heritage assessment criteria for application by Council officers and conservation professionals in assessing heritage items for listing in the District Plan and for including items in the heritage inventory.

Since the 1970s Wellington City Council has recognised items of historic value in its District Schemes and District Plan. When the District Plan was notified in 1994 a significant advance was made in respect to measures to protect and conserve Wellington's heritage, including the adoption of the current heritage criteria that are still in use today. In more recent times it has become evident that these criteria were not robust in today's environment. This has been reflected in changes made in the 2001 heritage inventory and in Plan Changes 53 and 58 where the criteria have been adapted to reflect more up to date heritage philosophies.

This report researches and analyses heritage assessment criteria at Wellington City Council, and at national and international levels. Key findings indicate that the criteria used by Council since 2001 are for the most part robust and comprehensive. However inconsistencies, variations, and a lack of clarity were identified. In addition the criteria now set out in the District Plan do not meet current international best practice. These issues have been addressed and amended in the proposed criteria to reflect international best practice in heritage conservation.

This report fulfils requirements of the Wellington City Council's Built Heritage Policy (2005) to review current assessment criteria used for listing items in the District Plan and to adopt new criteria.

3. Recommendations

It is recommended that the Committee:

1. *Receive the information.*
2. *Agree to recommend to Council that it adopt the proposed criteria set out in Appendix II of this report.*

4. Background

The current heritage items contained in the District Plan represent heritage buildings, objects, and areas for protection. All of these items have been assessed using heritage criteria that have adapted over time to suit the changing practice of heritage assessment.

Under the 1972 District Scheme six items were listed as places of historical interest. At this time, no criteria were used to formally assess these buildings, but Council was obligated to keep particulars of them ready for public inspection. In following years more buildings were identified and added to the District Scheme.

The first scheme to formally introduce heritage criteria was the 1985 District Scheme which set out the selection process for items for 'registration'. These criteria were not too dissimilar to the criteria that are used today in that they identified key elements such as historic, scientific, and aesthetic value. Under these criteria, approximately 124 buildings, objects, areas, and trees were identified as items for protection in the District Scheme.

When the District Plan was notified in 1994 a significant advance was made in respect of the measures to protect and conserve the heritage of Wellington City. For the first time a comprehensive approach involving financial incentives and advice was adopted, along with enhanced regulatory measures.

Specific objectives, policies, and rules were adopted to ensure that items were retained and appropriately managed. In following years the District Plan satisfactorily managed historic heritage, but monitoring showed that improvements could be made.

The elevated status given to built heritage under the Resource Management Amendment Act 2003 (which made the recognition and protection of historic heritage a matter of national importance) provided the opportune time to review Council's approach to heritage issues.

After an extensive consultation process, Wellington City Council's new Built Heritage Policy¹ was adopted in June 2005. It aims to provide for greater

¹ 'Built Heritage Policy,' Wellington City Council, June 2005, Implementation Plan 2005-2015, Objective 1, Tasks, Assessment criteria, b and c.

statutory protection for Wellington city's built heritage; the creation of more heritage items in the District Plan; and direction to readdress the criteria for assessing heritage items.

The criteria proposed in this report have been developed in fulfilment of requirements of Council's Built Heritage Policy that sets out the following tasks:

Review assessment criteria for listing heritage places in District Plan and criteria for assessing inclusion of places in Wellington Building Heritage Inventory 2001

Adopt new criteria for assessing additions to the District Plan

Following on from the Built Heritage Policy, District Plan Change 43 (Heritage Provisions) has proposed revised heritage requirements that strengthen the regulatory controls for the protection of Wellington's historic heritage. Submissions for Plan Change 43 closed 6 November 2006 with the Plan Change heard in May 2007. The Hearing Committee Decision was notified on 18 October 2007, with submitters having 30 days to appeal the decision to the Environment Court. If no appeals are received the provisions will become operative.

During the preparation of Plan Change 43, the decision was made to remove the current criteria from Chapter 20 of the District Plan. It was known that the criteria for assessing heritage items were to be reviewed and would be reported to Council in the near future. By removing them from the District Plan, it provided the opportunity to thoroughly assess the current criteria in a well researched manner. It was not considered beneficial to include the current criteria knowing that further work would be undertaken.

Legal comment also indicated that this information formed part of the section 32 analysis that underpinned any particular listing. While such analysis would be guided by the established criteria they would not in all cases provide the only determinants. It was considered that such information would relate more appropriately to Council's heritage inventory, which details the listing of items resulting from assessment work that is undertaken. Nevertheless it was considered that current criteria still apply to any new listings that are considered. The opinion was that even if it remains physically out of the District Plan, Council can still apply whatever criteria are appropriate (so long as the section 32 analysis is robust).

5. Discussion

5.1 *What are heritage assessment criteria?*

In order to determine if an item has cultural heritage significance, it is necessary to determine its heritage values. Heritage assessment criteria are the intrinsic attributes and characteristics against which heritage items are assessed when determining their cultural heritage significance.

At Wellington City Council cultural heritage significance is determined as part of the process of listing an item in the District Plan. Once the heritage values of an item have been identified, future decisions about the item can be based upon protecting these qualities.

Type of significance

The type of heritage significance refers to the different categories of intrinsic values a heritage item may have. Types of significance include aesthetic, historic, scientific, and social value.

Degree of significance

Once the type of heritage significance has been determined, an item can be assessed for its degree or level of significance. For example, an item can be judged to be important in a local, regional, national, or international context. Items can be categorised within these contexts, for example in terms of being rare, representative, or unique.

5.2 Why do we list?

Listing is a mechanism for protecting heritage items. In addition to the strong public mandate to protect heritage, the understanding that heritage helps to strengthen personal and community identity, and the desire to pass heritage on to future generations, Wellington City Council has statutory obligations.

Under Section 6 Part II of the Resource Management Amendment Act 2003 'the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development' was added to the list of matters of national importance. Council has a statutory obligation to enact this legislation to protect the city's heritage through the District Plan. One of the key mechanisms to achieve this directive is through the listing process.

The imperative to list buildings is further reinforced by the Greater Wellington Regional Council's Regional Policy Statement.² This document sets out policies that city and district councils are to implement. The first of these states:

Policy 1: District and regional plan identification of historic heritage

Regional and district plans shall identify historic heritage places and areas to be included in historic heritage schedules...

5.3 Methods

The criteria put forward in this report have been developed through:

² Greater Wellington Regional Council, 'Historic Heritage: Draft provisions for the Regional Statement, 21 September 2007.

- Research and analysis of Wellington City Council's heritage assessment criteria that have been applied up until the present.
- Research and analysis of current nationally and internationally recognised heritage assessment criteria.

This material is included in Appendix I.

5.4 *Research and analysis findings*

Key research and analysis findings are:

- There is an increasing number of heritage assessment criteria versions available. In general they all incorporate the same concepts, but they are expressed using different terminology and categories. These criteria are identified and discussed in Appendix I.
- The criteria set out and applied in the Wellington Heritage Building Inventory 2001 and the criteria applied for recent District Plan listings including Plan Change 53 and Plan Change 58 are for the most part robust and comprehensive. They continue to stand up comparatively well against other national and international criteria.
- The types of heritage significance applied since 2001 have remained consistent. However there are inconsistencies that exist within the descriptions and content of the types of significance. In addition there are variations in how the degree of significance is described and incorporated in descriptions.
- The 2001 inventory criteria and those used for recent listings have their basis in 'The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Significance (The Burra Charter).'
- The Burra Charter is an internationally recognised and respected document. Its criteria are comprehensive and concise. All cultural heritage values can be encompassed within four principal value types.
- Assessment criteria used in New Zealand have their basis in the Burra Charter, but they typically expand some of the types of significance to form a larger list of values. This is not regarded as beneficial but as confusing particularly since definitions of criteria types are not included.
- The assessment criteria in the District Plan are not based upon the Burra Charter. They include values that are not recognised heritage values in international best practice. Some descriptions lack clarity and terminology is not always appropriate. Appendix I has detailed discussion on these issues.

5.5 *Proposed criteria*

The criteria set in Appendix II are an adaptation of the Wellington Heritage Building Inventory 2001 criteria and those used for listing items in recent District Plan Changes 53 and 58. Both of these sets of criteria use the fundamental cultural heritage significance criteria types of aesthetic, historic, scientific, and social value. Both include similar content for levels of cultural

heritage significance. The proposed criteria combine features of both versions but they are modified and supplemented in order to improve the understanding of cultural heritage values and their levels of significance.

The proposed version refines types and levels of cultural heritage significance. The categories selected are comprehensive and explicit. Changes are made in order to correct inconsistencies, including repetition, and the lack of clarity identified and discussed in Appendix I. Key words are included to explain what can be included within each value type. Descriptive questions are included to explain the intention behind each type and each level of significance. Types and levels are listed separately. The changes ensure that the criteria are user-friendly and readily understood.

The criteria will be publicly accessible on Wellington City Council's website and readily available as supplementary information and in promotional material. If the criteria are added to the District Plan, a formal Plan Change process will be required.

5.6 Parameters

Cultural heritage

The proposed criteria are intended for application when assessing cultural heritage items including, buildings, objects, and areas for listing in the District Plan. They are not intended for natural heritage places.

Culturally inclusive

The proposed criteria acknowledge and encompass the cultural heritage values pertaining to the heritage of every cultural group in New Zealand's multicultural society. In this way they are applicable to all cultural heritage items in Wellington City.

6. Conclusion

This Heritage Assessment Criteria report fulfils three important objectives set out in Wellington City Council's Built Heritage Policy (2005):

Firstly the report presents a review of assessment criteria for listing heritage items in the District Plan.

Secondly the report presents a review of criteria for assessing inclusion of items in the Wellington City Council's heritage inventory.

Thirdly the report proposes new criteria for assessing additions to the District Plan.

The proposed heritage assessment criteria are based upon international best practice in heritage conservation. They are designed to be comprehensive, explicit, consistent, and user-friendly.

Contact Officer: *Alexandra Teague, Urban Designer-Heritage*

Supporting Information

1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome

This initiative supports Council's overall vision of Creative Wellington – Innovation Capital. It has a direct link to the Urban Development Strategy, has links with the Transport and the Culture Well-Being Strategies.

This initiative supports the second highest strategic priority - high quality urban design. It also contributes to the delivery of other strategic priorities:

- *Protection of sense of place*

High quality urban design contributes to the following Council outcomes:

Outcome 1: More liveable – by developing and maintaining a high quality public environment

Outcome 2: Stronger sense of place – by integrating sense of place into asset management, by enhancing the role of the city as Capital, by ensuring high quality built design and by conserving the city's heritage.

2) LTCCP/Annual Plan reference and long term financial impact *n/a*

3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations *n/a*

4) Decision-Making

This decision shows Council's commitment to raising the profile of heritage.

5) Consultation

a) General Consultation

The criteria that form the basis of the proposed criteria have been formulated through an ongoing process of consultation.

b) Consultation with Maori

n/a

6) Legal Implications

n/a

7) Consistency with existing policy

This initiative is consistent with existing Council policy as outlined in Built Heritage Policy 2005.

Review and Analysis

1 Wellington City Council's heritage assessment criteria

1.1 Operative District Plan

Wellington City Council's Operative District Plan³ states:

The criteria used for considering inclusion of an item in the District Plan are:

20.1.1.1 Cultural Values

Emotional

These are values which are associated with a place by function, location, history, setting or commemoration. They include legendary, spiritual, sentimental, religious, symbolic, political and patriotic values and include sites that may no longer exist in a physical form but have a turangawaewae/spiritual connection. Such sites, a form of "hidden landscape", may have a metaphysical or symbolic meaning rather than physical form.

Historical

Historical values are those with which a place is imbued by virtue of age, or the fact that they provide the context for significant events or the activities of significant people or groups. They include age, tradition, continuity, association with people and groups, or an association with an event.

Design

Design values may include the creative or artistic use or adaptation of materials, spaces, colour, structures and/or textures in the fields of architectural, landscape, urban, technical, engineering (civil, structural, mechanical and electrical) and functional design.

Technological

Technological values include the association, application or contribution of a place to the creation, innovation or invention of a science or technology.

20.1.1.2 Use Values

People can value a heritage resource in its current form, through the process of its conservation or because of the end result of its conservation for reuse. Use values can include benefits such as the generation of income from its existing or new use, the educational value derived from cultural values and the potential for amenity use.

³ Wellington City District Plan Operative 27/07/00, last amended 6 July 2006, Heritage 20.1.1.

20.1.1.3 Contextual Values or Levels of Significance

These are factors which determine the relative levels of significance possessed by a heritage item. Different heritage items have different levels of significance.

Measure of Value

The relative value of an item may be assessed against certain measurements. Is the item:

unique; rare; outstanding; seminal; landmark; influential; representative with respect to cultural value (including building type, construction, style, design, builder, designer, period, region)?

Level of Authenticity

Authenticity is generally understood as the item's original state. However, later modifications to a place may also be considered to be authentic. The areas of authenticity are:

Design

Authenticity of design is the retention of the design values.

Setting

Authenticity of setting is where the urban and landscape design values of the setting are retained.

Materials

Authenticity of materials includes the retention of materials, the impact of history, the process of ageing and patina of the material.

Workmanship/Craftsmanship

Authenticity of workmanship includes retention of the evidence of the use of technology and the methods of manufacture, material treatment and of construction.

Key issues

- Criteria are not based upon the Burra Charter, which is recognised international best practice (Refer section 3.1 below).
- The definition of emotional value is not clear. For example it introduces values associated with a place by history, which is historical value.
- The word 'emotional' is pejorative.
- Definition of historical value is not clear. For example it uses the present tense rather than the past.
- Use values as defined are not heritage values (Refer 'Comments' below).
- Educational value is misplaced in use values.
- Explanation and terminology of contextual values/levels of significance and measure of value are not clear.

Comments

Use values and economic value

The Operative District Plan includes 'use values' as criteria for listing places of cultural heritage value. In this context, use is taken to include the 'benefits such as the generation of income from its existing or new use, the educational value derived from cultural values and the potential for amenity use.'

Use values as defined here to include economic value and amenity use are not heritage values. Use values in this sense are extrinsic values that 'are not heritage values but are influenced by heritage values and can change rapidly over time, such as capital values.'⁴

Cultural heritage values are the intrinsic characteristics of an object. Discussion of economics in heritage conservation is about extrinsic values and is more to do with costs than with values.

Economic benefits such as the generation of income are not intrinsic heritage values and cannot be considered when assessing the heritage significance of an item. The Getty Conservation Institute who is taking an active role in research about the assessment of cultural and economic values states that:

...something is lost when cultural values are measured in terms of price, something fundamental to the whole prospect of heritage conservation as part of a healthy society.⁵

Cultural values and economic values exist within different frameworks. These are two distinctly different worldviews and economics remains outside the realm of international heritage conservation theory and practice when determining cultural heritage significance. It does not appear in any of the heritage assessment criteria surveyed in this report.

Educational value

Educational value, which the operative plan includes as a use value, is an intrinsic heritage value. It would be more appropriately positioned within technological and scientific categories.

1.2 Wellington Heritage Building Inventory 2001

The 'Wellington Heritage Building Inventory 2001'⁶ sets out heritage assessment criteria as:

⁴ Ian Bowman, 'Chest Hospital, Wellington: Heritage Inventory,' report for Wellington City Council, 2004, 9.

⁵ de la Torre, Marta and Randy Mason, 'Economics and Heritage Conservation: Issues and Ideas on Valuing Heritage,' Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, California, online at: <http://www.icomos.org/usicomos/Symposium/SYMP99/delatorre.htm>, [16 August 2007]

Historic Value

Is the building associated with important or **representative** aspects of national, regional or local history?

Is the building associated with events, people, groups of people or institutions which are of importance in national, regional or local history?

Does the building have **rarity** value as a particular type of place or for its age or style?

Social value

Is the building held in high **public esteem**?

Does the building have **symbolic**, commemorative, traditional, **spiritual** or other **cultural** value for groups within the community?

Does the building have **amenity** value, either for its use, or for the role it plays in defining the identity of the community.

Aesthetic Value

Does the building have **architectural** or artistic value because of its design, form, scale, materials, colour, patina or quality of space?

Is the building a good **representative** example of a particular style of architecture or period?

Does the building have **townscape** value for the part it plays in defining a space or street, in providing visual interest, for its role as a **landmark**, or for the contribution it makes to the character and sense of place of Wellington?

Is the building part of a **group** of buildings, structures or sites that, taken together, have coherence because of their age, history, style, scale, materials or use?

Scientific Value

Does the building have technical value in its structure, or for the choice or use of materials, or is it a good **representative** example of a particular building technique?

Is the building **authentic**, retaining significant fabric from the time of its construction, or from latter periods when important additions or modifications were carried out?

Does the building have archaeological value for its ability to provide scientific information about past human activity or life style?

⁶ Wellington City Council 'Wellington Heritage Building Inventory 2001,' Volume 2, Appendix I, Assessment Criteria.

Key issues

- Style is included in historic value but is an aesthetic value.
- Amenity value undefined can include service convenience, which is not an intrinsic heritage value (Refer 'Comments' below).
- Representative and rarity are only assigned to specific value types. In reality they can apply to other value types as well. For example, an item may be rare because of its design.
- Bolding of value levels is unnecessary and confusing. It takes emphasis from other key concepts.
- Authenticity is included in scientific value, but is also applicable to aesthetic value.
- National, regional, and local can apply across value types but are only mentioned in historic value.

Comments

Amenity value

Amenity is included in New Zealand's Resource Management Act (1991) as a reason for placing a heritage order on a place. A heritage order can protect '[a]ny place of special interest, character, intrinsic or amenity value or visual appeal...'⁷

The act⁸ defines amenity values as

those natural or physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes.

In contrast, amenity is explicitly excluded as a reason for assessing a place as significant in the New South Wales Heritage Office's assessment criteria. In this instance, amenity is defined as 'service convenience.'⁹

The meanings of amenity in these two instances are distinctly different, and if amenity value is to be included in assessment criteria then a definition must make clear the intended meanings.

1.3 Plan Change 43: Heritage Provisions

Wellington City Council's District Plan Change 43¹⁰ states:

⁷ New Zealand Parliament, *Resource Management Act* (1991), Section 189.

⁸ Refer New Zealand Parliament, *Resource Management Act* (1991), Part 1, Section 2.

⁹ New South Wales Heritage Office, *Assessing Heritage Significance: New South Wales Heritage Manual Update*, 3rd ed. (Sydney, 2001), 14.

¹⁰ Wellington City Council, District Plan Change 43: Heritage Provisions, 10 October 2007, 20.1.1.

The criteria for identifying buildings, objects and areas in the district plan may include places with archaeological, architectural, cultural, historic, scientific, or technological qualities and whether the place is rare or unique, representative of a particular style of era authentic and /or contributes to a group of places.

This statement sets out both the type and the level of significance. It takes the place of the Operative District Plan clauses 20.1.1.1 to 20.1.1.3.

In addition Plan Change 43 recognises the 'ICOMOS NZ Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Significance', 'other international charters such as the Burra Charter, the Xia'n Declaration On The Conservation Of the Setting Of Heritage Structures, Sites And Areas 2005 and guidelines...' to 'provide important references in identifying and protecting heritage and in the resource consent process.'¹¹

Key issues

- Value types are taken from the Resource Management Act 2003.
- Values listed in the act are the same as those in the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter with the addition of cultural value (Refer 2.1 below).
- Cultural value is an all-encompassing term and not an individual value. Its inclusion here serves no purpose especially since no definitions for each value are included.
- Criteria types are an expansion of the Burra Charter criteria. They include no new value types.
- No definition of each value type is included.
- Archaeological value and technological value are scientific values (repetition).

1.4 Plan Changes 53 and 58: Proposed additions to listed heritage buildings and objects

The heritage assessment criteria applied in the assessment of items listed in Plan Change 53 and Plan change 58 are:

Historic Value:	Age Association (events, people etc)
Social Value:	Public Esteem/Community Value Symbolic, commemorative, spiritual, cultural Amenity/Economic Value
Aesthetic Value:	Architectural (Form/Fabric/Style) Townscape or Landscape Value
Scientific Value:	Technical Archaeological

¹¹ Ibid, 20.1.4.1.

Setting/Surroundings	Contribution to Setting Contribution of Surroundings/Group Value
Representative	
Importance (Local/Regional/National)	
Rarity/Uniqueness	
Authenticity	

Key issues

- Economic value is incorrectly included in social value. (Refer discussion about economic value in section 1.1 above)
- Amenity value undefined can include service convenience, which is not an intrinsic heritage value.
- Educational value is missing from scientific value.
- Townscape and landscape value sit within aesthetic value. Townscape and landscape value is closely connected to setting, surroundings, and group value but these are listed separately.

2 National heritage assessment criteria

2.1 The ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (1993)

The ICOMOS New Zealand Charter¹² states:

cultural heritage value means possessing historical, archaeological, architectural, technological, aesthetic, scientific, spiritual, social, traditional or other special cultural significance, associated with human activity

Key issues

- Criteria types are an expansion of the Burra Charter criteria. They include no new value types.
- No definition of each criteria type is included.
- Archaeological value and technological value are scientific values (repetition).
- Architectural value is an aesthetic value (repetition).
- Spiritual value is a social value (repetition).
- Traditional value can be a historic value if in the past or a social value if continuing.

¹² The New Zealand National Committee of ICOMOS, *ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value* (1993), Section 23.

2.2 New Zealand Historic Places Act (1993)

Section 23 of the New Zealand Historic Places Act (1993) sets out the New Zealand Historic Places Trust registration criteria.¹³

The Trust may enter any historic place or historic area in the Register if the place or area possesses aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, technological, or traditional significance or value.

Key issues

- Values listed in the act are the same as those in the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter with the addition of cultural value (Refer section 2.1 above).
- Cultural value is an all-encompassing term and not an individual value. Its inclusion here serves no purpose especially since no definitions for each value are included.
- Criteria types are an expansion of the Burra Charter criteria. They include no new value types.
- No definition of each value type is included.
- Archaeological value and technological value are scientific values (repetition).
- Architectural value is an aesthetic value (repetition).
- Spiritual value is a social value (repetition).
- Traditional value can be a historic value if in the past or a social value if continuing.

2.3 New Zealand Historic Places Trust Historic Heritage Guidance Information Sheets

In September 2007 the New Zealand Historic Places Trust produced a list of best practice criteria for use by local authorities and communities in identifying and assessing heritage.¹⁴

Physical values

Archaeological information: Does the place or area have the potential to contribute information about the human history of the region, or to current archaeological research questions, through investigation using archaeological methods?

Architecture: Is the place significant because of its design, form, scale, materials, style, ornamentation, period, craftsmanship or other architectural element?

¹³ New Zealand Parliament, *Historic Places Act (1993)*, Section 23, Part 1.

¹⁴ New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga, Sustainable Management of Historic Heritage Guidance Information Sheet 2.

Technology and Engineering: Does the place demonstrate innovative or important methods of construction or design, does it contain unusual construction materials, is it an early example of the use of a particular construction technique or does it have the potential to contribute information about technological or engineering history?

Scientific: Does the area or place have the potential to provide scientific information about the history of the region?

Rarity: Is the place or area, or are features within it, unique, unusual, uncommon or rare at a district, regional or national level or in relation to particular historical themes?

Representativeness: Is the place or area a good example of its class, for example, in terms of design, type, features, use, technology or time period?

Integrity: Does the place have integrity, retaining significant features from its time of construction, or later periods when important modifications or additions were carried out?

Vulnerability: Is the place vulnerable to deterioration or destruction or is threatened by land use activities.

Context or Group: Is the place or area part of a group of heritage places, a landscape, a townscape or setting which when considered as a whole amplify the heritage values of the place and group/ landscape or extend its significance?

Historic values

People: Is the place associated with the life or works of a well-known or important individual, group or organisation?

Events: Is the place associated with an important event in local, regional or national history?

Patterns: Is the place associated with important aspects, processes, themes or patterns of local, regional or national history?

Cultural values

Identity: Is the place or area a focus of community, regional or national identity or sense of place, and does it have social value and provide evidence of cultural or historical continuity?

Public esteem: Is the place held in high public esteem for its heritage or aesthetic values or as a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment?

Commemorative: Does the place have symbolic or commemorative significance to people who use or have used it, or to the descendants of such people, as a result of its special interest, character, landmark, amenity or visual appeal?

Education: Could the place contribute, through public education, to people's awareness, understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's history and cultures?

Tangata whenua: Is the place important to tangata whenua for traditional, spiritual, cultural or historical reasons?

Statutory recognition: Does the place or area have statutory acknowledgement including: registration under the Historic Places Act 1993; is it recorded by the New Zealand Archaeological Association, is it an archaeological site as defined by the Historic Places Act 1993; is a statutory acknowledgement under claim settlement legislation; or is it recognised by special legislation?

Key issues

- Cultural values is an all-encompassing term and not an individual value. All cultural heritage values are cultural values.
- Scientific value appears in physical values (under 'Archaeological information,' 'Technology and Engineering,' and 'Scientific') and in cultural values under 'Education.'
- Rarity is only applied to physical values but it could apply to the other value categories.
- Statutory recognition is not an intrinsic heritage value.
- Local, regional, and national importance is only applied to 'Events' and 'Patterns' in historic values but it could apply to 'People' and to other value categories.

2.4 The Resource Management Act 2003

The Resource Management Amendment Act 2003¹⁵ states:

historic heritage—

“(a) means those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's history and cultures, deriving from any of the following qualities:

- (i) archaeological
- (ii) architectural
- (iii) cultural
- (iv) historic
- (v) scientific
- (vi) technological

Key issues

- Values listed in the act are the same as those in the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter with the addition of cultural value (Refer section 2.1 above).
- Cultural value is an all-encompassing term and not an individual value. Its inclusion here serves no purpose especially since no definitions for each value are included.
- Criteria types are an expansion of the Burra Charter criteria. They include no new value types.
- No definition of each value type is included.
- Archaeological value and technological value are scientific values (repetition).

2.5 Wellington Regional Council

In June 2007 the Greater Wellington Regional Council produced 'Historic Heritage: Draft provisions for the Regional Policy Statement.'¹⁶ This document proposes the criteria by which heritage places and areas are to be identified for inclusion in regional and district plan heritage schedules. The criteria are:

(a) **Historic Values:** These relate to the history of a place and how the historic heritage resource demonstrates important historical events, processes, themes or people.

(i) Themes: The place is associated with important themes in history or patterns of development.

(ii) Events: There is an association with an important event in local, regional or national history.

(iii) People: The place is associated with the life or works of a well-known or important individual, group or organisation.

(iv) Social: The place illustrates common or everyday experiences from the past.

(b) **Physical Values:** These values relate to the physical evidence present.

(i) Archaeological: There is potential for archaeological investigation to contribute information about the human history of the region.

(ii) Architectural: There are significant design, form, scale, materials, ornamentation, period, craftsmanship or other architectural values present.

(iii) Technological or scientific: There is evidence of

¹⁶ 'Historic Heritage: Draft provisions for the Regional Policy Statement,' Greater Wellington Regional Council, 21 September 2007.

technological or scientific history.

(iv) **Integrity:** The significant physical values have largely been unmodified.

(c) **Social values:** These criteria relate to the esteem that a community or communities holds on a place.

(i) **Shared values:** The place is a focus of spiritual, political, social, religious, national or other cultural sentiment.

(ii) **Recognised values:** The place is widely known and is highly valued for its contribution to local identity within the immediate and wider community, or it is a landmark.

(d) **Maori values:** The place is sacred or important to Maori for spiritual, cultural or historical reasons.

(e) **Surroundings:** The setting or context of the place is intact.

(f) **Group values:** The place contributes to the heritage values of a wider townscape, landscape or setting.

(g) **Rarity:** The place is unique or rare within the district or region.

(h) **Representative:** The place is a good example of its type or era.

Key issues

- The eight categories are a mixture of value types, value levels, and other characteristics.
- Criteria mix value type with value level: integrity is included as a physical value.
- Scientific values including archaeological and technological are subsumed within physical values.
- District or regional context is only included in relation to rarity, but it can also relate to being representative and to physical values.
- Maori values are listed separately but all Maori values are included within the other categories (repetition).
- Surroundings is a physical value but is listed separately.

2.6 Auckland City Council

Auckland City Council applies the following heritage assessment criteria:¹⁷

Physical Characteristics

¹⁷ 'City of Auckland: District Plan Central Area Section: Operative 2004,' updated 18/08/2006, Part 10 Heritage, Section 10.9.5, 11.

a)Style: Notable, rare, unique, or early example of a particular design style, type, or convention.

b)Construction: Notable, rare, unique, or early example of a particular method of construction or use of material.

c)Age: Comparatively old in the context of its region.

d)Architect/designer/originator: Designed or built by originator, (an architect, builder, or designer), who has made a significant design contribution to the community, province, or nation, and illustrative of that contribution.

e)Design: An object or feature which is particularly attractive or regionally, nationally or internationally significant because of the excellence, artistic merit, or uniqueness of its design, composition, craftsmanship, or details, and illustrative of those characteristics.

f)Interior: Interior arrangement, finish, craftsmanship, and/or detail which is particularly attractive or unique regionally, nationally or internationally.

History: People/Events/ Associations

a)Personnel: Associated with, and evocative of, the life or activities of a person, group, iwi, organisation or institution that has made a significant contribution to, or is recognised for its significant association with, the community, locality, or nation.

b)Events: Associated with, or evocative of, an event or events that has made a significant contribution to, or is significant in the history of, the community, locality, or nation.

c)Social context: Associated with, and evocative of, broad patterns of cultural, social, political, military, economic or industrial history or is a repository of cultural or community memories.

Environment

a)Continuity: Object, feature or place which contributes to the continuity or character of the street, neighbourhood, area, cityscape or landscape.

b)Physical context (setting): Physical and visual character of the object, feature, or place, which contributes to the continuity or character of the context, whether it be street, neighbourhood, area, cityscape or landscape.

c)Landmark quality: A particularly important visual landmark or feature.

d)Group significance: Item is a part or member of a recognisable group of related items. Criteria test the impact of a hypothetical initial loss from the group only, and categorise the group accordingly.

Integrity

a)Location: The relationship of the object, feature or place to its original site.

b)Intactness: The effect of alterations, deletions and additions on the heritage character and value of the object, feature or place.

Key issues

- Scientific value is omitted.
- Social value is omitted.
- Physical characteristic d) relating to association with the architect/designer/originator is misplaced. It should be within the history category.

2.7 Christchurch City Council

Christchurch City Council applies the following heritage assessment criteria:¹⁸

Historical and Social Significance

For its historic value or significance in terms of a notable figure, event, phase or activity, and whether it is an important reflection of social patterns of its time.

Cultural and Spiritual Significance

For its contribution to the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, religion or other belief and/or the esteem in which it is held by a particular group or community, including whether it is of special significance to the Tangata Whenua.

Architectural and Artistic Significance

For its significance in terms of a design of a particular style, period or designer and whether it has significant artistic value.

Group and Setting Significance

For its degree of unity in terms of scale, form, materials, texture and colour in relationship to its setting and/or surrounding buildings.

Landmark Significance

For its landmark significance in the community consciousness.

Archaeological Significance

The heritage item and its relevance in respect of important physical evidence of pre-1900 human activities.

Technology and Craftsmanship Significance

The heritage item's importance for the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or constructional methods which were innovative for the period or of noteworthy quality.

Heritage Groups

Heritage items are listed in one of the following groups that rank its overall significance as being either:

- Group 1 International or national significance
- Group 2 National or regional significance
- Group 3 Regional or metropolitan significance
- Group 4 Metropolitan or local significance

Key issues

- Historical is combined with social, but these are two separate value types. Social value in a historic context is actually historic social value.

¹⁸ Christchurch City Council, 'Christchurch Heritage: Heritage Listings: Heritage values and groups,' November 2004; online at: <http://www.ccc.govt.nz/Christchurch/Heritage/Information/HeritageListings.asp>. [8August07].

- Cultural and spiritual significance is used in place of social value.
- Cultural value is an all-encompassing term and not an individual value.
- Rarity, representative, and authenticity are not included.

3 *International heritage assessment criteria*

3.1 *The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Significance (The Burra Charter)*

Article 1.2 of the Burra Charter¹⁹ states:

1.2 *Cultural significance* means aesthetic, historic, scientific, or social value for past, present or future generations.

Key issues

- The Burra Charter is an internationally recognised, respected, and referenced document. It is influential in heritage conservation theory and practice both in Australia and internationally. It has been accepted in many countries, including Latin and North America, Europe, and Asia.
- The Burra Charter has provided the model for the development of conservation guidelines in Canada, New Zealand, and most recently China. It is respected for providing some of the clearest guidance for heritage assessment and evaluation.²⁰

3.2 *Australian Heritage Commission*

The federal agency, the Australian Heritage Commission (AHC) has a list of criteria²¹ used for potential items from the natural and cultural environment for inclusion on the Register of the National Estate:

A place **meets** the registration criterion if the place has a significant heritage value because of one or more of the following:

- (a) the place's importance in the course, or pattern, of Australia's natural or cultural history;
- (b) the place's possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Australia's natural or cultural history;
- (c) the place's potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Australia's natural or cultural history;
- (d) the place's importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of:

¹⁹ The Australian National Committee of ICOMOS. *The Burra Charter (The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance)*. Burra, Sth. Aus., 1979. A revision to the charter in 1999 added spiritual value, but this is understood as part of social value.

²⁰ Teague, AM, 'Materialising the Immaterial: Social Value and the Conservation of Recent Everyday Places,' PhD, The University of Melbourne, 2004, 24-25.

²¹ *Australian Heritage Council Act 2003*, Part 5 Section 22 (2).

- (i) a class of Australia's natural or cultural places; or
- (ii) a class of Australia's natural or cultural environments;
- (e) the place's importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;
- (f) the place's importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- (g) the place's strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- (h) the place's special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Australia's natural or cultural history;
- (i) the place's importance as part of indigenous tradition.

Note: Under subsection 3(2), the expression **heritage value** has the same meaning as in the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. Section 528 of that Act defines **heritage value** of a place as including the place's natural and cultural environment having aesthetic, historic, scientific or social significance, or other significance, for current and future generations of Australians.

Key issues

- Criteria are based upon the Burra Charter, but expanded.
- No types of significance are included.
- Aesthetic value equates to (e).
- Historic value equates to (a) and (h).
- Scientific value equates to (c) and (f).
- Social value equates to (g) and (i).
- Rarity equates to (b).
- Representative equates to (d).

3.3 *New South Wales State Government (Heritage Council of New South Wales)*

The NSW State Government has adopted a set of criteria²² for listing items on the State Heritage Register of state and local heritage significance.

- a) an item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW's cultural or natural history;
- b) an item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW's cultural or natural history;
- c) an item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW;
- d) an item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;

²²

'Assessing Heritage Significance: A NSW Heritage Manual Update,' NSW Heritage Office, 2001, 8.

e) an item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW's cultural or natural history;

f) an item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW's cultural or natural history;

g) an item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW's

- cultural or natural places; or

- cultural or natural environments.

Key issues

- Criteria are based upon the Burra Charter.
- No types of significance are included.
- Criteria are expanded in line with AHC criteria.
- Aesthetic and scientific values equate to c).
- Historic value equates to a), b) and e).
- Social value equates to d).
- Rarity equates to f).
- Representative equates to g).

3.4 The City of Sydney

The City of Sydney applies the heritage assessment criteria set out by the New South Wales Heritage Office as discussed above in section 3.3.

3.5 Victoria State Government

The State Government of Victoria applies the following assessment criteria:²³

Criteria for assessing cultural heritage significance

Criterion A:

The historical importance, association with or relationship to Victoria's history of the place or object.

Criterion B:

The importance of a place or object in demonstrating rarity or uniqueness.

Criterion C:

The place or object's potential to educate, illustrate or provide further scientific investigation in relation to Victoria's cultural heritage.

Criterion D:

²³ Criteria adopted by the Heritage Council on 6 March 1997 pursuant to Sections 8(1)(c) and 8(2) of the Heritage Act 1995.

The importance of a place or object in exhibiting the principal characteristics or the representative nature of a place or object as part of a class or type of places or objects.

Criterion E:

The importance of the place or object in exhibiting good design or aesthetic characteristics and/or in exhibiting a richness, diversity or unusual integration of features

Criterion F:

The importance of the place or object in demonstrating or being associated with scientific or technical innovations or achievements.

Criterion G:

The importance of the place or object in demonstrating social or cultural associations.

Criterion H:

Any other matter which the Council considers relevant to the determination of cultural heritage significance

Key Issues

- Criteria are based upon the Burra Charter.
- No types of significance are included.
- Criteria are expanded in line with AHC criteria.
- Aesthetic value equates to Criterion E.
- Historic value equates to Criterion A.
- Scientific value equates to Criteria C and F.
- Social value equates to Criterion G.
- Rarity equates to Criterion B.
- Representative equates to Criterion D.

3.6 *City of Melbourne*

The City of Melbourne applies the heritage assessment criteria set out by the Victoria State Government as discussed above in section 3.5.

3.7 *United Kingdom*

In England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland, places are listed through legislation on the grounds of 'special architectural or historic interest.' The National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty in England, Wales and Northern Ireland has guidelines for preparing a statement of significance that do not set out criteria in terms of value categories, but instead in terms of 'spirit of place' and of understanding what people feel about a place.²⁴

²⁴ Teague, AM, 'Materialising the Immaterial: Social Value and the Conservation of Recent Everyday Places,' PhD, The University of Melbourne, 2004, 77.

Key issues

- United Kingdom criteria do not reflect contemporary advances in heritage assessment criteria.
- Scientific value is omitted.
- Social value is omitted.

3.8 The United States of America

In the United States the criteria²⁵ for determining the cultural significance of places considered for the National Register of Historic Places state:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and:

A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

C. That embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Key issues

- United States criteria do not reflect contemporary advances in heritage assessment criteria.
- Social value is not recognised.
- Criteria have no organised categories for types or levels of significance.

3.9 Canada

In 2001 the Department of Canadian Heritage produced a draft document²⁶ for nation-wide standards and guidelines for the conservation of heritage places, which sets out significance criteria of aesthetic, historic, scientific, social, and spiritual value.

²⁵ National Park Service US Department of the Interior, 'National Register Criteria for Evaluation,' in *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (1997), Part II.

²⁶ Gordon W. Fulton, ed. *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada: Draft* (Parks Canada Agency, 2001), 1-2.

Key issues

- Criteria are based upon the Burra Charter.
- Spiritual value is a social value.

Criteria for assessing cultural heritage significance

1 *Cultural heritage values*

Aesthetic Value: Architectural
Townscape/Landscape/Landmark
Group

Does the item have architectural or artistic value for characteristics that may include its design, style, era, form, scale, materials, colour, texture, patina of age, quality of space, craftsmanship, smells, and sounds?

Does the item have townscape value for the part it plays in defining a space or street; providing visual interest; its role as a landmark; or the contribution it makes to the character and sense of place of Wellington?

Is the item part of a group of buildings, structures, or sites that taken together have coherence because of their age, history, style, scale, materials, or use?

Historic Value: Association

Is the item associated with an important person, group, or organisation?

Is the item associated with an important historic event, theme, pattern, phase, or activity?

Scientific Value: Archaeological
Educational
Technological

Does the item have archaeological value for its ability to provide scientific information about past human activity?

Does the item have educational value for what it can demonstrate about aspects of the past?

Does the item have technological value for its innovative or important construction methods or use of materials?

Social Value: Public esteem
Symbolic, commemorative, traditional, spiritual
Identity/Sense of place/Continuity
Sentiment/Connection

Is the item held in high public esteem?

Does the item have symbolic, commemorative, traditional, spiritual or other cultural value for the community who has used and continues to use it?

Is the item a focus of community, regional, or national identity?

Does the item contribute to sense of place or continuity?

Is the item a focus of community sentiment and connection?

2 *Level of cultural heritage significance*

Rare

Is the item rare, unique, unusual, seminal, influential, or outstanding?

Representative

Is the item a good example of the class it represents?

Authentic

Does the item have authenticity or integrity because it retains significant fabric from the time of its construction or from later periods when important additions or modifications were carried out?

Local/Regional/National/International

Is the item important for any of the above characteristics at a local, regional, national, or international level?