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Executive Summary

This report presents the recommendations made by Dr Ann McEwan of Heritage Consultancy Services in regard to historic heritage identification and management by the Thames-Coromandel District Council. The report is divided into a number of sections, which address the key historic heritage management issues of identification and protection, interpretation and integration. An analysis of the current planning framework and recommendations for increased protection of the district’s historic heritage resources, under the auspices of the District Plan and specific Reserve Management Plans, are included in the report.

Together with the accompanying Coromandel Peninsula Thematic History, five individual Community Board heritage studies, the Monitoring Built Heritage Outcomes report and Photographic Portfolio, the consultant’s report brings together historic heritage research and analysis that may be used by the Thames-Coromandel District Council in its forthcoming review of the District Plan. It is also intended to aid discussions regarding community heritage values as part of the Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint project, in conjunction with the development of Local Area Blueprints.

The consultant has adopted a thematic assessment approach to compiling and analysing historical information about the Coromandel Peninsula, as this is the best practice methodology most appropriate to identifying and interpreting historic heritage resources in the district. The Thematic History that accompanies this report identifies five key themes in the history of the Coromandel Peninsula that are fundamental to understanding its historic heritage resources (Peopling the Land, Developing Economies, Governing the Coromandel, Building Communities & Mind and Body). The five Community Board heritage studies (Thames, Coromandel/Colville, Mercury Bay, Tairua/Pauanui and Whangamata) describe in greater detail the historic heritage resources located in each area.

This report is intended to serve as a discussion document in support of the Council-community partnership that is fundamental to successful historic heritage identification and protection. Historical knowledge and understanding is constantly evolving and so this report should be seen as a stepping stone or springboard, rather than as a terminus.

While the consultant is aware of the cultural diversity of the Peninsula, both historically and in the present day, this report does not presume to tell the story of the district from a tangata whenua perspective. Nor does it purport to be a research project based on primary research material, such as oral histories, family diaries, or historic newspapers. It is intended, however, that this project and its documentation provide a solid foundation for future research and community consultation. Hopefully this will in turn lead to enhanced identification and protection of the district’s historic heritage and a wider understanding of why that is both necessary and desirable.

This report is aligned with the District Heritage Strategy adopted by the Council in 2007 and progresses a number of goals signalled in that document.
The principal recommendations contained within the report are:

**Identification and protection**

**Identification:**

- **Encourage local iwi, residents and ratepayers, and key stakeholders to continue helping the Council to identify district-wide historic heritage resources.**
- **Undertake a co-operative review exercise with NZHPT staff to align databases, including nomenclature, and establish the accuracy of condition, address and location information.**
- **Commission further research by a landscape heritage consultant to identify the historic heritage values of the District’s trees and other natural features.**
- **Develop a single integrated Historic Heritage Inventory for the Coromandel Peninsula, in conjunction with a GIS heritage overlay, to enhance identification, protection and interpretation activities in the district.**

**Protection:**

1) **District Plan:**

- **Include all rules relating to historic heritage resources in the heritage protection section of the District Plan for ease of access; rules can be repeated in other sections as appropriate.**
- **Refer to the District Plan historic heritage list as a ‘Schedule’ to avoid any confusion that may arise as a result of referring to the list of heritage items identified for protection in the District Plan as a ‘Register’. The latter term is used to denote the inventory of the NZ Historic Places Trust.**
- **Develop explicit assessment criteria for the identification of historic heritage resources, including archaeological sites, for inclusion in the District Plan, ideally based upon the definition of historic heritage in the RMA.**
- **Include information in the District Plan as to the history and built form of both individual scheduled items, heritage and character areas.**
- **Consider the establishment of three levels of protection within the District Plan to reflect types of built heritage (Heritage Area, Character Area, Individual Scheduled item) and identify the degree to which changes can be made without comprising heritage values.**
- **Develop comprehensive assessment criteria and design criteria based on the built heritage/character area descriptions to ensure they are directly relevant to the development proposals being assessed.**
• Provide regularly scheduled heritage conservation advice clinics at Council service centres throughout the District to promote good heritage protection and resource consent outcomes.

• Consider the extent to which historic heritage assessments should be undertaken as technical documentation for subdivision and Structure Plan preparation.

• Commission a suitably qualified consultant to undertake a review of the Coromandel and Thames Tree Registers. This should be conducted in conjunction with the review of the Thames-Coromandel District Tree Strategy (2003) and the district-wide identification of historic heritage trees recommended above.

• Review existing Heritage Registers to ensure they are robust, defensible and provide adequate information to inform resource consent processing and communicate historic heritage values to property owners and others.

• Remove items from the Heritage Register where they are no longer extant or have had their historic heritage values significantly compromised.

• Adopt the proposed template (Appendix 4) to record basic information about existing, and proposed, historic heritage items scheduled in the District Plan so as to improve the information available to substantiate scheduling, process resource consent applications and inform owners and others.

• Make additions to the Heritage Schedule of the District Plan to better reflect the District’s historic heritage values, their geographic range and historical diversity.

2] Council Reserves:

• Consider both the Clutha District Council and Auckland City Council approaches to the management of historic heritage resources on reserves, preparing either a permitted activity rule or advice note within the District Plan that sets out that ‘works and activities’ on reserves shall be undertaken in line with the requirements of section 4(3) of the Resource Management Act. It may also be necessary to prepare assessment criteria for determining what constitutes a ‘significant adverse effect beyond the boundary’ of a reserve.

• Seek legal advice on this matter, particularly in regards to what might happen when the historic heritage management provisions in an RMP are weak or non-existent.

• Confirm the presence of historic heritage resources on council reserves and then rewrite the management issues and actions in the relevant TCDC Reserve Management Plans accordingly.

• Include Council reserves with historic heritage values in the Council’s GIS Heritage Overlay and include a note in the District Plan referring readers to the overlay should they wish to know more about the full range of historic heritage resource actively managed by the Council.

• Ensure that TCDC Reserve Management Plans are of a quality that reflects the status afforded to them under s4 (3) of the RMA.
• Develop an overarching Historic Heritage Reserve Management Plan that sets out the council's approach to identifying, protecting, interpreting and maintaining historic heritage resources on reserves.

• Review, either on a regularly scheduled basis or as programmed work on them is undertaken (whichever happens soonest), the potential for historic heritage resources to exist on reserves for which a Reserve Management Plan has not yet been prepared.

3] District Cemeteries:

• Revise the TCDC Cemetery Management Plan to identify historic heritage issues and recommend appropriate management methods, in regards to site maintenance and mowing, for example, which will protect historic heritage values from any potential adverse effects. As the current CMP was produced in 2001 it is presumably due for review, at which time historic heritage values may be incorporated into the plan.

• Rename the district's 'disused cemeteries', perhaps to 'historic' or 'closed' subject to their official closure under the Burial and Cremation Act 1964, to better describe their state and highlight their historic heritage values for the community.

• Share historic heritage management advice with the owners and guardians of private cemeteries so that they are appropriately identified and protected.

Interpretation:

• Develop a dedicated presence on the Council web site to publish information about the Coromandel Peninsula's historic heritage resources and promote the Council's role in identifying, protecting and interpreting them.

• Promote the use of the TCDC Libraries' digital Kete project to solicit historic heritage from residents throughout the district.

• Promote the use of The Treasury, Thames as a repository for the district's historic records.

• Consider the development of a variety of interpretative templates, based upon the design work undertaken for the Council web site, that might be shared with key stakeholders and community groups wishing to interpret and promote the historic heritage stories, places and buildings of the district.

Integration:

• Establish the position of TCDC Heritage Planner.

• Review the TCDC Heritage Strategy.
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Introduction

Given the long and fascinating history of the Coromandel Peninsula, the identification, protection and interpretation of the district’s historic heritage resources by the Thames-Coromandel District Council, in partnership with the community and other agencies, will help to safeguard an asset that is treasured by local people and appreciated by all New Zealanders.

Community aspirations in regard to conserving local history and council responsibilities for the sustainable management of historic heritage resources come together in this domain. Guided by the definition of historic heritage provided in the Resource Management Act (RMA), this heritage review project has attempted to organise historical information and analysis so that it can be readily used by council officers, working with the district’s residents and visitors, to maintain and enhance local historic heritage resources.

Thames-Coromandel District Council is already playing an exemplary role in the use and conservation of significant historic heritage resources in its care. The former Carnegie Library in Thames, the Tararu Cultural Centre and former Coromandel Courthouse are three landmark buildings in the district that are a credit to the Council and the community. Historic places in private, institutional and central government ownership, such as the Colville General Store, St Paul’s Anglican Church in Harataunga/Kennedy Bay, and Hikuai School attest to the community pride in historic buildings that is found in a diverse range of environments and communities. There can be no doubt that the people of the Coromandel Peninsula value their history and wish to protect their heritage sites, structures, and stories so that they can be enjoyed now and into the future.
Authorship
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Project Scope and Limitations

This report is based upon the Thematic History of the Coromandel Peninsula prepared by the consultant and is specifically focused upon making recommendations that may be considered as part of the forthcoming TCDC District Plan review.

While every effort was made to ascertain the accuracy and credibility of the source material used during the preparation of this report, the authors acknowledge that history can at times be fragmentary, controversial and open to multiple interpretations.

Please note that this thematic study aims to outline only briefly the pre-European history of the Coromandel Peninsula. It does not presume to provide a detailed Maori settlement history on behalf of tangata whenua. TCDC is in the process of engaging with hapu and iwi through iwi authorities to facilitate appropriate ways of accessing the iwi histories of the District. If appropriate, this information may in the future be able to sit beside this document.

For further information regarding iwi histories of the district please contact Thames-Coromandel District Council, in the first instance, to be put in touch with the appropriate iwi authorities.
Coromandel Peninsula Historic Heritage Thematic Framework

In line with national and international best practice, a thematic heritage assessment framework has been developed to assist in the identification and interpretation of the Coromandel Peninsula’s historic heritage places, sites, structures and narratives.

The following framework is based upon the Canadian National Thematic Framework (2000) but has been modified to suit local circumstances. The Canadian thematic framework was selected for its relevance to a fellow settler society and its brevity, which lends itself more readily to heritage interpretation outputs.

The five principal themes and their associated sub-themes, are intended to act as a sieve, or a test bed, for assessing the breadth of historic heritage resources that the district may acknowledge, identify, manage and interpret.

1. Peopling the Land:
   - Coromandel’s earliest inhabitants - Te Tara-o-te-Ika-a-Maui
   - Early European settlement
   - Gold, timber and gum settlements
   - Farming
   - Population growth
   - Holiday settlements
   - People and the environment

2. Developing Economies:
   - Barter and exchange
   - Extraction and production
   - Trade and commerce
   - Technology and engineering
   - Labour
   - Communications and transportation

3. Governing the Coromandel:
   - Politics and political processes
   - Government institutions (local and central)
   - Security and law
   - Military and defence

---

4. Building Communities:
   - Religious institutions
   - Education and self-improvement
   - Social groups and classes
   - Serving the community

5. Mind and Body:
   - The arts
   - Sport and leisure
   - Invention and discovery
   - The Great Escape

An individual historic heritage resource, whether a building, archaeological site or wahi tapu, may have a number of themes attached to it. ‘The consistent organizing principle for the Thematic Framework is activity.’ The themes are not arranged in a chronological sequence and should be read as being inclusive of men, women and children and of people of all ethnic groups, religious beliefs and political persuasions. No theme is more or less important than another.

---

Legislative Backdrop and Strategic Alignments

A number of central government statutes and local government policies and strategies direct and promote the sustainable management of the district’s historic heritage resources. Acts of Parliament relevant to the domain and to the discussion and recommendations contained within this report are presented here in chronological order.

Reserves Act 1977

Under this Act reserves are to be classified as having either a recreation, historic, scenic, nature, scientific, government purpose or local purposes.

Part 3, s. 16 Classification of reserves

(1) To ensure the control, management, development, use, maintenance, and preservation of reserves for their appropriate purposes, the Minister shall, by notice in the Gazette, classify [reserves] according to their principal or primary purpose (added emphasis).

Part 3, section 41 of this Act requires the administering body of a reserve to prepare a management plan for the affected reserve within five years of the Act or the appointment of the administering body, whichever is later.

Conservation Act 1987 (refer to Appendix 2 for further information about DoC’s role in the district)

The Department of Conservation identifies, manages and interprets historic heritage resources on behalf of the government and the people of New Zealand. Under the Act the Department of Conservation’s definition of historic and cultural heritage is:

Any natural feature, land, water, archaeological or historic site, building or other structure, facility, object, event or tradition, or combination of these, which contributes to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand’s history and cultures.

Crown Forests Asset Act 1989

The Act provides for the management of the Crown’s forest assets, on which may be located historic heritage resources.

Section 18 of the Act includes the following with regard to use of Protective covenants on Crown forestry land:

(1) Every Crown forestry licence shall, where appropriate, include—
(a) Covenants for conservation purposes under section 27 of the Conservation Act 1987;
(b) Covenants for the protection of archaeological sites:
(c) Covenants for the protection of sites having historical or spiritual or emotional or cultural significance:
(d) Water and soil covenants:
(e) Covenants relating to forest research areas and Wahi Tapu.

**Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)**

The RMA establishes the statutory basis for the District Plan. It is the principal statute for the management of land, subdivision, water, soil, the coast, air and pollution control.

Part 2 of the RMA states the Act’s purpose and principles:

**PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES**

5. Purpose
1. The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.
2. In this Act, ‘sustainable management’ means managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well being and for their health and safety while
   a) Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and
   b) Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and
   c) Avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.

6. Matters of national importance - In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:
   a) The preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use and development:
   b) The protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development:
   c) The protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna:
   d) The maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes and rivers:
   e) The relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga:
   f) The protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, (emphasis added)
   g) The protection of recognised customary activities.

Historic heritage is defined in the Resource Management Act as ‘[t]hose 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; and includes  

(i) historic sites, structures, places, and areas; and  
(ii) archaeological sites; and  
(iii) sites of significance to Maori, including waahi tapu; and  
(iv) surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources.

Under s187 of the Act the Thames-Coromandel District Council is a Heritage Protection Authority and thus can issue heritage orders as a means of protection.

**Historic Places Act 1993 (HPA)** (refer to Appendix 1 for further information about the Trust’s role in the district)

The primary purpose of the HPA is to promote the identification, protection, preservation and conservation of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand (s.4 (1)).

Statutory protection of archaeological sites is established by the HPA. Any person wishing to undertake work that may damage, modify or destroy an archaeological site, or to investigate a site by archaeological excavation, must first obtain an authority from the New Zealand Historic Places Trust for that work (HPA ss.10-20).

An ‘archaeological site’ is defined in the Historic Places Act as:

Any place in New Zealand that  
(a) either –  
   (i) was associated with human activity that occurred before 1900; or  
   (ii) is the site of the wreck of any vessel where that wreck occurred before 1900; and  
(b) is or may be able through investigation by archaeological methods to provide evidence relating to the history of New Zealand.

Under the HPA, the New Zealand Historic Places Trust also has the responsibility to establish and maintain a register of historic places, historic areas, waahi tapu, and waahi tapu areas for the purposes of:

• informing members of the public about historic places, historic areas, waahi tapu, and waahi tapu areas  
• notifying owners of historic places, historic areas, waahi tapu, and waahi tapu areas where necessary for the purposes of the HPA  
• assisting historic places, historic areas, waahi tapu, and waahi tapu areas to be protected under the RMA
Registration alone does not confer protected status on a historic place, area, waahi tapu or waahi tapu area. For protection under the RMA a heritage covenant, heritage order or scheduling on a territorial authority’s District Plan must be entered into.

Local Government Act 2002

Under the broad purpose of promoting social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and future, the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) provides for community plans and a sustainable development approach to strategic land use and planning. The LGA requires consultation to ensure plans reflect community-based objectives. Strategic direction for growth giving rise to new development, or even negative growth as places contract, should recognise the intrinsic values of protecting heritage and address the effects on heritage places and areas. As areas used by the community change, new uses may need to be found for heritage buildings and places. Under the LGA a local authority must also provide opportunities for Maori to contribute to the decision-making processes (ss 4, 14 (1)(d), 81).

National Library Act 2003

Legal Deposit provisions under this Act allow for the collection and preservation of published documentary heritage ‘for the benefit of all New Zealanders’.

Building Act 2004

In administering its functions under the Building Act, a territorial authority can adopt a flexible approach with heritage buildings, and one of the Act's stated purposes is to acknowledge ‘the need to facilitate the preservation of buildings of significant cultural, historical or heritage value’ (s.4).

The territorial authority grants or refuses an application for a building consent based largely on compliance with the building code. Currently the Building Act links with the Historic Places Act through Project Information Memoranda (PIMs) and building consent processes. These links provide an ‘early warning system’ and enable the Trust to fulfill its statutory function to advocate for the protection of historical and cultural heritage in the public interest.

The Building Act also contains provisions relating to managing dangerous or unsanitary buildings. These provisions may require owners of heritage building to strengthen their building or remove any danger.

Public Records Act 2005

Thames-Coromandel District Council is required to collect and adequately store Council records and archives under this Act. Property files in particular may provide valuable information about historic heritage resources throughout the district.
At the regional and local government level the following policies and plans are relevant to historic heritage identification and protection:

**Environment Waikato Regional Policy Statement**

This is currently under review and its next iteration will be predicated, in part, upon the 2003 amendment to the RMA in which the sustainable management of historic heritage was made a matter of ‘national importance’.

The 2009 RPS Working Draft, which has been recently released for comment, proposes the development of a regional Cultural Heritage Inventory (CHI), based upon the Auckland Regional Council’s model. It is intended that a Waikato CHI would bring together historic heritage information from across the region and aid in identification, management and interpretation of historic heritage resources, including those with archaeological values. Although this inventory would, in part, duplicate the digital archaeological site-recording database ([www.archsite.org.nz](http://www.archsite.org.nz)) administered by the NZ Archaeological Association, it would nevertheless be a valuable resource for heritage planners, community members and developers throughout the region.

**Whaia te Mahere Taiao a Hauraki – Hauraki Iwi Environmental Plan 2004**

This plan includes consideration of wahi tapu and cultural heritage identification and management. It is not recognised by Ngati Maru but may provide a platform for developing Council-iwi historic heritage partnerships with members of the Hauraki Maori Trust Board.

The following plans and strategies contribute to the existing framework within which TCDC has acknowledged its functions in regards to the identification and protection of historic heritage resources:

**Thames-Coromandel District Council District Plan (Operative in Part, August 2007)**

The District Plan is the principal mechanism by which territorial authorities manage historic heritage resources, amongst other things, within their boundaries. The current District Plan includes issues, objectives, policies and methods that outline the means by which Council intends to manage historic heritage resources. Volumes 3 and 4 respectively of the District Plan itemise the Thames and Coromandel Heritage Registers of Sites & Buildings and Notable Trees. The Heritage Sites and Buildings section of each volume has been reviewed as part of the Heritage Review Project (see below).
Parks, Reserves and Cemeteries - Asset Management Plan for the Thames-Coromandel District Council 2006

The Thames-Coromandel District Council oversees approximately 2200 hectares of parks and reserves in the district. In addition to having oversight of these physical assets, the Council also liaises with a number of local reserve management committees and interest groups that provide valuable information and input with regard to the management of parks and reserves.

TCDC Heritage Strategy 2007

The principal actions identified in the Heritage Strategy that are being implemented through the Heritage Review Project include:

Maintain registers of heritage items – the description of this action in the Strategy includes adding the NZHPT registered archaeological sites to the District Plan.

Update the registers – The Strategy mentions updating the District Plan Heritage registers with new NZHPT registrations only. The Heritage Review Project is predicated on the presumption that the District Plan Schedule will also be updated with additional items that may not be registered by NZHPT but are nevertheless considered to have historic heritage significance that should be protected under the auspices of the District Plan.

Zone Heritage Areas – Heritage areas promote the identification of groups of historic heritage items, commonly buildings, which together constitute a significant streetscape or cultural landscape. A number of historic heritage areas have been identified during the course of this project (see below).

Protection of trees – in as much as some elements of the natural environment may be said to embody New Zealand’s culture and history thanks to their association with human activity, trees can be historic heritage features. Coromandel kauri giants, for example, are associated with both the exploitation of Coromandel resources and their conservation.

Thames-Coromandel District Tree Strategy 2003

This strategic document acknowledges that trees may have historic values and can make an important contribution to a community’s sense of place and identity. The individual area Tree Masterplans that have been produced for Tairua, Pauanui and the Whangamata Area to date (all 2005) are intended to be complementary to local Reserves Management Plans and so promote an integrated approach to managing this aspect of the public domain.
SWOT Analysis of TCDC Historic Heritage Management

This section provides analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats associated with the current management of historic heritage resources in the Thames-Coromandel district. Many of the recommendations made in this report and supporting documents aim to build upon the strengths and opportunities of the current situation whilst countering the apparent weaknesses and potential threats.

Strengths

The Coromandel Peninsula has a rich history and heritage, one that illuminates the development of local communities and has national resonance and significance.

There is a well-established awareness of the history of the district, especially as regards its history of Maori settlement, European discovery, mining and timber industries, and its longstanding role as a visitor and lifestyle destination.

The existing framework offered by District Plan, and other council policies, including Reserve Management Plans and the District Cemetery Policy, provides a foundation for effective heritage identification and protection.

Many organizations, groups and individuals stand ready to assist the Council in identifying, protecting and interpreting the district’s historic heritage values.

Council has shown itself to be a good steward of historic buildings and recognises the value of conservation plans and assessment reports in facilitating good heritage outcomes.
Weaknesses

Only historic heritage resources located in the vicinity of Thames and Coromandel are scheduled in the District Plan. This has the unintended consequence of suggesting the rest of the Peninsula possesses no historic heritage resources that merit the protection afforded by the District Plan.

Resource consent outcomes for scheduled historic heritage buildings in Thames and Coromandel have not been altogether positive. (Please see the Built Heritage Monitoring Study undertaken by Dr Greg Mason attached to this report.)

The information required to process resource consent applications effectively and communicate the district’s historic heritage values to residents and visitors can be meagre or difficult to access.

The 2007 TCDC Heritage Strategy places a high value on the work of the NZHPT in identifying and registering historic places and areas. While this is a key function of the Trust it is not sufficient for the council to rely solely on the NZHPT in this area. The Trust may not consider local historic heritage resources meet the requirements for registration, despite the fact that there is a high level of interest and support within the community for identification and protection by the council. Equally the RMA places a requirement upon territorial authorities to sustainably manage natural and historic heritage resources, regardless of whether the latter are registered by the NZHPT.
Opportunities

Interpretation of the Coromandel Peninsula’s rich history and the numerous historic heritage sites, structures and resources that exist in every ward within the district can enhance community well-being, inspire young and old to learn more about their local history, and facilitate authentic cultural tourism experiences.

The Council’s relationship with Coromandel iwi and hapu can be fostered and enhanced through a shared commitment to identifying and protecting the Maori history and cultural values of the Peninsula.

Partnerships with community groups and historic heritage protection agencies can improve identification and protection outcomes and extract the greatest value from the financial and human capital required in this area.

Increased council integration under the umbrella of historic heritage identification, protection and interpretation has the potential to enhance the council’s community profile, asset management effectiveness and fiscal responsibility.

The investigation of historic heritage values during the preparation of Structure Plans can future-proof subdivision and development activities and, at the same time, provide a useful means by which communities can engage with the planning process.
Threats

Council policy and practice may not deliver the outcomes for historic heritage identification and protection required by the RMA and desired by local communities.

A lengthy delay between identification of historic heritage resources and their scheduling on the District Plan, if that is the most appropriate protection mechanism, may lead to a loss of heritage values.

Confusion as to the difference between historic heritage and character values, the former defined in the RMA and the latter having more to do with visual appearance that can lead to a Victorian ‘time-warp’ in town centres, may lead to poor outcomes for historic heritage protection and conflict between Council and local residents.

Community misunderstanding or misinformation as to what historic heritage protection can be achieved under the District Plan, and the cost to ratepayers of both regulatory controls and non-regulatory incentives, may undermine Council efforts in this area.

Lack of integration between Council departments may compromise historic heritage service delivery and place unnecessary limits on the financial and personnel resources needed in this area.

Damage and destruction of archaeological sites and Maori historic heritage values may occur through uninformed planning, subdivision and development processes.

Demolition by neglect of historic heritage buildings, sites and places may occur if the Council focuses solely on the resource consent process to achieve historic heritage protection outcomes.

The community may become dissatisfied with Council efforts to identify, protect and promote historic heritage values if communication is poor or inadequate.
Identification and Protection of Historic Heritage Resources on the Coromandel Peninsula

Identification

Before historic heritage sites, structures, buildings or places can be protected and promoted they must first be identified. Often identification happens only when a building, wahi tapu or archaeological site is under threat of demolition or destruction. Ideally, however, identification is undertaken proactively by the Council working in partnership with local communities and heritage professionals. Identification of sites and places of significance to local iwi and hapu should also arise out of a proactive relationship with Council. Some information may be culturally sensitive and so be retained by its holders or guardians. In this case Council needs to foster and maintain good lines of communication so that land subdivision, development and use do not inadvertently compromise historic heritage values.

Once a historic heritage resource has been identified then the most appropriate protection and interpretation methods can be determined. First and foremost it is important to have a clear understanding of why a building, place or area is important and may require protection, as well as the extent of the historic heritage resource to be identified and protected. This requires sound research and expert judgement in addition to Council and community input and involvement, especially in the event that contentious or controversial historic heritage values are identified and merit protection.

Using this report as the basis for focused consultation with local iwi, community groups, key stakeholders and other interested parties should affirm and extend the list of identified historic heritage resources in the district.

Recommended actions:

- **Encourage local iwi, residents and ratepayers, and key stakeholders to continue helping the Council to identify district-wide historic heritage resources.**

- **Undertake a co-operative review exercise with NZHPT staff to align identification databases, including nomenclature, and establish the accuracy of condition, address and location information.**

- **Commission further research by a landscape heritage consultant to identify the historic heritage values of the District’s trees and other natural features.**

- **Develop a single integrated Historic Heritage Inventory for the Coromandel Peninsula, in conjunction with a GIS heritage overlay, to enhance identification, protection and interpretation activities in the district.**
Protection

Having identified historic heritage resources in a district, locality or property, the decision must then be made as to how that resource should be managed. Protection under the auspices of the District Plan or Reserve Management Plan is the preserve of Council, who shares the responsibility to sustainably manage the Coromandel’s historic heritage resources along with the NZ Historic Places Trust and the Department of Conservation.

What follows is a discussion of the protection mechanisms offered by the District Plan, Reserve Management Plans and the District Cemeteries Management Plan to the district’s historic heritage resources. Recommendations relevant to each Council planning instrument may be found at the end of each sub-section. Given their importance in this matter an extended discussion of the District Plan and Council Reserves has been provided to assist Council in its review of the District Plan.

1] The District Plan

The Thames-Coromandel District Plan is the principal Council instrument for the protection of the district’s historic heritage resources. Section 214 of the Plan addresses the district’s ‘Heritage Resources’, followed by Section 215 that identifies ‘Tangata Whenua Issues’, including historic heritage values. Section 350 of the Plan focuses upon ‘Designations and Heritage Protection Orders’. Section 430 describes the rules pertaining to ‘Heritage Protection’. ‘Tree Protection’, which may involve historic heritage values, is outlined in Section 440 of the Plan. Information requirements for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Heritage Resources are specified in Section 846. The assessment criteria for resource consent applications involving Herita
Internal Consistency

On the whole, the heritage protection section in the District Plan appears to provide a reasonably strong and consistent framework for addressing the adverse effects of activities on heritage values, particularly considering that it was written when the ‘recognition and protection of the heritage values of sites, buildings, places or areas’ was only a section 7 matter (now repealed).

As identified in the scoping study commissioned by EW (Mason and McEwan, 2008), the heritage provisions do however 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). The plan’s methods in turn state the particular techniques to be used to implement the policies (Ericksen, 2003). The existing heritage objective in the TCDC 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 (Willis, 2003), 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.

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.

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 2003 RMA amendment (discussed below).

The following policy topics are suggested to assist with developing the Plan’s heritage policies further. They are reinforced by many of the methods already espoused in the heritage protection section of the Plan and therefore will strengthen the Plan’s overall internal consistency. They are also congruent with advice provided by the NZHPT (2007).

- 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 and within a Heritage Policy Area).
- Inclusion of rules in the District Plan that reflect the potential for activities to cause adverse effects.
- Requirement that assessments of environmental 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.
- Change plan provisions when there is evidence that they are not effective in conserving, protecting and enhancing heritage resources.³

**Strength of provisions**

The current heritage provisions remain unchanged since the District Plan decisions were released in 1999. 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 historic heritage to a matter of national importance.

The heritage protection rules make a range of activities permitted, controlled or discretionary:

- Permitted activities relate to ‘minor work’ on the exterior or interior of registered buildings and buildings in Heritage Policy Areas where the interior has not been identified for protection.
- Controlled activities relate to new or relocated buildings and external alterations to buildings in the Heritage Policy Areas.
- Discretionary activity status is applied to a range of activities including exterior and interior (where identified) alterations to registered buildings, demolition, relocation and removal of registered buildings and those in Heritage Policy Areas, and the modification, damage or destruction to archaeological sites.

A couple of points can be made about this regulatory framework. First, controlled activity status has been shown to be an ineffective rule category for protecting heritage values, both for individual heritage items listed on a district plan schedule (Mason and McEwan, 2005a) and for heritage resources situated in a precinct or zone similar to the Heritage Policy Areas (Mason and McEwan, 2005b). The main issue is that controlled activities cannot be declined regardless of the fact that the construction of new buildings and external alterations can significantly undermine heritage values. Following reviews by Drs Mason and McEwan both Wellington and North Shore City Councils strengthened the activity status of controlled activities to restricted discretionary and discretionary activities.

Second, in relation to registered 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 registered item has the potential to completely destroy its heritage values. This is contrary to the rules for the

---

³The Matamata-Piako, South Waikato and Waikato District Plans include detailed heritage policies addressing these matters and they may assist in redrafting the TCDC Plan policies.
Heritage Policy Areas that provide a stronger activity status for demolition, relocation or removal (discretionary) compared to external alterations (controlled).

The same point can be made about archaeological and wāhi tapu sites. That is, there is only one activity status (discretionary) applying to their modification, damage or destruction, even though it could be argued that the effects on heritage values will not be equal. For instance, the total destruction of an archaeological or wāhi tapu site will negate its heritage values, whereas the modification of a site may have little or no adverse effect.

It is therefore recommended that TCDC consider making the demolition, relocation or removal of a registered item and the total destruction of an archaeological or wāhi tapu site a non-complying activity. 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 registered heritage resources) 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. Such a provision would not, however, void the requirement for meeting the provisions of the Historic Places Act in regards to proposals seeking to damage, destroy or modify archaeological sites.

Activities to be regulated:

It is important that the plan anticipates all activities that may be undertaken in the district that may have a negative impact on historic heritage values. In this regard, a number of activities do not appear to be captured by the existing rules.

Subdivision
The 2003 RMA amendment specifically refers to inappropriate subdivision as an activity that councils must control in order to protect historic heritage. Effects of subdivision and subsequent development on registered heritage resources can include the loss of the original curtilage associated with a heritage building or buildings, the loss of surroundings that contribute to an item’s heritage values (including gardens or open space), the loss of historical or visual association between heritage items, and the negative impact of higher density and/or inappropriately located development.

While the Plan includes a general rule for subdivision in a Heritage Policy Area (either a controlled activity or discretionary if the standards are not met), there does not seem to be a similar rule applying specifically to subdivision of land containing a registered heritage item. In the NZHPT’s view (2009, p.55), such 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.

It should be noted that the District Plan does allow for ‘conservation lots’ to be created in rural and coastal zones as part of the subdivision process, which can and have been used to protect heritage items such as archaeological sites (Mason and McEwan, 2008).

---

4 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.
New buildings on the site of a registered item
Associated with the issue of subdivision is the lack of a rule in the heritage protection section dealing with new or relocated buildings on the site of a registered heritage item, although there is such a rule in place for the Heritage Policy Areas.

Monitoring work undertaken for Wellington City Council (Mason and McEwan, 2005a) demonstrated that new buildings can have significant adverse effects on scheduled heritage buildings along the lines outlined above for subdivision. It is therefore vital that there is a rule in the District Plan that requires consent for such an activity 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, and supported by detailed assessment criteria.

Modification of, damage to, or destruction of archaeological sites
This provision focuses on the effects of activities (i.e. modification, damage, destruction), but it does not indicate the types of activities that may give rise to the effects. In contrast, the other Plan rules relate to specific activities known to adversely affect heritage values if not appropriately controlled (alterations, demolition or removal of a building, new buildings, earthworks). To avoid doubt, it is suggested that TCDC consider specifying in the rules the types of activities likely to lead to the modification, damage or destruction of archaeological sites, which may include tree clearance and planting, stock grazing, new structures, fencing etc.

Values to be protected
The 2003 RMA amendment provided a definition of historic heritage, which bears repeating here:

‘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; and includes
   (i) historic sites, structures, places, and areas; and
   (ii) archaeological sites; and
   (iii) sites of significance to Maori, including waahi tapu; and
   (iv) surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources.

With this definition in mind, there are several notable gaps in the range of heritage values identified currently in the District Plan Register. These were noted in the scoping study undertaken by Drs Mason and McEwan for Environment Waikato in 2008 and further confirmed by the research undertaken for this project.
First, there are no sites with archaeological or Māori heritage value included in the Plan despite there being rules in place to protect them. Similarly, while the Plan rules require resource consent for alterations affecting listed interiors there are currently no interiors identified on the Heritage Register, which renders the rule superfluous unless interior features to be protected are added.

The RMA definition of historic heritage includes the surroundings associated with a heritage item as an aspect to be protected. With regard to registered buildings, the 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 registered item, but not physically affecting the structure, do not trigger a rule under the heritage provisions. It is suggested that the Plan’s Heritage Schedule denotes when a heritage building has associated surroundings of value and that rules are introduced that require consent for activities that may have a negative impact (most notably subdivision and the construction of new buildings, as discussed above).

Provisions relating to archaeological and wāhi tapu sites do recognise that activities (i.e. earthworks) ‘within the vicinity’ of a registered site can cause adverse effects and so a discretionary rule is applied. However, there are activities other than earthworks that can impact on archaeological and Māori heritage values, such as new structures and landscaping. The rule also brings in to question what ‘in the vicinity of’ means and how it should be interpreted during plan implementation. Designating appropriate surroundings and specifying these in the Heritage Register may be a way of avoiding confusion.

The need for monitoring

Monitoring the District Plan is essential for assessing the quality of existing provisions; in particular whether or not Plan implementation has enabled the heritage outcomes anticipated by the Plan to be achieved ‘on the ground’.

Recognising the value of District Plan monitoring TCDC commissioned a monitoring study part way through the completion of this Heritage Review Project. The study identified the range of resource consent outcomes achieved under the built heritage provisions of the District Plan, and assessed how closely these outcomes satisfied the Plan’s design criteria. The findings and recommendations arising from this monitoring study are attached to this report (Mason, 2009).

Assessment of the Suitability of Heritage Policy Areas for Continued Area Protection in Thames-Coromandel

As well as scheduling individual buildings and structures for protection, the District Plan identifies a number of Heritage Policy Areas (HPAs) in Thames and Coromandel townships. The Plan identifies three types of HPA – commercial, housing and industrial, the last two being applied in Thames only. The aim of the provisions is to ensure that the particular heritage values of the HPAs are retained during the development process. As noted above, resource consent is required (as a controlled activity) for external alterations to any non-scheduled building within the HPA, as well as the construction of a new building within an HPA. The demolition, removal or relocation of all or part of a non-scheduled building in an HPA requires resource consent as a discretionary activity.5

5 Separate rules apply to scheduled buildings within an HPA, as set out in the previous section.
The analysis and discussion below reveals that TCDC has previously considered a range of mechanisms for protecting the values of its built heritage and that the current District Plan area provisions could be strengthened based on this earlier work.

Two documents have helped inform the assessment and recommendations, namely:
1) Plan Change 42: Grahamstown Heritage Zone Overlay (1993);
2) Plan Change 54: Coromandel Heritage (1995); and

These documents are summarised below. The findings of the TCDC built heritage monitoring study (Mason, 2009) have also informed the assessment and recommendations.

**Plan Change 42: Grahamstown Heritage Zone Overlay (1993)**

Plan Change 42 to the Transitional District Plan introduced a heritage zone overlay in the Grahamstown area and a Register of Heritage Items. The plan change was based on recommendations made in a Thames Heritage Study and associated Landscape Assessment, which had been carried out by consultants in 1989-90. It appears the Council’s focus at this time was predominantly on Grahamstown, as they considered it had the greatest number of items of heritage significance in Thames (p.9).

The plan change designated functions ‘relating to Thames heritage’ to a Heritage Committee, including statutory duties, e.g. assessing resource consent applications for proposals within Grahamstown and for scheduled items, as well as non-statutory powers, e.g. establishing a heritage awards programme. A ‘major responsibility’ of the Heritage Committee was the ‘interpretation of the significance of aspects of Thames’ cultural heritage’ (10).

The heritage zone overlay also included two smaller conservation areas, Pollen Street and Victoria Park. The Pollen Street Conservation Area ‘was designed specifically to protect what is arguably the most significant component of heritage streetscape remaining in Thames’. The Victoria Park Conservation Area ‘was designed to conserve, protect and enhance the heritage values of this historically significant open space’ (p.15).

The plan change spelled out that the new provisions were to override existing plan provisions for Grahamstown where there was a conflict (p.29). Design guidelines were produced for commercial buildings as well as for residential buildings. The former related to both scheduled and non-scheduled commercial buildings within in the overlay area; the latter guidelines applied to houses within the overlay that were 40 years of age or older (a rolling date), as well as scheduled dwellings.

The plan change introduced the following rules for development in the Grahamstown Heritage Zone (pp.33-34):
- Alteration, addition to, or modification of any non-scheduled building 40 years of age or older (controlled activity).
- Demolition of any non-scheduled building 40 years of age or older (discretionary activity).
- Alterations, additions, modifications and demolitions of non-scheduled buildings less than 40 years old (controlled activity).
- Construction of new building or structure (controlled activity).

---

6 Tourism was cited as a reason for protecting heritage on the Coromandel Peninsula. In particular, reference was made to a 1991 ‘international task force of Tourism experts’ under the Pacific Area Travel Association (PATA), which ‘identified the potential of the Coromandel Peninsula in cultural heritage/tourism terms’ (p.20).

7 The Heritage Committee’s full range of responsibilities is set out as policies on pp.30-32 of the plan change document.
Assessment criteria and design criteria were also specified, and these appear to have influenced the selection and wording of criteria currently used in the District Plan.\textsuperscript{8}

Plan Change 42 included separate objectives, policies and rules for the Pollen Street and Victoria Park Conservation Areas. With regard to the former, a stricter activity status for development was applied compared to the rules for development in the Grahamestown Heritage Zone (outlined above). Demolition was made a non-complying activity and additions, alterations or modifications were a discretionary activity (all requiring notification). As such, buildings in the Pollen Street Conservation Area were afforded the same significance as scheduled buildings. Design criteria (including diagrams) were set out that largely mirror those in the District Plan today.\textsuperscript{9}

The Victoria Park Conservation Area was concerned with maintaining the open space and links with the coastline, as well as protecting particular features on the Park, including a band rotunda and trees. The policies relating to the Park ‘substitute for a Management Plan under section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977 and shall be implemented with enablement through the Annual Plan’ (p.66). Only one rule was applied which gave the Heritage Committee responsibility for assessing proposals and, if they did not accept a proposal, it became a non-complying activity requiring council consent.

\textbf{Plan Change 54: Coromandel Heritage (1995)}

Plan Change 54 to the Transitional District Plan was informed by a document titled Coromandel Heritage and Planning Issues Study (1994), which outlined the town’s history and identified ‘a number of’ events and sites of importance, assessed the landscape character of the town, and suggested an ‘interpretation strategy’ for identifying heritage items (p.2). The plan change aimed at enhancing the protection afforded buildings already identified on the Plan schedule, as well as introducing provisions to protect buildings in Coromandel’s Town Centre Zone.

As well as introducing an objective and several policies, new rules were added for development affecting buildings in the Town Centre Zone, namely (p.3):
\begin{itemize}
  \item Alterations, additions and modifications (discretionary activity).
  \item Construction of a new building (discretionary activity).
  \item Demolition or relocation (discretionary activity).\textsuperscript{10}
\end{itemize}

Design Criteria were also introduced that closely reflect those presently in the District Plan for Coromandel. A height standard of two-storeys or 8-metres was also set for the Town Centre Zone.

---

\textsuperscript{8} Rules were also introduced for scheduled buildings, namely demolition of a scheduled item – a non-complying activity requiring notification, and additions and alterations – a discretionary activity requiring notification (p.37). Rules were also introduced for archaeological sites, wahi tapu and trees (pp. 36-42). There are also several policies relating to non-regulatory methods, such as rates relief and the waiving of consent fees. Given its broad consideration of heritage management, this plan change represents a useful model for considering changes to the current Plan framework for heritage.

\textsuperscript{9} This helps to explain why the current design criteria are not universally applicable in Thames – they appear to have been written for a discrete area, i.e. Grahamstown.

\textsuperscript{10} Note: there is an anomaly in the page numbering between pp.2-11. Some of these pages appear at the end of the scanned document, including the rules relating to demolition or relocation.
As with Plan Change 42 relating to Grahamstown, Plan Change 54 gave delegated authority to the Heritage Committee to assess resource consent applications and carry out the same broad range of functions spelt out in the earlier plan change (p.13-14). It similarly introduced policies and rules relating to scheduled buildings, archaeological sites and trees (apparently not wahi tapu), as well as policies promoting the use of non-regulatory methods for protecting heritage (pp.11-25). In many ways, the plan change took the provisions developed for Grahamstown and reworded them to apply to Coromandel.

**Summation**

It appears that the HPA provisions in the current District Plan have been influenced by the framework introduced in the Transitional District Plan by way of Plan Changes 42 and 54. The former, relating to Grahamstown, which in turn influenced the latter relating to Coromandel, provided the most comprehensive approach to the identification and protection of heritage values, and therefore provides a useful model for considering the current HPA provisions.

The aspects of the Grahamstown Historic Area that are worth noting include:

- It related to a specific area in Thames, the boundaries of which appear to have been identified following research and assessment of the area’s built heritage values.
- It recognised differences within the Historic Area that warranted additional protection by way of Conservation Areas and scheduling of individual buildings.
- The design criteria used to assess the applications were based on a study of the built form of the Grahamstown area and therefore had a high degree of relevance.
- The policies were broad in scope and a range of rules were applied to address the effects of different activities.

Also of interest was the intended use of the Heritage Committee to consider resource consent applications and to undertake a range of non-statutory functions to promote heritage protection.

As noted in the built heritage monitoring study, however, many of the design criteria that are in the Plan are irrelevant for most development proposals, as they have not been written with the particular HPA or scheduled buildings in mind. The following area descriptions would provide a useful basis for preparing criteria that relate specifically to a protected area or building. This means that each area identified in the District Plan may have a different set of criteria for assessing resource consent applications.

1) Heritage Area (or similar) – for built areas having significant heritage values and for which physical change should be avoided or kept to a minimum.

---

1 Plan Change 54 also refers to a Coromandel Hospital Historic Area, including rules controlling additions, alterations or modifications to pre-1960 buildings, the construction of new buildings, and the demolition or relocation of pre-1960s buildings, or the three main buildings on the site.

12 Controlled activity status was used for several rules in the Grahamstown Historic Area Zone, as was common for the time, but, as already stated, this has since been shown to be an ineffective rule category for protecting heritage values (Mason and McEwan, 2005a; 2005b; Mason, 2009).
2) Character Area (or similar) – for built areas that have lesser heritage values, but that nonetheless reflect a recognisable character or amenity value. It is likely that such areas would tolerate a greater degree of change provided the built elements that give the area character are reflected in development, e.g. building materials, building form, style and orientation, height, retention of open space.

3) Scheduled Buildings/Structures – for buildings and structures that warrant protection in their own right. As with Heritage Areas, changes to scheduled buildings should be avoided or kept to a minimum.

There is also virtually no information in the District Plan relating to the HPAs, i.e. why they have been selected, where they are located, and what their particular values or characteristics are. Some district plans have detailed and useful information included in them that give the reader a strong sense of why an area is important (e.g. Dunedin City Council’s description of the Heritage Precincts protected in the District Plan).

As regards to the implementation of the District Plan’s heritage provisions, the results of the Monitoring Built Heritage Outcomes report suggest that better resource consent outcomes may arise in areas where the Council is seen to be promoting historic heritage values and development solutions. Heritage clinics have the potential to foster best practice conservation of historic heritage resources and promote capacity building and the value of historic heritage.

Finally if trees on the District Plan are to be identified as having historic heritage value further research is needed, particularly where they relate to sites and structures, for example at the Te Totara (Ngati Maru) pa site and Victoria Park recreation area in Thames. More comprehensive information lends itself to better and more holistic management decisions by Parks and Reserves and Policy Planning staff working in tandem.

Recommended actions:

- Include all rules relating to historic heritage resources in the heritage protection section of the District Plan for ease of access; rules can be repeated in other sections as appropriate.

- Refer to the District Plan historic heritage list as a ‘Schedule’ to avoid any confusion that may arise as a result of referring to the list of heritage items identified for protection in the District Plan as a ‘Register’. The latter term is used to denote the inventory of the NZ Historic Places Trust.

- Develop explicit assessment criteria for the identification of historic heritage resources, including archaeological sites, for inclusion in the District Plan, ideally based upon the definition of historic heritage in the RMA.

- Include information in the District Plan as to the history and built form of both individual scheduled items, heritage and character areas.

- Consider the establishment of three levels of protection within the District Plan to reflect types of built heritage (Heritage Area, Character Area, Individual Scheduled item) and identify the degree to which changes can be made without comprising heritage values.
• Develop comprehensive assessment criteria and design criteria based on the built heritage/character area descriptions to ensure they are directly relevant to the development proposals being assessed.

• Provide regularly scheduled heritage conservation advice clinics at Council service centres throughout the District to promote good heritage protection and resource consent outcomes.

• Consider the extent to which historic heritage assessments should be undertaken as technical documentation for subdivision and Structure Plan preparation.
1A] Review of the District Plan Historic Heritage Registers

The existing Heritage Registers contained within the Thames-Coromandel District Plan (Volumes 3 & 4) identify Heritage Sites and Buildings in the vicinity of Thames and Coromandel that are offered protection under the Plan.

Thames Heritage Register

There are 83 heritage sites and buildings listed in the Thames Heritage Register within the District Plan (Volume 3). These represent a diverse range of historic heritage values associated with the development of Thames, its history of mining and the wealth and prosperity of the township in view of its association with the exploitation of the Peninsula’s native timber resources. A small number of items are located outside of Thames itself, but generally the Heritage Register represents the historic heritage values of the town rather than those of the Thames Community Board area.

There are 67 Notable Trees included in the Thames Heritage Register. Of this number 22 appear, judging from the Item Identification Sheets, to have historic heritage values.

Coromandel Heritage Register

There are 91 heritage sites and buildings listed in the Coromandel Heritage Register within the District Plan (Volume 4). These represent a range of historic heritage values associated with the township’s mining history and nineteenth century development. A very small number of items are located outside of Coromandel itself, but generally the Heritage Register represents the historic heritage values of the town rather than those of the Coromandel Community Board area.

There are 43 Notable Trees included in the Coromandel Heritage Register. Of this number 13 appear, judging from the Item Identification Sheets, to have historic heritage values.

See Appendix 1 for a comprehensive assessment, with italicised comments, of each individual Heritage Site or Building included in the Heritage Registers. The identification of historic heritage trees within the district was largely beyond the scope of this project, but a note has been made, where applicable, to cross-reference a building listed on the Heritage Register with a notable tree to which it connected.
Recommended actions:

- Commission a suitably qualified consultant to undertake a review of the Coromandel and Thames Tree Registers. This should be conducted in conjunction with the review of the Thames-Coromandel District Tree Strategy (2003) and the district-wide identification of historic heritage trees recommended above.

- Review existing Heritage Registers to ensure they are robust, defensible and provide adequate information to inform resource consent processing and communicate historic heritage values to property owners and others.

- Remove items from the Heritage Register where they are no longer extant or have had their historic heritage values significantly compromised.

- Adopt the proposed template (Appendix 3) to record basic information about existing, and proposed, historic heritage items scheduled in the District Plan so as to improve the information available to substantiate scheduling, process resource consent applications and inform owners and others.
1B] Additional items to consider for District Plan scheduling

Historic heritage buildings and areas that merit protection under the District Plan, in addition to those already scheduled, have been identified within the following Community Board areas: Thames, Coromandel/Colville, Mercury Bay, Tairua/Pauanui and Whangamata. The identification of historic heritage resources not already protected by the Plan was based upon the Thematic History prepared by the consultant, fieldwork in all five Community Board areas, and information provided by local informants, although there remains considerable scope for further local input. All site visits undertaken during the course of this project were confined to the public domain, however, and therefore most of the buildings and places listed below were viewed only from the street. No interior inspections were undertaken.

Significant historic heritage resources are located throughout the district and the District Plan heritage schedule should reflect this fact. Not only does the current District Plan schedule omit significant heritage resources that should be afforded protection but it may also inadvertently give the impression that Thames and Coromandel are the only historic settlements on the Peninsula. Even a passing acquaintance with the history of the Coromandel should dispel this misconception.

In Appendix 2 newly identified historic heritage resources in each of the five Community Board areas have been tabulated. A brief discussion and identification of the principal heritage theme(s) accompanies the name and address of each item.

Recommended action:

- Make additions to the Heritage Schedule of the District Plan to better reflect the District’s historic heritage values, their geographic range and historical diversity.
2] Council Reserves

In addition to the historic heritage resources that may be scheduled on the District Plan and thus protected by its rules, another class of historic heritage resources that warrant close attention are those located on the many TCDC reserves to be found throughout the district. There is a separate statutory management regime for reserves in New Zealand, which is set out under the Reserves Act 1977. As discussed below, this Act requires the preparation of Reserve Management Plans to determine how reserves are to be looked after. All council reserves are ‘subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977’ and ‘must be managed in accordance with both the Reserves Act and rules under the District Plan’ (Thames-Coromandel District Plan s. 372).

In this section of the report, the question of the relationship between Reserve Management Plans and the District Plan in protecting historic heritage values is considered. The approaches taken by two councils are outlined and a TCDC current Reserve Management Plan (RMP) that applies to several reserves in Whitianga and Wharekaho is assessed to determine how well it addresses heritage issues. Several recommendations are made to ensure that TCDC’s Reserve Management Plans appropriately recognise heritage values and provide for their protection and promotion, notwithstanding their independence of the District Plan.

There is some question as to whether the RMA and the plans produced under that Act apply to historic heritage resources located on reserves gazetted under the Reserves Management Act 1977 and, if so, in what circumstances. In this regard, Section 4 of the RMA states that:

**Act to bind the Crown**

(1) This Act binds the Crown, except as provided in this section.
(2) This Act does not apply to any work or activity of the Crown which—
   (a) is a use of land within the meaning of section 9; and
   (b) the Minister of Defence certifies is necessary for reasons of national security.
(3) Section 9(3) does not apply to any work or activity of the Crown within the boundaries of any area of land held or managed under the Conservation Act 1987 or any other Act specified in Schedule 1 of that Act (other than land held for administrative purposes) that—
   (a) is consistent with a conservation management strategy, conservation management plan, or management plan established under the Conservation Act 1987 or any other Act specified in Schedule 1 of that Act; and
   (b) does not have a significant adverse effect beyond the boundary of the area of land.

The Reserves Act 1977 is specified in Schedule 1 of the Conservation Act 1987 meaning that subsection 4(3) of the RMA takes effect. In other words, the Crown, or the Council as its proxy under the Minister’s delegated authority, is free to undertake ‘any work or activity’ on reserves without consideration of heritage provisions in a district or regional plan provided that a two-prong test is met:

1. the work or activity is consistent with a relevant management plan; and
2. the work or activity will not give rise to significant cross-boundary effects.
This implies that, in the first instance, a Reserve Management Plan is the instrument to be used for protecting and managing historic heritage on reserves.13

A number of questions then arise:
1) Who assesses whether or not a particular Crown activity passes the tests and by what process?
2) What happens if the test is not passed - do the District Plan rules then apply?
3) What happens where there is no relevant management plan, or where there is a management plan but the existing provisions are too weak to determine consistency?
4) In general, under what circumstances are District Plan heritage provisions applicable to activities on reserves?

The Quality Planning guidance note on historic heritage14 does not provide any direction on the matter and only comments that:

Reserves may be classified as historic reserves. Historic reserves may be vested in local authorities or the Historic Places Trust, or local authorities or the Historic Places Trust may be appointed to control and manage historic reserves. Reserves of other classifications may also include important historic heritage. [RMA] Plans should be coordinated with the overall management direction of reserve management plans, prepared under the Act.

Currently, the Reserves Management section of the Thames-Coromandel District Plan states that:

The development of Reserve Management Plans under the Reserves Act 1977 is an important method of achieving community involvement in the management of reserves. Many reserves have Operative Reserves Management Plans under the Reserves Act 1977. Whether reserves have a management plan or not they are subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977. Reserves must be managed in accordance with both the Reserves Act and rules under the District Plan.

A review of two District Plan heritage provisions – promulgated by Clutha District Council (CDC) and Auckland City Council (ACC) – suggests councils have taken a varied approach to protecting heritage on reserves.

Clutha District Council

The Clutha District Plan has addressed a number of the questions raised above by including a permitted activity rule in the Heritage chapter of the District Plan reiterating the test set out in section 4(3) of the RMA. In addition, the rule dictates that any work or activity carried out on a reserve must be consistent with the relevant District Plan rules. Importantly, it also requires the administering body of a reserve to give details to CDC of any anticipated work or activity, thereby establishing an assessment procedure.

13 When preparing or changing district plans, councils are required to have regard to 'management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts' to the extent that their content has a bearing on resource management issues of the district (section 74(2)).
**Rule HER.3 Activities Undertaken on Conservation and Reserve Land**

Any work or activity (excluding the erection of buildings) undertaken by persons or bodies (including the Crown) on or within land held or managed under the Conservation Act 1987 and those other Acts specified in the First Schedule of that Act, is a permitted activity provided that,

- it is consistent with the particular Act under which the land is held, or any management strategy or plan developed under that Act, and
- it is consistent with the general rules of this Plan and the rules of the stated underlying Resource Area, and
- it does not create a significant adverse effect beyond the boundary of that land, and
- notice is given to Council of the intention to carry out any such work or activity that outlines the intention and nature of the work or activity and how it complies with the points above.

Any activity that does not comply with this rule and the erection of buildings shall be considered as a discretionary activity.

**Reason**

The rules relating to resource use within these lands are generally set out by the relevant Act. Therefore Council need only intervene when the objectives of the Act are not being achieved or there is a significant effect generated outside the boundary of the land concerned.

CDC advised Dr Mason they chose this approach to avoid duplication of bureaucracy and process. Their view was that a resource consent process was not going to add value where a management plan was already in place to protect heritage. Council’s Planning and Environment Manager assesses proposals for work and activity on reserves, with the criteria being the management plan requirements. If there is no relevant management plan then resource consent is needed. If the management plan is vague with regard to heritage protection, then it comes down to a case-specific assessment. In a number of instances there has not been a site-specific management plan, but the work has been undertaken by DoC in accordance with its overall Conservation Management Strategy, so CDC have deemed that as complying with the permitted activity rule.

CDC has applied the provision numerous times. Generally it has related to work on a reserve being carried out by DoC, NZHPT, Council, and/or a community group (usually some combination of these). The approach has worked well in practice. The other agencies or community groups appreciate being able to proceed without extra costs and delays, and the management plan provisions have protected the values involved. CDC would not undertake compliance monitoring unless there was a complaint - they consider the agency responsible for the management plan as having the primary interest and responsibility. CDC has never had a complaint to test this.

**Auckland City Council**

ACC in contrast schedules heritage items located on some reserves, including buildings, trees and archaeological sites, and requires resource consent for any activity affecting them in accordance with the District Plan rules. For instance, Maungakieie/One Tree Hill, which has been gazetted as a recreation reserve under the Reserves Act, has two structures (including a surrounding area of 100m) and three trees scheduled in the Auckland City District Plan. Moreover, the hill is recorded as an archaeological site under the Historic Places Act. This means that council consent is required when

---

15 Murray Brass, Planning and Environment Manager, personal communication, 16th June 2009
an activity activates the relevant heritage provisions in the District Plan and an archaeological authority is required if an activity will modify, damage or destroy archaeological features. In addition, there is a management plan in place, which also specifies objectives and policies relevant to the recognition and protection of the reserve’s heritage values.

TCDC Reserve Management Plans

An important consideration in this matter is the extent to which reserve management plans deal with heritage protection issues. A review of Document 2 of TCDC’s Whitianga and Wharekahoe RMP (Individual Reserve Plans), for example, found few details about historic heritage on the reserves. The exceptions are the Robinson Road Estuary Reserves (pp.44-47), which include one historic reserve at 2A Robinson Rd and another proposed for historic reserve classification at 2B Robinson Rd. These reserves cover the site of a battle in 1820 between Maori tribes in which around 400 people were killed. The dead were buried along the foreshore and the area is accordingly tapu. The management plan also mentions the presence of a ‘historic stone building’, but no details about it are provided.

This example demonstrates that reserve management plans can lack the necessary information for identifying historic heritage on reserves, assessing its significance, and/or providing meaningful provisions to ensure their protection. This in turn will make it difficult for TCDC to establish whether or not a proposed work or activity is consistent with the management plan. As well, the management plan exhibits poor linkages to the District Plan schedule. An important task for the council, therefore, is to review current reserve management plans and strengthen heritage provisions where necessary.

Summation

Please see Appendix 4 for a tabulation of the reserves in Thames-Coromandel, identified by their location in one of the five Community Board areas, which embody or may embody historic heritage values. Note also that TCDC Reserves not provided with an individual Reserve Management Plan, for example the Port Charles Wharf Reserve, Port Charles (1927 concrete wharf, ID# 047900000) may also include historic heritage features within them.

The assessment matters for resource consent applications contained in the Plan may assist with determining whether or not a proposed work or activity is consistent with a reserve management plan, especially in the absence of useful management plan provisions. What is obvious is that a transparent process is required to enable a consistent appraisal of proposed works and activities on reserves so as to determine whether the plan rules should apply.

The quality of current Reserve Management Plans needs to be examined to determine whether they provide clear and robust guidance for protecting heritage values. Initially, Council could rank RMPs according to the standard of their heritage information and management advice, assigning a basic rating, e.g. 1. Comprehensive, 2. Satisfactory, but need updating, 3. Weak/non-existent. In the short-term this would provide a starting point for TCDC reserves and planning staff when considering whether a proposal on a reserve can be carried out in accordance with a management plan under s4 (3) of the RMA, or whether it requires resource consent under the District Plan.

In addition an overarching Historic Heritage Reserve Management Plan would create the overall management framework and principles to be applied across the district. The Council would then need to rewrite individual reserve management plans to ensure they adequately identify and explain historic
heritage features and values located there, and set out the specific objectives, policies and actions to be considered in managing and protecting those items. Where the relevant management plans exist in an electronic form it would be useful to link these to the reserves identified in the Council’s GIS Heritage Overlay (see recommendation below).

While there may be fewer development pressures on historic heritage resources within reserves, when compared to those in private ownership, heritage values can still be adversely affected by recreational activities, garden and lawn maintenance, tree planting, erection of other structures etc. Thus, it is important that historic heritage values on reserves are identified and protected, especially so that the Council can maintain its good record as a guardian of the district’s historic heritage.

**Recommended actions:**

- **Consider both the CDC and ACC approaches to the management of historic heritage resources on reserves, preparing either a permitted activity rule or advice note within the District Plan that sets out that ‘works and activities’ on reserves shall be undertaken in line with the requirements of section 4(3). It may also be necessary to prepare assessment criteria for determining what constitutes a ‘significant adverse effect beyond the boundary’ of a reserve.**

- **Seek legal advice on this matter, particularly in regards to what might happen when the historic heritage management provisions in an RMP are weak or non-existent.**

- **Confirm the presence of historic heritage resources on council reserves and then rewrite the management issues and actions in the relevant TCDC Reserve Management Plans accordingly.**

- **Include Council reserves with historic heritage values in the Council’s GIS Heritage Overlay and include a note in the District Plan referring readers to the overlay should they wish to know more about the full range of historic heritage resource actively managed by the Council.**

- **Ensure that TCDC Reserve Management Plans are of a quality that reflects the status afforded to them under s4 (3) of the RMA.**

- **Develop an overarching Historic Heritage Reserve Management Plan that sets out the council’s approach to identifying, protecting, interpreting and maintaining historic heritage resources on reserves.**

- **Review, either on a regularly scheduled basis or as programmed work on them is undertaken (whichever happens soonest), the potential for historic heritage resources to exist on reserves for which a Reserve Management Plan has not yet been prepared.**
3] District Cemeteries

According to the TCDC Cemetery Management Plan 2001, the Council is responsible for the maintenance and management of 13 cemeteries across the District. Of these, seven are open (Buffalo, Colville, Mercury Bay, Omahu, Tairua, Totara, and Whangamata Cemeteries), and six are closed (Shortland, Tararu, Port Charles, Tairua Historical, Allan Block (Whangamata), and Kuaotunu (1888-1943) Cemeteries). Tapu Cemetery is also currently listed on the TCDC web site as one of the district’s disused cemetery. The 2001 Cemetery Management Plan notes that it is owned and administered by local iwi, as is the Totara Maori Cemetery.

Human remains, family history records, funerary art, and district memorials can all be found in cemeteries. The historic heritage values associated with cemeteries (archaeological, architectural, cultural and historic) make them places of remembrance and research that are a magnet for visitors, whether local or non-resident.

Burial records for Totara Memorial Park Cemetery, Shortland Cemetery, Whangamata Cemetery, Omahu Cemetery, Buffalo Cemetery, Tairua Cemetery, Tararu Cemetery, Mercury Bay Cemetery, Colville Cemetery (gazetted 1894) and Christ Church Anglican Cemetery (Coromandel) are available on-line through the TCDC web site at http://web.tcdc.govt.nz/cemeprod/. Among the dead interred in Shortland Cemetery, for example, are a number Commonwealth War Graves. These contain the remains of six local men who served in World War I.

Recommended actions:

- Revise the TCDC Cemetery Management Plan to identify historic heritage issues and recommend appropriate management methods, in regards to site maintenance and mowing, for example, which will protect historic heritage values from any potential adverse effects. As the current CMP was produced in 2001 it is presumably due for review, at which time historic heritage values may be incorporated into the plan.

- Rename the district’s ‘disused cemeteries’, perhaps to ‘historic’ or ‘closed’ subject to their official closure under the Burial and Cremation Act 1964, to better describe their state and highlight their historic heritage values for the community.

- Share historic heritage management advice with the owners and guardians of private cemeteries so that they are appropriately identified and protected.

---

16 The Wharepoa War Memorial, for example, is located in the Omahu Cemetery (1922, relocated 1973).
Interpretation of the District’s Historic Heritage Resources

The identification and protection of historic heritage resources is directed by statute and generally managed by local authorities under the auspices of the District Plan and Reserves Management Plans. That said there is considerable scope for interpreting historic heritage values and promoting them within the district and beyond in order to enhance community well-being and support cultural tourism initiatives. Promotional activities can in turn foster the identification and protection of historic heritage resources by raising the profile of the rich history of the Coromandel amongst its residents and visitors, thereby increasing the community’s willingness to support both council-led and privately-funded initiatives in this domain.

Interpretation is an area of historic heritage activity in which Council is likely to take a role as both initiator and coordinator. In some instances, such as on Council reserves, the Council may be wholly responsible for creating interpretative material that provides heritage information about the site, place or building. In other instances Council may simply fulfil a coordinating role; in the event that local historical societies, for example, wish to produce historic heritage information specific to their area but would like to achieve some district-wide consistency by using a standardised pamphlet or web site template. TCDC Libraries are partner members of the Aotearoa People’s Network Kaharoa, of which the digital Kete (knowledge basket) project is a key element. Once the library is fully subscribed to Kete in early 2010 the digital archive offers an exciting means by which to engage the local community, and others with a special connection to the Coromandel, with historic heritage interpretation and promotion. This type of community input can also be of great benefit to Council officers in their efforts to identify and protect the district’s historic heritage resources.

Having devised a common signage and interpretation style, individual historic heritage plaques and other forms of heritage publication could be initiated by community boards, Parks & Reserves, Policy & Planning and Library staff. Partnerships with Coromandel iwi, DOC, NZHPT, Environment Waikato, the Hauraki Heritage Forum, local historical societies and other community organisations have the potential to generate both the content and necessary funding to realise this historic heritage goal.

Recommended actions:

- Develop a dedicated presence on the Council web site to publish information about the Coromandel Peninsula’s historic heritage resources and promote the Council’s role in identifying, protecting and interpreting them.

- Promote the use of the TCDC Libraries’ digital Kete project to solicit historic heritage from residents throughout the district.

- Promote the use of The Treasury, Thames as a repository for the district’s historic records.

- Consider the development of a variety of interpretative templates, based upon the design work undertaken for the Council web site, that might be shared with key stakeholders and community groups wishing to interpret and promote the historic heritage stories, places and buildings of the district.
Integration of TCDC’s Historic Heritage Roles and Responsibilities

Cost-effective and timely delivery of historic heritage identification, protection and interpretation can be greatly improved with the adoption of an integrated management approach within Council. Many Council departments, among them Strategic and Environmental Planning, Parks & Reserves, Libraries, and Communications, have core obligations and/or interests in the area of historic heritage. Shared expertise, funding and advocacy can increase the effectiveness of Council’s approach to historic heritage. Steps taken to improve internal integration will likely also enhance the council-community partnership in which all parties seek to improve the present-day environment and safeguard its historic heritage values for future generations.

Possibly the single most useful action that may be taken to support the other recommendations made in this report, and those made in the ‘Monitoring Built Heritage Outcomes’ report, would be the appointment of a council officer for whom historic heritage was their primary focus and responsibility. Given that, on the one hand, the RMA directs territorial authorities to promote the sustainable management of historic heritage as a matter of national importance and, on the other hand, community interest in historic heritage is high, it is vital that Council has the personnel resources available to oversee this aspect of council responsibility.

Once appointed, council having either redefined an existing officer’s position description or created a new position, the Council Heritage Planner could then work across Council departments and liaise with external agencies and local residents and ratepayers to ensure historic heritage outcomes are successful and cost-effective. The role of the Heritage Planner would include identifying key stakeholders within council and coordinating regular interdepartmental meetings to encourage the integrated management of the district’s historic heritage resources. The Heritage Planner should also continue to support the Heritage Hauraki Coromandel Community Forum and foster Council’s relationship with local iwi, the Department of Conservation, NZ Historic Places Trust, Environment Waikato, the NZ Archaeological Association, and other key agencies, which also have responsibilities and interests in regards to the district’s historic heritage resources. In these and other actions that may be undertaken by the Heritage Planner, the TCDC Heritage Strategy (June 2007) should be a guiding document, subject to its review at regular intervals.

Recommended actions:

- Establish the position of TCDC Heritage Planner.
- Review the TCDC Heritage Strategy.
Conclusion

Thames-Coromandel district has a rich history and a high profile, regionally, nationally and internationally, as a place of great beauty and character. The historic heritage resources of the district make a significant contribution to the Coromandel Peninsula’s unique identity and sense of place. The Thames-Coromandel District Council has already shown that it is committed to identifying, protecting and interpreting the district’s historic heritage buildings, places and stories. Working with the community, the Council is now in a sound position to review its District Plan and other historic heritage management plans in order to safeguard a finite resource that is infinitely varied, highly valued, and much loved.
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Appendices to this report:
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8] ICOMOS NEW ZEALAND - Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value
1] Review of Thames and Coromandel Heritage Registers, Volumes 3 & 4 of the Thames-Coromandel District Plan

Information included here, beneath the register number and name of the item scheduled, includes whether or not the building is registered by the NZ Historic Places Trust and, in italics, comments about the current status of the Item Identification Sheet provided for each Heritage Item included in the District Plan. Where it is noted that there is no or little information about the scheduled item on the Item Identification Sheet this raises concerns as to the defensibility of the inclusion of this building or place on the District Plan’s Heritage Register.

Thames Heritage Register

Register Item No 1 Hauraki Prospectors Assn
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Group of buildings that embody Thames’ 19th century mining history and the mid-20th century appreciation of its educational and tourism potential

Register Item No 2 Old Golden Crown Mine Storage Shed
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4643

Register Item No 3 A & G Price Foundry
- NZHPT Category I, no. 128
- Group of buildings, dating from 1871

Register Item No 4 Burke Street Wharf
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4666
- No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 5 former Royal Hotel
- NZHPT Category II, no. 2668

Register Item No 6 World War One Memorial
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4658

Register Item No 7 Saxon Shaft and Pumping Station
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4650
Register Item No 8 Sunkist Lodge
- NZHPT Category II, no. 2667 – name given as former Lady Bowen Hotel

Register Item No 9 Victoria Park
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Identified as Victoria Park Conservation Area
- No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 10 Band Rotunda [Victoria Park]
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4609
- No information on Item Identification Sheet. Question as to why the rotunda should be scheduled separately from the Park? Ornamental brackets are not visible in 1989 register photograph, which suggests they are a modern addition.

Register Item No 11 former Lady Bowen Hotel
- NZHPT Category II, no. 713 – name given as Lady Bowen Hotel
- Potential for confusion here between items 8 and 11 as regards their names on the NZHPT register.

Register Item No 12 Boer War Memorial [Victoria Park]
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4610
- Also located in Victoria Park – single ‘conservation area’ approach more appropriate and arguably more suited to raising awareness of the relationship between the park, rotunda and memorial.

Register Item No 13 former Police Station
- Not registered by NZHPT

Register Item No 14 Robertson’s’ Funeral Homes Ltd
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4981 – name give as Thames Courthouse (former)

Register Item No 15 former Miners’ Union Office
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4653 – name given as Thames Aluminium Co. building
- No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 16 Carnegie Library [former]
- NZHPT Category II, no. 718 – name given as Public Library

Register Item No 17 Thames School of Mines
- NZHPT Category I, no. 132
Register Item No 17a Fire Bell behind Thames School of Mines
• Not registered by NZHPT – unless registration of School of Mines includes Fire Bell
  • **No apparent relationship between school buildings and bell.**

Register Item No 18 former Livery Stables
• NZHPT Category II, no. 4624
  • **No information on Item Identification Sheet.**

Register Item No 19 Thames Working Men’s Club
• NZHPT Category II, no. 702 – name given as former Cornwall Arms Hotel (now Club)

Register Item No 20 former Odd fellows’ Lodge
• Not registered by NZHPT
  • **No information on Item Identification Sheet.**

Register Item No 21 Corinthian Lodge
• Not registered by NZHPT
  • **See Salmond conservation plan for further information.**

Register Item No 22 row of historic shops, east side of Pollen Street
• Not registered by NZHPT as a group – individual registrations of shop frontages as follows.
  • **Query as to ‘shop frontage’ name given by NZHPT – does HPT registration include only the street elevations?**

Register Item No 22a 704/706/708 Pollen Street
Register Item No 22b
• NZHPT Category II, no. 2685?? – Check current status, as on-line Register of Historic Places does not include this property
  • **No information on Item Identification Sheet.** Duplicate listing for same building, same legal description – Embassy Theatre. **Determine correct street address and combine as one heritage item.**

Register Item No 22c 710 Pollen Street
• NZHPT Category II, no. 5481
  • **No information on Item Identification Sheet. What about 712 Pollen Street, northern half of this building?**

Register Item No 22d 714 Pollen Street
• NZHPT Category II, no. 2684

Register Item No 22e 720, 720a, 720b Pollen Street
• NZHPT Category II, no. 5482
  • **No information on Item Identification Sheet.**
Register Item No 22f 724 Pollen Street
• NZHPT Category II, no. 2683
• **No information on Item Identification Sheet.**

Register Item No 22g 726 Pollen Street
• NZHPT Category II, no. 2682
• **No information on Item Identification Sheet.**

Register Item No 22h 728, 730, 732 Pollen Street
• Not registered by NZHPT
• **No information on Item Identification Sheet. Modern building – review heritage values and placement on the schedule.**

Register Item No 22i 734/736 Pollen Street
• NZHPT Category II, no. 2677 – 736 Pollen Street only
• **No information on Item Identification Sheet. Check street addresses and confirm scope of scheduling.**

Register Item No 22j 738 -742? Pollen Street
• NZHPT Category II, no. 2679 – for group 738-742
• **No information on Item Identification Sheet. Check street addresses to reconcile NZHPT register and DP schedule.**

Register Item No 22k 742 746-8 Pollen Street
• NZHPT Category II, no. 2681 – for group 746-8
• **No information on Item Identification Sheet. Reconcile HPT registration and DP schedule.**

Register Item No 22l 750 Pollen Street
• NZHPT Category II, no. 2680
• **No information on Item Identification Sheet. Check inclusion of 752 Pollen Street in this item.**

Register Item No 22m 754 Pollen Street
• NZHPT Category II, no. 2678
• **No information on Item Identification Sheet. Check inclusion of 756 Pollen Street in this item.**

Register Item No 22n 758 Pollen Street
• NZHPT Category II, no. 2675
• **No information on Item Identification Sheet. This looks like a modern building – review heritage values and placement on the schedule.**
Register Item No 22o [760-?] 768 Pollen Street
- NZHPT Category 2, no. 2676?? – Check current status, as on-line Register of Historic Places does not appear to include this property
- No information on Item Identification Sheet. Site was vacant when Heritage Study carried out, since then the Thames Masonic Centre has apparently been erected on the site. Question heritage values and placement on the schedule.

Register Item No 22p 770 Pollen Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 23 Thames Hauraki Mine Pumphouse
- NZHPT Category II, no. 724 – address given as Cochrane Street
- Has the recommended Conservation Plan been prepared?

Register Item No 24 Quadrants from Thames Hauraki Mine Pumphouse
- NZHPT Category I, no. 4682 – Queen of Beauty Mine Pump Quadrants
- Suggest Items 23 and 24 be combined into an area listing.

Register Item No 25 Junction Hotel
- NZHPT Category II, no. 712

Register Item No 26 St James’ Union Church
- NZHPT Category I, no. 131 – note DP schedule states Cat II registration

Register Item No 27 St James’ Church Hall
- NZHPT Category II, no. 722

Register Item No 28 Beck Cottage
- Not registered by NZHPT
- No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 29 House, 300 Pahau Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet

Register Item No 30 Thames Club
- Not registered by NZHPT

Register Item No 31 St George’s Anglican Church
- NZHPT Category I, no. 721
Register Item No 32 St George’s Anglican Church Hall
  • NZHPT Category II, no. 2672

Register Item No 33 Old Hospital Building
  • Not registered by NZHPT
  • REMOVE from register as building has been removed from the site.

Register Item No 34 Brian Boru Hotel
  • NZHPT Category I, no. 129 - note DP schedule states Cat II registration

Register Item No 35 Rural Bank [ACC] building
  • Not registered by NZHPT
  • Late 1980s facadism, exterior appears in relatively poor condition today [2009]

Register Item No 36 Halsbury Chambers
  • Not registered by NZHPT
  • No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 37 Westpac Bank building
  • Not registered by NZHPT
  • No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 38 Tararu Cultural Centre
  • NZHPT Category I, no. 133
  • Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet. See NZHPT on-line register information.

Register Item No 39 House 746 Tararu Road
  • NZHPT Category II, no. 710
  • No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 40 House 750 Tararu Road
  • NZHPT Category II, no. 711
  • No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 41 House 727 Tararu Road
  • NZHPT Category II, no. 709
  • No information on Item Identification Sheet.
Register Item No 42 former St John’s Anglican Church
  • NZHPT Category II, no. 723
  • *No information on Item Identification Sheet. Now in private ownership – date of sale by Anglican Church?*

Register Item No 43 Pillar Boxes V R Type [3]
  • NZHPT Category II, no. 717, 7242 & 7244
  • *Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet. Three separate locations, three separate NZHPT registrations – suggests the need for three separate scheduled items.*

Register Item No 44 House, 200 Queen Street
  • NZHPT Category II, no. 4633
  • *Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet.*

Register Item No 45 Shortland/Thames Railway Station
  • NZHPT Category II, no. 719, also goods’ shed no. 4646
  • *Limited information on Item Identification Sheet. Desirable that scheduling clearly identifies the two separate buildings that are included in this item.*

Register Item No 46 Thames Plunket Rooms
  • Not registered by NZHPT
  • *REMOVE from schedule as the building has been removed from this site – relocated to Pipiroa in Hauraki District Council. No information on Item Identification Sheet. See Burgess heritage assessment report.*

Register Item No 47 House, 300 Queen Street
  • Not registered by NZHPT
  • *Note photograph held by the Auckland Art Gallery shows the circular staircase in this building. Consider scheduling interior features of this house following a site assessment.*

Register Item No 48 Superior Dairy
  • Not registered by NZHPT
  • *Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet, but mention of former use as a Maori boarding house.*

Register Item No 49 Holy Trinity Anglican Church
  • NZHPT Category II, no. 705
  • *Limited information on Item Identification Sheet.*

Register Item No 50 House, 210 Parawai Road
  • NZHPT Category II, no. 706 – name given as House [formerly Marshall]
Register Item No 51 ‘Coniston’ house, 201 Heale Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- *Limited information on Item Identification Sheet.*

Register Item No 52 ‘Thurlston’ house, 300 Banks Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- *Limited information on Item Identification Sheet.*

Register Item No 53 House, 316 Rolleston Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- *Limited information on Item Identification Sheet.*

Register Item No 54 Roman Catholic Convent
- Not registered by NZHPT
- *Limited information on Item Identification Sheet.*

Register Item No 55 House, 402 Williamson Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- *Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet.*

Register Item No 56 Lodge Sir Walter Scott
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4652
- *Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet, but some archival information appended to original study sheet.*

Register Item No 57 House, 200 The Terrace
- Not registered by NZHPT
- *Limited information on Item Identification Sheet.*

Register Item No 58 Old School House
- Not registered by NZHPT
- *Limited information on Item Identification Sheet. Notes architectural integrity has been compromised by installation of aluminium window joinery.*

Register Item No 59 Brick building, Thames High School
- Not registered by NZHPT
- *No information on Item Identification Sheet.*
Register Item No 59a Bell tower, Thames High School
- Not registered by NZHPT
- No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 59b Old school building, Thames High School
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 60 Shortland Wharf
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4672
- No information on Item Identification Sheet, but some archival information appended to original study sheet.

Register Item No 61 Hotel Imperial
- Not registered by NZHPT

Register Item No 62 Salutation Hotel
- Not registered by NZHPT

Register Item No 63 House, 306 Richmond Street
- NZHPT Category II, no. 5384
- No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 64 House, 202 Kirkwood Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- No information on Item Identification Sheet. Noted that owner requested inclusion on the schedule – review heritage values to establish significance of the dwelling.

Coromandel Heritage Register

Register Item No 1 House, 6 Taurua Place
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4659 – name given as Kahakaharoa Cottage, also known as Yellow House and Johnson House
- Relocated 1993 from 155 Watt Street [see photograph of house in Watt Street in heritage study inventory]. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 2 Kelso Cottage
- Not registered by NZHPT.
Register Item No 3 James House
- Not registered by NZHPT.
- See Tree register, item no. 32

Register Item No 4 Coromandel Colonial Cottage Motel
- NZHPT Category II, no. 704 – name given as former Mine Manager’s House

Register Item No 5 Coromandel Hospital
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4632
- See Tree register no. 31.
- Review extent of scheduling in light of NZHPT Coromandel Hospital Historic Area and consider extending schedule to include whole of historic area curtilage and features.

Register Item No 6 ‘Four Oaks’ house
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4629
- See Tree register no. 29.

Register Item No 7 Mitcalfe House
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4641

Register Item No 8 St Andrew’s Presbyterian Church
- NZHPT Category II, no. 720
- See Tree register no. 27

Register Item No 9 House, 1374 Rings Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 10 House, 671 Rings Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- REMOVE from schedule as the building has been demolished.

Register Item No 11 House, 1205 Rings Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.
Register Item No 12 House, 1200 Rings Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- **Limited information on Item Identification Sheet. Based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values.**

Register Item No 13 School of Mines
- NZHPT Category II, no. 714 – name given as Museum (former School of Mines)

Register Item No 14 Masonic Lodge
- NZHPT Category II, no. 7133

Register Item No 15 House, 756 Rings Road
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4614

Register Item No 16 House, 729 Rings Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- **No information on Item Identification Sheet, but original study Item Identification Sheet has a photograph appended to it showing a wedding party, ‘at Martin’s house’, in the front garden. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.**

Register Item No 17 House, 719 Rings Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- **Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.**

Register Item No 18 House, 692 Rings Road
- NZHPT Category II, no. 2666 – name given as Hauraki Mine Office (former)

Register Item No 19 House, 636 Rings Road
- NZHPT Category II, no. 2671

Register Item No 20 House, 865 Rings Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- **Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.**

Register Item No 21 House, 2251 Rings Road
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4648 – name given as Reilly House

Register Item No 22 House, 2365 Rings Road
- NZHPT Category II, no. 708 – formerly Captain Rings
- **See Tree register no. 36.**
Register Item No 23 House, 290 Edward Street/Road?
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information on Item Identification Sheet. Based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values.

Register Item No 24 House, 109 Pagitt Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- No information on Item Identification Sheet. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 25 House, 130 Pagitt Street
- Not registered by NZHPT

Register Item No 26 House, 100 Pagitt Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information on Item Identification Sheet. Based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values.

Register Item No 27 Schubert House, 2 Watt Street
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4651
- Modified and limited pre-1965 information about the building. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 28 House, 22 Watt Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- No information on Item Identification Sheet. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 29 House, 141 Watt Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information on Item Identification Sheet. Based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values.

Register Item No 30 House, 222 Watt Street
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4617

Register Item No 31 House, 245 Edward Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- No information on Item Identification Sheet. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.
Register Item No 32 House, 230 Watt Street
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4639 – name given as McNeill house
- Limited information on Item Identification Sheet.

Register Item No 33 House, 475 Albert Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- No information on Item Identification Sheet. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 34 House, 335 Albert Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information on Item Identification Sheet based on CT alone. Photographs dated 1956 appended to original study sheet show veranda infill section with solid balustrade. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 35 ‘Blueberry Cottage’, 80 Oxford Terrace
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information on Item Identification Sheet. Based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values. Note reference to a potter’s studio.

Register Item No 36 ‘Fir Lawn’
- NZHPT Category II, no. 699
- See Tree register no. 23. Building appears to be in a very poor state of repair and gardens are overgrown.
- Note former Fir Lawn dairy was relocated to Coromandel Colonial Cottage Motel for use as a spa bathhouse. Possible scheduling of item on its new site?

Register Item No 37 Coromandel Hotel
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information on Item Identification Sheet. Social history of the pub is missing. Noted that it has been ‘extensively modified over time.

Register Item No 38 Coromandel Citizens’ Hall
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Occupied by local branch of the RSA.
- Post-1973 alterations to the faced include recessed entry and decorative strong courses over windows.

Register Item No 39 Catholic Presbytery
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Moved to present site in 1983.
Register Item No 40 House, 415 Kapanga Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- **Limited information on Item Identification Sheet. Based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values.**

Register Item No 41 RAOB Lodge
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4669
- **No information on Item Identification Sheet.**

Register Item No 42 House, 444 Wharf Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- **REMOVE from schedule as the building has been removed from this site.**

Register Item No 43 House, 316 Wharf Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- **Information on Item Identification Sheet is based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values. Consider adding dairy cream separating shed to this scheduled item.**

Register Item No 44 House, 145 Hauraki Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- **Modified.**

Register Item No 45 House, 229 Hauraki Road
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4656 – name given as Ward Cottage

Register Item No 46 House, 205 Hauraki Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- **Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule. Highly modified, now unrecognisable as 19th century miner’s cottage.**

Register Item No 47 Lillis House, 188 Wharf Road
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4638

Register Item No 48 Thames Coromandel District Council Area Office
- NZHPT Category I, no. 4680 – name given as former Courthouse and Post Office
- **This item is located on the Memorial Reserve. Review placement on the schedule in view of heritage management and protection that may be offered through the relevant Reserve Management Plan.**
Register Item No 49 Coromandel Drapery
• NZHPT Category II, no. 4616

Register Item No 50 Government Battery
• NZHPT Category II, no. 130
  • This item is located on the Drinkwater Reserve. Review placement on the schedule in view of heritage management and protection that may be offered through the relevant Reserve Management Plan.

Register Item No 51 Assay House
• NZHPT Category II, no. 697

Register Item No 52 Hauraki House
• NZHPT Category II, no. 2670 – name given as Primary School & Shelter Sheds
  • See Tree register no. 18.
  • This item is located on the Hauraki House Reserve. Review placement on the schedule in view of heritage management and protection that may be offered through the relevant Reserve Management Plan.

Register Item No 53 Shop, 209 Kapanga Road
• Not registered by NZHPT
  • Significantly altered between 1993 and present day. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 54 Shop, 225 Kapanga Road
• Not registered by NZHPT
  • Additions to both sides since 1993 and façade does not appear to date from c. 1901. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 55 Shop, 265 Kapanga Road
• Not registered by NZHPT

Register Item No 56 Moehau Tearooms
• Not registered by NZHPT
  • REMOVE from schedule, as the building is no longer on this site. Burnt down 2009. Note: Norfolk pine on site said to have been planted in the 1890s – see identification sheet.

Register Item No 57 Four Square, 18 Kapanga Road
• Not registered by NZHPT
  • Decorative veranda brackets post-date 1993. Information sheet is based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values.
Register Item No 58 Shop, 24 Kapanga Road
- Not registered by NZHPT

Register Item No 59 Shop, 36 Kapanga Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Decorative veranda brackets post-date 1993. Information sheet is based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values.

Register Item No 60 Shop, 46 Kapanga Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Information sheet is based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values.

Register Item No 61 Coromandel Surgery
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Information sheet is based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values.

Register Item No 62 Kathleen Mine Foundation
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4613 – name given as Catherine Mine Machinery Foundations

Register Item No 63 Audley House
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4612 – name given as Campbell House
  - See also Tree register no. 2.

Register Item No 64 former Methodist Church
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4625

Register Item No 65 Elliott House, 90 Driving Creek Road
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4622
  - See also Tree register no. 41.

Register Item No 66 Old Davies Homestead
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4642
  - Given the very poor condition of the building its inclusion on the schedule should be reviewed.
Register Item No 67 Wilson House
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4657

Register Item No 68 former Vicarage, 234/236? Tiki Road
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4670
- Significantly compromised by subdivision of the property at front and rear of the house. No visual connection to church and cemetery. Veranda/carport extension post-dates 1993. Review inclusion of this house on the schedule.

Register Item No 69 Monument
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4645 – name given as Queen Victoria Monument
- This item is located on the Memorial Reserve. Review placement on the schedule in view of heritage management and protection that may be offered through the relevant Reserve Management Plan.

Register Item No 70 House, 1682 SH25 Manaia
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4611 – name given as Briars House

Register Item No 71 ‘Seaview’ house
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4667 – name given as Darling House

Register Item No 72 ‘Karamana’ house
- NZHPT Category II, no. 4630 – name given as Cadman House

Register Item No 73 Calloway house
- NZHPT Category II, no. 707 – House formerly Calloway

Register Item No 74 Stone Arch and building
- Not registered by NZHPT
- This item is located on the Samuel James Reserve. Review placement on the schedule in view of heritage management and protection that may be offered through the relevant Reserve Management Plan.

Register Item No 75 House, 1355 Rings Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Architectural integrity has been compromised, historically linked to Coromandel Hospital. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.
Register Item No 76 War Memorial
• Not registered by NZHPT
• *This item is located on the Memorial Reserve. Review placement on the schedule in view of heritage management and protection that may be offered through the relevant Reserve Management Plan.*

Register Item No 77 House, 32 Whangapoua Road
• Not registered by NZHPT

Register Item No 78 Drinking Trough
• Not registered by NZHPT

Register Item No 79 Stone Wall, Wharf Road
• Not registered by NZHPT
• *Limited information on identification sheet. Requires research to ascertain age and heritage significance of the wall.*

Register Item No 80 House 2076 Rings Road
• Not registered by NZHPT
• *Minimal information on Item Identification Sheet. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.*

Register Item No 81 House 2628 Rings Road
• Not registered by NZHPT
• *Limited information on identification sheet. Ownership by Culdian Celestial Age Trust raises issue of more recent historic interest. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.*

Register Item No 82 House, 1000 Tiki Road
• Not registered by NZHPT
• *Limited information on identification sheet. Building has apparently been reclad. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.*

Register Item No 83 House, 1070 Tiki Road
• Not registered by NZHPT
• *REMOVE from schedule, as the building is now longer on this site.*

Register Item No 84 House, 1825 Tiki Road
• Not registered by NZHPT

Register Item No 85 House, 65 Kingston Road
• Not registered by NZHPT
• *Limited information on identification sheet. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.*
Register Item No 86 House, 2330 Tiki Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information on identification sheet based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values.

Register Item No 87 House, 2590 Tiki Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information on identification sheet based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 88 House, SH 25
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information on identification sheet based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 89 House, 1040 Tiki Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information on identification sheet based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 90 House, 1565 Tiki Road
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information on identification sheet based on interviews with local informants – desirable to cross-reference with other sources to lend further weight to heritage values. Review heritage values and placement on DP schedule.

Register Item No 91 House, 205 Albert Street
- Not registered by NZHPT
- No information on Item Identification Sheet.

Historic Site

Register Item No 92 Tauranga Waka Site
- Not registered by NZHPT
- Limited information, further research recommended.
2] Additional items to consider for District Plan scheduling

Thames Community Board Area

The 11 items listed in Table 1 below are located in the Thames Community Board Area and are to be considered for scheduling in the District Plan. The first four items are registered by the NZHPT. The proposed additions to the District Plan align the Council’s Heritage Schedule with the Register of the NZ Historic Places Trust, acknowledge the contribution of some notable Thames residents to the district and nation’s history, and identify a collection of buildings that contribute to the area’s social and cultural history.

Table 1: Additional Historic Heritage Items to Consider for District Plan Scheduling – Thames Community Board Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NZHPT Register</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments/Principal Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Scheduling should be done in conjunction with Hauraki DC who have already proposed scheduling ‘their’ half of the bridge in the 2010 Draft District Plan – Item HAU023, Category A, Planning Map 3 |
| Former Thames Borough Council Office, 401 Albert Street, Thames | Category II, No. 4668 |Principal theme: Governing the Coromandel  
Check address information |
<p>| House / Corbett Homestead, 8088 SH 26, Hikutaia | Category II No. 4635 |Principal theme: Peopling the Land |
| Kauaeranga Valley School (former), 437 Kauaeranga Valley Road, Kauaeranga | Category II No. 9278 |Principal theme: Building Communities |
| Totara Vineyard, 219 Ngati Maru Highway, Totara | Not registered |Formerly the Gold Leaf Vineyard established by Joe Ah-Chan in 1925 and sold to Stanley Young Chan in 1950, who renamed it SYC Wines. Gilbert Chan, son of Stanley, is the winemaker at the vineyard today, maintaining an 84-yr historical association between two Chinese New Zealand families and a prominent business located on the outskirts of Thames. | Principal themes: Peopling the Land, Developing Economies |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NZHPT Register</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments/Principal Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House / former Rei Hamon home, 817 Mt Pleasant Road, Thames</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Former home of Rei Hamon (1919-2008), a self-taught artist who is best known for his line drawings of Coromandel’s flora and fauna. A kauri near the source of the Kaimarama Stream is named for him in recognition of his life as a bushman and efforts to raise awareness and conserve the Coromandel’s remnant native forests. Hamon was also a stalwart member of Mormon Church, serving as Branch president in Thames at one time. He was the subject of a television documentary <em>Rei Hamon Man of Nature</em> that screened on Maori TV in May 2009.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Mind &amp; Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former John Grigg house, 604 Queen Street, Thames</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>John Grigg (1838-1920) was an astronomer, teacher, composer and musician and he built an observatory behind his Thames home in 1884. This was then rebuilt on another site, presumably this one, in 1894 and enlarged into a two-storey structure. He has been described as the ‘founding father of New Zealand cometary astronomy’, having discovered four comets and received two Donohoe Medals from the Astronomical Society of the Pacific in recognition of his stargazing efforts. Grigg was also a foundation member of the Thames Baptist Church and operated a furnishing and upholstery business in Thames in addition to his musical and astronomical commitments. The house is a square-plan hip roofed villa with an enclosed veranda. The property once extended south to the Karaka outfall.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Mind &amp; Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikawau &amp; Tapu tram baches, 949 Thames Coast Road &amp; 1 Tapu Wharf Road, 709 Thames Coast Road</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>EJ (Ted) Russek acquired decommissioned trams from the Auckland tram Company in the early 1950s and transported them to the Coromandel. 10 were converted to baches at Tapu and 23 received the same treatment at Waikawau. Others were located singly on farms etc for accommodation and storage.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Mind &amp; Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s Anglican Church, 8059 Paeroa-Kopu Road, Hikutaia</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Promoted by the local schoolmaster EJ Walters and other members of the local community in 1910. Opened in 1914. Restored in 2002 with support from Frank Bax and Keith Trembath. The lectern and altar were evidently carved by RW Lowry of Hikutia.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopu Station Hotel, 1 Kopu Road SH25, Kopu</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>First hotel established at Kopu by Joseph Cornwell Williams (b. 1847, Wales) in 1880. Oldest section of the present hotel, on the corner of the site, appears to date from c.1910. Possibly some of the late 19th century hotel may have been reduced in height to a single storey and refashioned.</td>
<td>Principal themes: Developing Economies, Building Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Additional Historic Heritage Items to Consider for District Plan Scheduling – Thames Community Board Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NZHPT Register</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments/Principal Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain Cook Memorial, 23 Kopu Road SH25, Kopu</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Unveiled on 21 November 1941 beside the Kopu Bridge and resited beside the Kopu Public Hall in 1969. Stands adjacent to Kopu Hall and Clubrooms.</td>
<td>Principal themes: Peopling the Land, Building Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area

The 14 items listed in Table 2 below are located in the Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area and are to be considered for scheduling in the District Plan. The first item is registered by the NZHPT. The proposed additions to the District Plan align the Council’s Heritage Schedule with the Register of the NZ Historic Places Trust, widen the ambit of the District Plan’s heritage protection beyond Coromandel township, and acknowledge some significant historic heritage values relating to creativity, community life and industrial activity.

Table 2: Additional Historic Heritage Items to Consider for District Plan Scheduling – Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NZHPT Register</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments/Principal Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Saints’ Anglican Church, 884 SH25, Manaia</td>
<td>Category II, No. 2662</td>
<td>The church replaced an earlier Catholic church, built in 1871, and was named for the Irish home parish of Auckland’s second catholic Bishop, Thomas Croke. The presbytery, which is already scheduled on the District Plan (1880) was moved to its present site behind the church in 1983. The church features the ceramic artwork of local GP Dr Deirdre Airey, in the form of the Stations of the Cross and its date and style are representative of the post-war renewal of many Catholic churches.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Colman’s Roman Catholic Church, 465 Kapanga Road, Coromandel (1954)</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>The church replaced an earlier Catholic church, built in 1871, and was named for the Irish home parish of Auckland’s second catholic Bishop, Thomas Croke. The presbytery, which is already scheduled on the District Plan (1880) was moved to its present site behind the church in 1983. The church features the ceramic artwork of local GP Dr Deirdre Airey, in the form of the Stations of the Cross and its date and style are representative of the post-war renewal of many Catholic churches.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Creek Railway &amp; Potteries, 360, 380, 380A, 380B Driving Creek Road, Coromandel</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Potter Barry Brickell began to build the pottery and railway on the outskirts of Coromandel in 1973. The railway, at first built for transporting clay, has become a visitor attraction in its own right. ‘Brickell’s influence over New Zealand ceramics was two-fold. He was a parent to both the ceramic sculpture movement and the more expressive domestic ware that begun to appear in the 1970s’ (At Home – A century of New Zealand design p. 245). Brickell also helped to popularise Coromandel as an artistic retreat.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Mind &amp; Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>NZHPT Register</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comments/Principal Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coromandel Fire Station, 345 SH25 Tiki Road, Coromandel</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>The Coromandel Fire Brigade was established in 1896 and its centenary in 1996 as marked by the publication of a booklet. The oldest building on the fire station site houses a historical museum.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth house, 385 Pagitt Street, Coromandel</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>This building appears on the surface to present a latter 20th century earth structure with monopitch roof forms and idiosyncratic fenestration. It evokes an alternative DIY aesthetic in contrast to the timber cottages more commonly associated with Coromandel's mining heritage.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Mind and Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell bach / former Camp Shop, 86 Waitete Bay Road, Waitete Bay</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>A monopitch mid-20th century combined residence and shop built to serve the campers and local residents in the bay and once run by the Whitehouse family. It is located on an elevated site at the northern end of the bay and is one of the most prominent baches in ‘The Camp’. Construction appears to be concrete block with exposed aggregate with a high shell content.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Developing Economies, Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House / former School, Post Office and flagpole, 2 Captain Amodeo Road, Amodeo Bay</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>This house once served as the local school and post office and has been owned as a holiday home by the Moss family since the mid-1950s. It stands on a prominent site overlooking the bay and close by a popular fishing lodge and boat ramp on the Coromandel-Colville Road. The house’s villa form suggests a turn of the century farmhouse (c. 1898). It was built for Charles McCall and his family who were assisted in 1894 by Captain Frank Amodeo when the house lot of timber he was delivering to the bay aboard the Argyle was washed away in a flash flood.</td>
<td>Principal themes: Building Communities, Mind &amp; Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Colville Village Centre Heritage Area, Colville Road, Colville | Not registered | The 2006 publication Escape to the Cape records the history of a number of structures from 2km south of the village centre to the area in the vicinity of the intersection of Wharf and Woods Road with the Main North Road. Included within the area are the:  
- Colville Community Hall, est. 1931, 2310 Colville Road  
- The Colville Tennis Club Pavilion and Courts, est. 1947, 2313 Colville Road  
- Colville General Store & Colville Café, former built late 1940s by Dick Goudie with timber from the dismantled Naval Base at Port Jackson, 2314 Colville Road  
- Colville Post Office, 1930, 2312 Colville Road  
- War Memorial Hall, 1898 built as Brethren Church, dedicated in 1924 as a World War I memorial hall, 2331 Colville Road | Principal themes: Peopling the Land, Building Communities |
## Table 2: Additional Historic Heritage Items to Consider for District Plan Scheduling – Coromandel/Colville Community Board Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridle homestead and bakehouse, 97 Wharf Road, Colville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone fish traps (poraka), Wharf Road, Colville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridle homestead and bakehouse, 97 Wharf Road, Colville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone fish traps (poraka), Wharf Road, Colville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opuni Intentional Community meeting house, 350 Wharf Road, Te Whau Point, Colville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ye Old Stone Jug, 1780 Port Jackson Road (seaward side), Paritu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone wharf, Port Jackson Road, Paritu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s Anglican Church, 1361 Kennedy Bay Road, Harataunga / Kennedy Bay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NZHPT Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not registered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fire Station, 1996, 2331 Colville Road  
Colville School, est. 1891, moved to present site in 1924, 2391 Colville Road  
Built in 1892 by Joseph and Jane Bridle for use as an accommodation house. It also housed a bakery, butchery, grocery, and gum and fungus store.  
Local landmarks and evidence of the historic importance of fishing in the district.  
The first of the intentional communities in the Colville area established in the 1970s, this one founded by Aucklanders Heath Black, Julian Rosenberg and Chris King in 1970. The meeting house was modelled on a wharenui to create a communal meeting place for the independent families who were, and are, shareholders of Opuni Reserve Ltd.  
Built in the 1920s from the local tonalite to accommodate quarry workers, this small building is suggestive of the isolated life led by the stonemasons at Paritu. Since 1960 the stone is still quarried in nearby Darkie Stream, a second wharf having been built in 1950 south of the first.  
The wharf was built in 1918 by the NZ Coromandel Granite Co Ltd from tonalite [Coromandel granite] to facilitate the uploading of Coromandel granite for export from the district. The stone was quarried from the 1900s until the 1950s and was used for the basement level of Parliament Buildings in Wellington (1922)  
Church stands close by one of two marae in the bay and is a landmark in the small community. It was built on another site in 1901 and moved to its present site in 1953. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/Principal Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal themes: Developing Economies, Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal themes: Peopling the Land, Developing Economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal themes: Building Communities, Mind &amp; Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal theme: Developing Economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal theme: Developing Economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal theme: Developing Economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mercury Bay Community Board Area

The 18 items listed in Table 3 below are located in the Mercury Bay Community Board Area and are to be considered for scheduling in the District Plan. The first 10 items are registered by the NZHPT. The proposed additions to the District Plan would align the Council’s Heritage Schedule with the Register of the NZ Historic Places Trust, address the absence of any Mercury Bay historic heritage resources within the current District Plan, and identify heritage values relating to the history of the Coromandel as a place of recreation and retreat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NZHPT Register</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments/Principal Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Try Fluke Mine Manager’s house, 288 Kuaotunu-Wharekaho Road, Kuaotunu</td>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>The Try Fluke Mine was the most successful of the Kuaotunu mines, and was established in 1889. The house was likely built in the same year. It is a bay villa with a return veranda and double gables overlooking the garden frontage.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Developing Economies, Peopling the Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Wharf, Ferry Landing, Whitianga Harbour</td>
<td>Category I</td>
<td>The oldest stone wharf in New Zealand was built by Gordon Davies Browne (1838). Browne was a Sydney timber merchant who made land purchases in New Zealand in the 1830s. In c.1836 he established a timber mill and shipbuilding yard at Ferry Landing and so needed the wharf to service his operations. After several years of poor health Browne died in the Bay of Islands in 1842. The wharf is still in use and was built from local stone.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Developing Economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Mercury Bay Dairy Company building (Mercury Bay Museum), 11A The Esplanade, Whitianga</td>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>Whitianga’s first dairy factory was located in Albert Street, opposite Monk Street. It was of timber construction and erected 1911. The dairy company office and manager’s house were retained when the factory was demolished in early 1930s. Land for a new factory was purchased from Thomas Hannan (street name) for £150 in 1926. The factory was built for £6435 in 1934 and it operated until 1972, after which time all local milk was sent to Te Aroha for processing. In 1949 a merger occurred between the Tairua Dairy Company and that the Mercury Bay operation. In the 1970s the local Lions Club joined forces with the Mercury Bay Historical Society to buy the factory for use as a museum. The museum opened in 1979, having been vested in the council’s ownership.</td>
<td>Principal themes: Developing Economies, Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 5 Coghill Street, Whitianga</td>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>The cottage (post-1882) has had a significant addition made to one side but its original form still evident. In 1882 Frederick Hoy purchased this property and the one beside it from Thomas Peacock. He then sold this section to David Hamilton in 1890. The building has been used as shop since 1984 and may have been relocated.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Peopling the Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>NZHPT Register</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comments/Principal Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 20 Victoria Street, Whitianga</td>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>Once part of the Peacock subdivision of 1882, this cottage was erected c. 1889 following the sale of the rear section of 1 Coghill Street by Gorge Loram to Herbert Watts. An addition to the rear of the cottage was made in 1998. Watts was a local butcher and some locals know the house as the Hamlin house after Ethel Hamlin who owned it 1944-78.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Peopling the Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 3 Owen Street, Whitianga</td>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>The cottage (post-1882) stands on land that was also part of the 1882 Peacock subdivision. The lot was first purchased by Harriet Hughes, who then sold it to EJ White, the local postmaster, in 1888. It appears the decorative brackets on the veranda may be recent additions as they are not visible in the NZHPT register photo dated June 1993.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Peopling the Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 5 Owen Street, Whitianga</td>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>The cottage stands on land that was also part of the 1882 Peacock subdivision. In 1884 this section, and the one behind it fronting Campbell Street, was purchased by Catherine McTavish. The house dates from c. 1884, and the property was sold to Jane Bryce, wife of the local storekeeper, in 1898.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Peopling the Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Whitianga Cottage Hospital, 19 SH25 Buffalo Beach Road, Whitianga</td>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>The Mercury Bay Hospital Committee first met in 1896, the need for a resident doctor and hospital having been created by local timber and gold mining activities and the consequent growth of Whitianga. The site was offered by the Mercury Bay Timber Company in September 1897 for sum of 30/- per acre. The purchase of 6 acres was eventually agreed and the successful tender for construction was submitted by C. Wright for £415. The hospital was ready to receive its first patients on 2 July 1898. A morgue and female ward were opened over the next two years. The hospital also maintained dispensaries at Coroglen, Tairua and Kuaotunu. In 1913 sleeping quarters for the night nurses were provided and in 1939 the hospital amalgamated with Thames Hospital Board. Auckland architect William Henry Skinner designed the hospital and also St James’ Presbyterian in Thames.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew’s By the Sea Community Church, 82 Albert Street, Whitianga</td>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>Methodist-Presbyterian, Mercury Bay Co-operating Parish; also serves Whenuakite. Built by Arthur and Fred Meikle in 1898; aka the Undenominational Church. Land bought from Peacock for £15, church begun 1890, opened 27 March 1898, serving Methodist, Presbyterians and Anglicans. Op shop and large church hall also</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>NZHPT Register</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comments/Principal Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coroglen Hall, 1872 SH25 / Tairua-Whitianga Road, Coroglen</td>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>(c. 1900) The venue for Country Women’s Institute meetings from 1933 and Mercury Bay Country Girls’ Club meetings from 1962. Once part of a thriving township, built on timber and gum, and now the last public building from the heyday of Gumtown/Coroglen. Monopitch addition to the side of the building appears to date from the mid-20th century.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 1 Coghill Street, Whitianga</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>The land on which this cottage (c.1883) stands was subdivided by Thomas Peacock in 1882. Peacock had arrived in NZ in 1862, and was to serve two years as Mayor of Auckland. He was also a shareholder in the Whitianga Kauri Timber Mill Co. Coghill was the name of Peacock’s home town in Scotland and he named Owen, Campbell, Mary and Isabella Streets after his children. This cottage section was purchased from Peacock by George Loram in 1883. Six years later the rear of the property was sold off to Herbert Watts (see 20 Victoria Street). Notable features of the cottage include its flared veranda roof with decorative brackets, simple gabled ‘box’ shape with rear lean-to, and multi-pane sash windows.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Peopling the Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage, 3 Coghill Street, Whitianga</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>This cottage (post-1882) is presently used to accommodate a visiting lawyers practice rooms. It stands on part of the Peacock subdivision on the edge of Soldiers Memorial Park.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Peopling the Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosson bach, 348A Black Jack Road, Otama</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Winner of the NZIA’s Supreme Award in 2004, this house is known locally as ‘the container’ and is a contemporary response to many of the quintessential qualities of the Coromandel ‘bush bach’; vertical board and batten cladding, large openings to facilitate indoor-outdoor living, and robust interior fittings. Despite the fact that this house was built only very recently (2002) the architectural acclaim it has received thus far and the representative quality it has as a high-quality bach overlooking an east coast beach, gives it historic heritage values that will almost certainly accrue further with time.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Mind &amp; Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Additional Historic Heritage Items to Consider for District Plan Scheduling – Mercury Bay Community Board Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NZHPT Register</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments/Principal Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pole house, 5 Endeavour Place, Cooks Beach</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>A pole house with a recent addition, both designed by architect Neil Simmons, Bucklands Beach (1975, 2006). The original dwelling is set back from the beach and rises up through four storeys with open plan living. In 2007 the addition received a NZIA Award from the Waikato/Bay of Plenty Branch.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Mind &amp; Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Creek, Sarah’s Gully, 624 Black Jack Road, Opito</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>This site is significant for providing evidence of multiple occupations from c. 1300 to 1600. NZAA site T10/399</td>
<td>Principal theme: Peopling the Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderland community and shop, 2464 SH25 / Tairua-Whitianga Road, south of Mill Creek, Kaimarama</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>The community was established in 1964/5 by Dan and Edith Hansen, who had previously lived at Beeville near Morrinsville. The farmland the Hansens bought near Whitianga had been abandoned by previous owner in c.1956. On it the Hansens founded an intentional community or commune. Dan Hansen had been paralysed from the waist down in 1940 following an accident and so he relied on mechanical solutions to his mobility problems. The name of the community was taken from Tolkien’s <em>Lord of the Rings</em>. In 1984 all drugs, including alcohol and tobacco, were banned at Wilderland in response to the negative impact contemporary ‘hippie culture’ was having on the community. In the early 1990s the Hansens gifted the property to a charitable trust to preserve its collective community ethos.</td>
<td>Principal themes: Mind and Body, Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coroglen Tavern, 1937 SH25 / Tairua-Whitianga Road, Coroglen</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>The present pub took over the former Coroglen Post Office in 1946. Earlier the Waiwawa Hotel on the other side of the river had burnt down (1879-1922) and a temporary pub had been established in a local home. A community pub and Coromandel music venue, the hotel has hosted a darts club since 1966; and in 2008 was named Best Country Tavern.</td>
<td>Principal theme – Mind and Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sunnyside’, former Wigmore homestead, 4 Grange Road, Hahei</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Robert and Fanny Wigmore settled in Hahei in c.1866. At first the Wigmore family lived in a small house near the beach, close to the DoC reserve in which Robert and Fanny are buried. Later Robert built a much larger house, ‘Sunnyside’ further inland (by 1874). Robert Wigmore was the local magistrate and also known as a painter. After his death in 1890 the 230-acre family farm, including the homestead, was sold to the Harsant family.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Peopling the Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area

The seven items listed in Table 4 below are located in the Tairua/Pauanui Community Board Area and are to be considered for scheduling in the District Plan. None of the items are registered by the NZHPT. The proposed additions address the absence of any Tairua/Pauanui historic heritage resources within the current District Plan, identify heritage values relating to the early European settlement of the area and acknowledge the national historic heritage significance of the planned beach resort at Pauanui.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NZHPT Register</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments/Principal Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original classroom, Hikuai School, School Road, Hikuai</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Land was first offered for sale at Hikuai in 1895 and the school was established two years later (1897). Puketui gold aided the growth of Hikuai in the 1890s. The first classroom was designed by Mitchell and Watt, architects to the Auckland Education Board, who were also responsible for the Tairua school building in 1892. The Hikuai classroom was extended in 1929 and again in 1965-6. The building features prominently on the school site today, as can be seen in the photograph below. The school name was changed from Pukiore to Hikuai in 1915, the former being the Maori name for the locality according to Rev Bennett's history of Tairua [p. 94].</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory-Wright homestead, 297 Main Road, Tairua</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>The Cory-Wright family has been associated with Tairua for almost 100 years. George (d. 1917) and his son Harold farmed over 3000 acres at Tairua. Harold began subdividing the farm in the late-1940s in response to growing interest in Tairua as a holiday destination. His wife Phyllis Cory-Wright published a memoir and local history about Tairua in 1988. The house dates from c.1912.</td>
<td>Principal themes: Developing Economies, Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Tairua Schoolhouse, 147 Main Road, Tairua</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>The Tairua school house dates from 1879 and Father Bennett records that improvements were made to it by the Education Board architects, Mitchell and Watt, in 1893. It is located on the Main Road just south of the intersection with Wharf Road and represents the origins of the 19th century mill town south of the Pepe Stream.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former William Jackson house, 71A Main Road, Tairua</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>William Jackson was manager of the timber mill in Tairua and the house he built for himself (c.1870) just south of the mill and the emerging Tairua township was subsequently used as the Police Station (1878-95). According to the Francis Bennett the house was</td>
<td>Principal themes: Developing Economies, Governing the Coromandel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paku Heritage Area, Tairua</strong></td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Small-scale commercial and open space heritage area located at the base of Paku overlooking the inner-harbour and bounded by Paku Drive, The Marina and The Esplanade. Historic heritage structures include a former limestone mill (now the Old Mill Restaurant, 1 The Esplanade), which pre-dates 1965, and a number of structures transported to the site after that date.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  |  | • The Old Mill Restaurant, The Esplanade, Paku, Tairua (pre-1965)  
• The Cypress Tree, former camp ground store and post office, The Esplanade, Paku (c. 1924)  
• SS Ngoiro, The Esplanade, Paku |
| **Pauanui Community Church, 20 Centreway, Pauanui** | Not registered | A building appeal was launched for the church in 1978 and the contract signed on 14 July 1979. One year later it was opened. The large stained glass window above the altar was donated by Mrs Edith Hopper, mother of the Hopper brothers who developed Pauanui. The window depicts the scenery, history, flora and fauna of the Coromandel Peninsula. The church stands on the periphery of the Pauanui shopping centre and has been added to on several occasions since it was first opened (1993 addition + 1998 memorial wall). In style and construction the church is a modest building, in sympathy with contemporary holiday houses in the resort. Nevertheless it communicates its ecclesiastical function through its steeply pitched roof, porte cochere over the entrance, memorial wall and symbolic stained glass window. |
| **Pauanui Heritage Area Dunlop Drive & McCall Avenue, Pauanui (1968-)** | Not registered | Sections in these streets were the first to be sold by Pauanui Ocean Beach Resorts. They conform to the cul-de-sac model adopted for the resort plan. Both were named, as many Pauanui streets are, after councillors who served on the Thames County Council. Median planting and red seal roadways are distinctive features of the public realm in Pauanui. |
|  |  | Including:  
House, 11 McCall Avenue, Pauanui (1968) |

Principal themes: Peopling the Land, Developing Economies

Principal theme: Building Communities

Principal theme: Peopling the Land
First house erected by a purchaser of a Pauanui Ocean Beach Resorts property. An A-frame built by its first owner Andy Carr. This house has been added to at the front but the original form of the house can still be read. Completed by Christmas 1968 and christened ‘The Retreat’.

**Whangamata Community Board Area**

The six items listed in Table 5 below are located in the Whangamata Community Board Area and are to be considered for scheduling in the District Plan. None of the items are registered by the NZHPT. The proposed additions address the absence of any Whangamata area historic heritage resources within the current District Plan, identify heritage values relating to the development of the beach community at Whangamata and acknowledge historian Michael King’s contribution to New Zealand’s cultural history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NZHPT Register</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments/Principal Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Patrick’s Catholic Church, 201 Port Road, Whangamata</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>A former joinery factory established after World War II by builder Alan Dunn and converted for use by the Catholic Church in 1961. Previously the site of Mrs Shaw’s shop and post office in c. 1932.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangamata Cinema, 708 Port Road, Whangamata</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>The building appears to date from c. 1943 and at one time there was also a cabaret in an adjacent building. In 1967 the Thames County Council gave Whangamata Amusements Ltd permission to screen movies on Sundays, on condition that they were G rated and did not clash with church services.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangamata Community Church, 103 Beverley Terrace, Whangamata</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Providing church facilities for Presbyterian, Anglican and Methodist adherents and dedicated on 31 December 1955.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Building Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaview Road Bach Heritage Area, Whangamata</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Comprising the full length of Seaview Road, Whangamata and properties on both sides of the road. White’s Aviation Ltd’s January 1953 aerial photograph of Whangamata Harbour shows a large number of the Seaview Road baches already in existence and</td>
<td>Principal theme: Mind &amp; Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>NZHPT Register</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comments/Principal Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td>surprisingly little changed up until the present day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included within this area is:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Williamson’s Bach, 108 Seaview Road, Whangamata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley Williamson was the daughter of Philip and Madeline Williamson. According to local historian Anne Stewart Ball the bach was built in 1934 by H Mason at a cost of c. £150. Philip and Madeline Williamson farmed the area and the nearby park is named in their memory, after Philip Williamson bequeathed the land to the local council in the 1940s. Beverley Williamson was the author of Whangamata – 100 Years of Change published in 1988. She died in 2008.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matariki Forest Ltd headquarters, 567 SH25 Tairua Road, south of Wharekawa</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>The NZ Forest Service was in existence from 1919 until 1987 and during that time it was active on the Coromandel Peninsula. It is believed that the Whangamata forest headquarters dates from c.1965. The buildings embody a vogue in the mid/late 20th century for neo-vernacular architectural styling.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Developing Economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former home of Michael King and Maria Jungowska, 7 Wharekawa Place, Opoutere</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>The house (c.1990) was home to one of New Zealand’s pre-eminent historians and writers for a decade and was the residence of King and Jungowska at the time of their deaths in 2004. The property was purchased from Michael King’s children by the University of Waikato in 2008 and now functions primarily as a writing retreat.</td>
<td>Principal theme: Mind &amp; Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>