

Kia ora koutou. Ko Fiona Wykes tōku ingoa. Ko au te Kaiwhakahaere-ā-Takiwā i Canterbury/West Coast for Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.

The following is a quick summary of my evidence as submitted to this hearing.

My information relates primarily to the buildings included on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero – notably the Robert McDougall Art Gallery and the Canterbury Museum (19th century portion). Both of these places are included on the list as Category 1 historic places, entered on the list in 1985 and 1986 respectively. Category 1 historic places are considered to be places of special or outstanding historical or cultural significance or value. The list is maintained by Heritage New Zealand and identifies New Zealand's significant and valued historical and cultural heritage places.

Inclusion on the list does not offer any form of protection; and with the exclusion of archaeological sites, statutory protection of historic heritage relies on provisions in RMA documents. As such we, Heritage New Zealand, advocate for 'all entries on the list to be protected through scheduling in district plans where appropriate'

Regarding archaeology – at least part of the Canterbury Museum (19th century portion) was erected prior to 1900 – therefore it meets the definition of an archaeological site under section 6(a) of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Archaeological sites are protected under the Act, and under section 42 of the Act it is an offence to modify, damage or destroy an archaeological site without an authority from Heritage New Zealand.

HNZ is supportive of the proposed works to provide increased exhibition and visitor experience space, staff areas and storage and services facilities.

The proposed redevelopment of these highly significant cultural institutions will enable the continued and more viable uses of the Category 1 listed 19<sup>th</sup> century portion of the Canterbury Museum and the Robert McDougall Art Gallery.

In particular Heritage New Zealand strongly supports the following aspects of the proposal:

- The partnership approach implied in the application – and confirmed in Ms Parata-Goodall's presentation – and Ngāi Tūāhuriri's role in the design of the proposal
- The conservation works to reveal the interior volume and roof trusses of the 1882 building, and the Heritage fabric of the 1870 building's northern gable end, west facade and roof, as well as part of the north elevation and roof of the 1872 building.
- The proposed scale and mass of the new structures, which we consider will have no more than minor effects on the visual appearance and setting of the listed historic places within the museum site.
- Removal of the blackouts and tints on the 1877 Mountfort building windows which will allow natural light into the building and a return to the original appearance of the building.
- Improved visitor and storage facilities, including exhibition spaces, cafes, circulation and amenities which will enable the museum to provide enhanced visitor experience and the ability to exhibit more of the extensive collection – the fundamental purpose of the museum.

One of Heritage New Zealand's functions is to advocate for the protection of any listed historic place. When considering the application documents, we concluded that insufficient detail was provided in relation to four main aspects of the proposed works to the Category 1 listed buildings. Without this detail it is difficult to ascertain the level of impact the works will have on the heritage fabric of the Category 1 buildings, and therefore difficult to assess whether these works can be considered appropriate. I note that in his presentation yesterday Mr Gardner agreed with this concern and our proposals to mitigate it.

The key areas of concern are:

- the separation between the 1877 Mountfort building and Centennial Wing – insufficient detail is provided regarding how this separation will be achieved and the linking structure installed
- Water feature – again insufficient detail is provided – the concerns being ensuring the proposed water feature will not cause detrimental impacts to the heritage fabric of the adjacent building
- Connections with the Robert McDougall Art Gallery – full assessment of the effects of the proposed link and connections cannot be made with the current level of detail
- Heritage fabric generally – we consider further information is required regarding how the fabric uncovered during the works will be treated, including clarification of the methodologies to be employed when removing heritage fabric – around identification, recording, deconstruction, storage or disposal. It is customary to have methodologies around these matters when working on heritage buildings.

Our submission therefore requested that any consent include conditions in relation to a number of points and having read the Council's section 42a report we consider that the conditions recommended in the report adequately address our request – with one minor suggested change (noting that below I am paraphrasing the requests we made)

Regarding identification, recording, deconstruction, storage or disposal of heritage fabric, we consider this to be covered with the Council's suggested condition of 15a vi

Ensuring that the installation of the link between the 1877 Mountfort building and the scheduled Centennial wing does not irreversibly damage significant heritage fabric on the Mountfort building is covered by the Council's proposed condition 15a vii

Ensuring the final design does not have significant detrimental impact on the heritage significance of the Robert McDougall Gallery is covered with condition 15c i – iv, noting our suggested minor change for condition 15c iii 'Lighting, HVAC, fire upgrade – this documentation shall demonstrate that there is the least physical and visual intrusion of heritage fabric practicable' – we suggest replacing 'of' with 'into'

Ensuring the new entrance in the Centennial wing will be differentiated from the original heritage fabric either side through careful design is covered with condition 15d i

Ensuring the proposed water feature will not cause detrimental effects to the heritage fabric is covered through proposed condition 15d ii

We strongly encourage the applicant and Council to continue consulting with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga when preparing and approving the details referred to in these conditions.

In addition we acknowledge that Heritage New Zealand's requested Advice Note in relation to an archaeological assessment is included as Advice Note xiv of the Council's recommended advice notes.

In conclusion:

The Canterbury Museum site, comprising listed and scheduled buildings, stands as a centre of cultural significance, being the core of Canterbury's leading museum, and reflecting the changing cultural function of museums over time. Individually significant, the buildings also have high contextual significance as part of a group of Gothic Revival buildings that form the heart of the early colonial cultural precinct of the city.

As such, Heritage New Zealand emphasizes that the appropriate detailing of any redevelopment is of the utmost importance.

We recognize that the proposed works incorporated within this application will not only enable the continued use of these highly significant Category 1 listed buildings but will also provide for more viable uses which could help secure the buildings' existence into the future.

Heritage New Zealand supports the conditions recommended in the Council's s42a report and confirms that these conditions, if imposed, alleviate the concerns raised in our submission.