BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

UNDER THE	Resource Management Act 1991
IN THE MATTER OF	Plan Change 9 (Historic Heritage and Natural Environment) to the Hamilton City Operative District Plan – Built Heritage, Stage 1
IN THE MATTER OF	Submission 341 of the New Zealand Police Nga Pirihimama o Aotearoa

---

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ADAM WILD ON BEHALF OF NEW ZEALAND POLICE NGA PIRIHIMANA O AOTEAROA

Heritage

24 July 2024

GREENWOOD ROCHE
LAWYERS
AUCKLAND
Solicitor: F M Lupis
francelle@greenwoodroche.com

Hayman Kronfeld Building
6/15 Galway Street
Auckland 1010
PO Box 106006
Auckland 1143

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 My name is Adam Wild. I am a director of Archifact – Architecture & Conservation Ltd, an Auckland-based architectural practice specialising in conservation architecture and the management of places of historic heritage value.

1.2 I have been engaged by New Zealand Police – Ngā Pirihimana o Aotearoa (*NZ Police*) to assist with its submission on Plan Change 9 (Historic Heritage and Natural Environment) to the Hamilton City Operative District Plan (*ODP*) (*PC9*). That submission opposes:

(a) the proposed scheduling of the Hamilton Central Police Station (*the Station*) located at 12 Anzac Parade, Hamilton (*the Site*) as a "B" ranked Heritage Item in Schedule 8A of the ODP; and

(b) the proposed amendments to a rule within the ODP which would classify demolition of a "B" ranked building as a discretionary activity.

1.3 Along with my colleague Veronica Cassin, I prepared a brief of evidence which addressed the methodology used by Hamilton City Council (*HCC*) to identify the values of prospective heritage items dated 22 September 2023 (*Primary Evidence*). We presented that evidence along with Mr Grant Eccles, planner on behalf of NZ Police, at the PC9 Session #2 Built Heritage hearing on 7 November 2023.

1.4 I have the qualifications and experience as set out in my Primary Evidence.

1.5 Following that hearing, I participated in expert conferencing on 16 November 2023. Through that conferencing, the majority of experts reached agreement on the appropriate methodology for assessing built heritage items. That methodology was endorsed by the Panel through its Interim Guidance #1, issued on 27 November 2023 (*Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology*), and is included as **Appendix 2** to my evidence.

Code of conduct

1.6 Although this is not an Environment Court proceeding, I confirm that I have read and am familiar with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses, contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023, and agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. Other than where I state that I am relying on the advice of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

2 SCOPE OF SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE

2.1 My evidence is presented on behalf of NZ Police.

2.2 Specifically, it:

(a) briefly addresses the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology;

(b) outlines my assessment of the Station using the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology; and

(c) compares my assessment against the initial WSP assessment of the Station and the revised heritage assessment of the Station undertaken by The Heritage Studio (*THS*) on behalf of HCC, both of which are addressed in, and inform, the supplementary evidence of Ms Elise Caddigan on behalf of WCC dated 3 July 2024.

2.3 In preparing this evidence, I have reviewed:

(a) the statement of evidence (24 August 2023), rebuttal statement of evidence (6 October 2023), and supplementary statement of evidence of Elise Natalie Caddigan (3 July 2024);

(b) THS's recategorisation assessment, included as Appendix 1 to Ms Caddigan's supplementary evidence (*THS Recategorisation Assessment*) and the Hamilton City Council: Supplementary Assessments included as Appendix 2 to Ms Caddigan's supplementary evidence (*HCC Supplementary Assessment*);

(c) the statement of evidence (1 September 2023), rebuttal statement of evidence (6 October 2023), and supplementary statement of evidence of Laura Jane Galt (3 July 2024);

(d) various decisions and directions of the Hearing Panel and memoranda of Counsel on behalf of the Hamilton City Council;

(e) the primary statements of evidence of Superintendent Bruce Bird and Grant Eccles on behalf of NZ Police;

(f) the evidence of Stanley Rahui Papa on behalf of Tanui Group Holdings Limited and NZ Police; and

(g) the supplementary statement of evidence of Grant Eccles on behalf of NZ Police.

3 ENDORSED BH ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

3.1 Ms Caddigan's supplementary statement helpfully summarises the genesis of the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology, which I will not repeat here.[1]

3.2 That Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology comprises updated criteria, significance scale and descriptors, and plan ranking descriptors, and is directly relevant to the assessment of heritage values of the Station.

3.3 The key differences from the previous methodology applied by WSP in its original assessment are:

(a) Built heritage places will only be eligible for inclusion in Schedule 8A where they achieve "outstanding" (Plan Ranking A) or "high" (Plan Ranking B) heritage significance, locally, regionally or nationally.

(b) The Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology clarifies that a place must meet one or more of the criteria at the level of "high" significance or above to be eligible for inclusion. The criteria are not weighted or hierarchical, and there is no correct number

[1] Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Ms Elise Caddigan on behalf of HCC dated 3 July 2024, at 22–32.

or combination of values required to determine overall significance.

(c) The Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology makes a number of changes to the description of the heritage assessment criteria. Those criteria are *historic qualities; physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities; context qualities; technological qualities; archaeological qualities; cultural qualities; scientific qualities.*

(d) The Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology includes a guidance note confirming that the heritage assessment criteria could be considered against a number of existing guidance documents and baseline evidence, including:

(i) Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (*HNZPT*), "Significance Assessment Guidelines" March 2019 (*HNZPT Guidance*).

(ii) Thematic Study of Hamilton, Lynette Williams, 2021.

(iii) Auckland Council, "Methodology and guidance for evaluating Auckland's historic heritage", August 2020 (*AC Methodology*).

3.4 Ms Caddigan refers to the earlier assessment undertaken by my colleague Veronica Cassin and me where our assessment (undertaken in line with the previous HCC methodology) found that the Station was subject to a single *moderate* criterion for its *physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities.*[2] We found that the Station had either *low* or *none* of the other qualities. We argued in our Primary Evidence that one *moderate* criterion was not sufficient to warrant inclusion in Schedule 8A.[3]

3.5 Based on her review of the THS Recategorisation Assessment and the HCC Supplementary Assessment, Ms Caddigan considers that the Station has *high physical/aesthetic/architectural and context qualities*

[2] Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Ms Elise Caddigan on behalf of HCC dated 3 July 2024, at 76.

[3] Evidence of Mr Wild and Ms Cassin on behalf of NZ Police dated 22 September, at 9.1-9.3.

and *high historic qualities.*[4] For that reason (and in accordance with the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology), she recommends that the Station is included in Schedule 8A.[5] As set out below, these qualities – *physical/aesthetic/architectural, and context* – are the key assessment matters remaining in contention in terms of assessment and threshold for inclusion in Schedule 8A across the three independent assessments (WSP, THS/Caddigan, and me).

3.6 Before addressing the comparative differences between those assessments, I briefly summarise the findings of my own assessment of the Station, using the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology.

4 ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

Assessment approach

4.1 In preparation for my assessment of the Station, I reviewed the photographs I took during the Site visit undertaken late last year. I also reviewed the various assessments provided on behalf of HCC, including the WSP assessment, the HCC Supplementary Assessment and the THS Assessment, and the draft Thematic Study of Hamiton. I also reviewed the documents referenced in the guidance note included in the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology (outlined above).

4.2 I have reviewed various monographs that describe and discuss the emergence of Modernism in New Zealand's architectural history from which I have been able to place the Station within a national context which suggests its value lies at a regional level at best. Those monographs include:

(a) David Mitchell & Gillian Chaplin, The Elegant Shed: New Zealand Architecture since 1945 (Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1984).

---

4 Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Ms Elise Caddigan on behalf of HCC dated 3 July 2024, at 81.

5 Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Ms Elise Caddigan on behalf of HCC dated 3 July 2024, at 133.

(b) Julia Gatley (ed), Long Live the Modern: New Zealand's New Architecture 1904-1984 (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2008).

(c) Peter Shaw, A History of New Zealand Architecture (Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett Publishers, 1990, 1st edition).

(d) Terence Hodgson, Looking at the Architecture of New Zealand (Wellington: Grantham House Publishing, 1990).

(e) Rosslyn J Noonan, By Design: A brief history of the Public Works Department Ministry of Works 1870-1970 (Wellington: Government Printer, 1975).

(f) Lewis E Martin, Built for Us: The Work of Government and Colonial Architects, 1860s to 1960s (Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 2004).

(g) Justine Clark and Paul Walker, Looking for the Local: Architecture and the New Zealand Modern (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2000).

(h) Wintec, Venetia Sherson (ed), Heritage Hamilton: a celebration of the city's historic buildings (Hamilton: Wintec and Hamilton City Council, 2006).

(i) Geoffrey Thornton, Cast in Concrete: Concrete construction in New Zealand 1850-1939 (Auckland: Reed Books, 1996).

(j) Charles Walker (ed), Exquisite Apart: 100 years of Architecture in New Zealand (Auckland: Balasoglou Books, 2005).

(k) Michael Fowler, Buildings of New Zealanders (Auckland: Landsdowne Press, 1984).

(l) "Block Map 5: Waikato: Hamilton, Huntly, Te Awamutu & Cambridge: A Guide to Waikato Architecture" (Andrew Barrie and Taylor Chen, 2020), which includes the Hamilton Police Station as a place (Item 61).

4.3 In considering the assessment criteria, and not for the first time,[6] I have been reminded that the assessment criteria tend to focus on a post-Colonial period determined by buildings and objects and in doing so separates pre-contact and post-contact cultural values to some sort of archaeological sub-set. New Zealand's heritage is a broader, more sophisticated and complex series of qualities that contribute to an understanding of that value and public benefit of which its archaeological and cultural values (including associated intangible values) are equally relevant considerations and are recognised in the assessment criteria. How these are applied is a critical matter when considering the value of the subject place.

4.4 In that regard, the HNZPT Guidance provides some useful direction on how those values may be accounted for in the assessment of an item's heritage significance. In particular, it notes that:

(a) Assessment under different criteria may take into account the views of different groups – from iwi or hapū to community groups and experts in a particular field.[7]

(b) Aesthetic, architectural and technological significance (often labelled "physical" values) generally reflect how well a historic place or area meets the ideals of a particular field or discipline, or further develops it. Aesthetic qualities go beyond what is visual. It includes how a place makes people feel.[8]

(c) Social, cultural, traditional and spiritual values focus on the meaning that a historic place or area has for a defined community or group. Significance is demonstrated through the extent to which the value of a place or area to the group can be shown. Consideration should be given to aspects such as the action taken by the group to maintain or protect what gives the historic place or area meaning, or the extent to which they might be expected to experience a sense of loss if they were no

6 Evidence provided to the submissions made by Te Kotahitanga O te AtiAwa Taranaki on the Proposed New Plymouth District Plan, 25 January 2022.
7 HNZPT Guidelines, page 7.
8 HNZPT Guidelines, pages 7, 12.

longer able to engage with it in the way that gave it meaning to them.[9]

4.5 In undertaking my assessment of the Station, I had the considerable benefit of the evidence of Mr Papa, which outlines the relationship between Waikato-Tainui and the Station. That evidence is compelling in how it enriched my understanding and assessment of the historic, context, archaeological, and cultural qualities of this place. In my opinion (and consistent with the HNZPT Guidance), the voice of tangata whenua, where it is expressed (as it is here through Mr Papa), must be accounted for in determining whether the values or qualities of a site are ones which we should look to protect under the Resource Management Act 1991. I have attempted to do that through my assessment, described below.

4.6 Of particular significance for my assessment is the statement from Mr Papa that:[10]

> TGH does not consider that these features of the Station represent any heritage value that is worth protecting, and that to include the Station on the Schedule:
>
> (a) prioritises the association of the Site with the Police over the tribe's historical relationship to it;
>
> (b) protects and places value on a building which:
>
> (i) has historically acted as a post-box for sending our people to incarceration and has exacerbated the grievances experienced by our people;
>
> (ii) both NZ Police and Waikato-Tainui agree is no longer fit for purpose (in every sense); and
>
> (c) as discussed further below, imposes further constraints on the future use of the Site which risk prolonging or indeed preventing the fulfilment of the redress promised to Waikato-Tainui.

4.7 In that same regard, I acknowledge the evidence of Superintendent Bruce Bird, which outlines the position of NZ Police regarding the

---

9 HNZPT Guidelines, page 7.

10 Evidence of Mr Rahui Papa on behalf of Tainui Group Holdings and NZ Police, dated 24 July 2024, at 5.4 (*Papa Evidence*).

Station.[11] The way in which that evidence has been accounted for in my assessment is outlined below.

Assessment summary

4.8 My own assessment of the Station found that it has an overall ranking of *medium* significance at a regional level. That was based on the Station achieving *medium* significance for *historic qualities, physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities* and *context qualities.* All other qualities were assessed as either *low* or *not assessed* qualities. As part of that assessment (and in accordance with the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology guidance note), I considered the various descriptions of the heritage criteria contained in the AC Methodology, and the HNZPT Guidelines.

4.9 My full assessment of the Station against the relevant criteria is set out in **Appendix 1** of my evidence, and is summarised below:

(a) *Historic qualities – medium / local.* The Station's associations with the NZ Police and with the Ministry of Works in Waikato are acknowledged; however, the mere fact of those associations with national organisations does not confer national (or indeed, regional or local) significance, nor, in my opinion, are those historic associations particularly unique or noteworthy. The sources cited in the HCC Supplementary Assessment refer to the "esteem and celebration" of the new Station (at the time it was built).[12] By comparison, for Waikato-Tainui, the Station's historic association with NZ Police is a reminder of historic grievances that should not be the subject of protection.

(b) *Physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities – medium / regional.* The Station has medium value as a representative example of the Brutalist architecture designed and built by the Ministry of Works in the late 20th century within Hamilton and across the Waikato region. There is evidence of Frank Irvine Anderson's involvement with the design of the Station. Anderson was then identified as the "contract architect" for the project, but only

11 Evidence of Superintendent Bruce Bird on behalf of NZ Police, dated 22 September 2023, at 5.1-5.21.

12 HCC Supplementary Assessment, page 2.

held the role for the first year and a half of construction.[13] The comparative analysis undertaken by HCC shows that there are other examples of Brutalist architecture within the district (none of which have been scheduled) and whose presence collectively suggests an absence of rarity.[14] I note that the absence of a place from a heritage list does not mean that it is necessarily without historic heritage value and so the group considered by the HCC provides an important comparative context with respect to the relative rarity of that architectural style within the district.[15]

(c) *Context qualities – medium / local.* As I described further below, I consider that the Station has a limited relationship to its setting. The Station's mass and height give it no more than a local (immediate) prominence in limited viewpoints, given the Site's typography and the extensive mature trees surrounding the Site which compromise its visibility/prominence within the townscape. For the reasons I describe further below (and with support from the evidence of Superintendent Bird and Mr Papa), I do not consider that the Station's historical association with law enforcement warrants a *high* significance ranking.

(d) *Technological qualities – low / local.* The Station is of a conventional reinforced concrete post and beam structural composition with a structural core accommodating vertical circulation and services. The exterior cladding comprises modular concrete panels and steel framed windows.

(e) *Archaeological qualities – not assessed.* The Site may have archaeological potential associated with its occupation prior to 1900.

---

13 HCC Supplementary Assessment, pages 2-3.

14 Supplementary Assessment, Appendix 1: Comparative Analysis.

15 Noting that, while 'rarity' is no longer explicitly noted as a sub-criterion in the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology, it is referenced throughout the Auckland Council "Methodology and guidance for evaluating Auckland's historic heritage", August 2020, and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, "Significance Assessment Guidelines", March 2019. Both documents are referred to in the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology as available guidance for informing the assessment criteria in the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology.

(f) *Cultural qualities – low / local.* The Site is owned by Waikato-Tainui who, through Mr Papa's evidence, have demonstrated that the Station holds no value for the tribe and in fact represents a reminder of the historical grievances perpetuated against the tribe. The evidence of Mr Papa makes plain that, for the tribe, protection of the Station for its heritage values would be an affront in light of those grievances.[16]

(g) *Scientific qualities – low / local.* This place is not considered to hold any special potential to contribute information about history.

4.10 On the basis of my assessment that its heritage values have overall *medium* significance, I do not consider that the Station is eligible for inclusion in Schedule 8A of the ODP.

5 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE WSP ASSESSMENT, THE RECATEGORIATION ASSESSMENT, AND MY OWN ASSESSMENT

5.1 I have compared my assessment with those of the earlier WSP assessment and with the *THS* Assessment (noting that the WSP Assessment applied the previous methodology). That comparative analysis is attached at **Appendix 1**, and is summarised in Table 1 below.

5.2 As set out in that Table, the WSP assessment concluded an overall assessment and ranking of *high* – Plan Ranking B.[17] In comparison, the THS Recategorisation Assessment moved from the WSP position on a number of criteria, but ultimately landed at a similar overall *high* rating.[18] My own assessment arrived at a *medium* rating.

---

16 Papa Evidence, at 5.7.

17 PC9, Section 32 Assessment, Appendix 8: Built Heritage Methodology Report and Inventories: Hamilton City Council Heritage Inventory Report (2 June 2022), Appendix A, section 3.3.

18 THS Recategorisation Report, page 8.

	WSP	**THS**	**Wild**
Historic	High	Medium[19]	Medium [local]
Physical / aesthetic / architectural	High	High	Medium [regional]
Context	Moderate	High	Medium [local]
Technological	Moderate	Low	Low [local]
Archaeological	Unknown	N/A	N/A [-]
Cultural	Low	Low	Low [local]
Scientific	Low	Low	Low [local]
Overall	**High**	**High**	**Medium [regional]**

Table 1 – Comparative analysis summary

5.3 There is a shift of sorts evident in both the THS Recategorisation Assessment and my own assessment. That shift responds, in part, to the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology, but is also informed by more information coming to light. I discuss the impact of this further below.

[19] Note the use of "medium" and not "moderate" is aligned with the Panel's endorsement of the significance scale as considered in the BH JWS

Comparative analysis

5.4 In considering the criteria of *cultural* and *scientific* qualities of the Station, both were recognised in all three assessments as *low.* The WSP assessment and my own aligned in the consideration of *moderate/medium* ratings for *context,*[20] with THS rating this as *high.*[21] THS and I reached similar conclusions with respect to *historic* and *technological* qualities. Archaeological values were not considered in any of the assessments.

5.5 It is in the consideration of the *physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities* where the WSP and THS found common ground and where I determined a lower value.[22] As noted above, THS considered that the *context quality* of the Station was *high*, whereas I considered that was only *medium* significance.[23]

Physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities

5.6 In considering the *physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities* criterion I note that both the WSP and THS assessments attribute the design of the Station (within the work of the Ministry of Works) to different project architects. WSP found Ted Hills to be responsible, while TSH suggest the Station is the work of Frank Irvine Anderson (Government Architect).[24]

5.7 The HCC *Supplementary Assessment* helpfully provides evidence illustrating Anderson's involvement with the Station's design, although it stops short of confirming his role as lead architect. Rather, it attributes responsibility for the plans of the Station to "local Ministry of Works architects", with Frank Anderson noted as having drawn the plans for the cell blocks. Anderson was then appointed as

---

20 PC9, Section 32 Assessment, Appendix 8: Built Heritage Methodology Report and Inventories: Hamilton City Council Heritage Inventory Report (2 June 2022), Appendix A, section 3.1(c).

21 THS Recategorisation Report, page 8.

22 PC9, Section 32 Assessment, Appendix 8: Built Heritage Methodology Report and Inventories: Hamilton City Council Heritage Inventory Report (2 June 2022), Appendix A, section 3.1(b); THS Recategorisation Report, page 8.

23 THS Recategorisation Report, page 8.

24 PC9, Section 32 Assessment, Appendix 8: Built Heritage Methodology Report and Inventories: Hamilton City Council Heritage Inventory Report (2 June 2022), Appendix A, section 1; THS Recategorisation Report, page 8.

contract architect for the first year and a half of construction (the project was delayed over the course of its construction).[25]

5.8 As described in the AC Methodology,[26] associations (such as a relationship with the national institution of the Ministry of Works) at a national scale do not however necessarily confer national, regional or even local significance, nor does the identification of the designers (i.e. Frank Anderson) or builders automatically confer significance.

5.9 In this instance, the HCC Supplementary Assessment and its biography of Frank Irvine Anderson recognise his 30-year professional association in Waikato, Rotorua, Taupo, and Bay of Plenty regions.[27] His role as District Architect saw him responsible for coordinating various projects in the region including projects at Waikato University, Forest Research Institute in Rotorua and jobs for the Post and Telegraph Department. There is no evidence that I am aware of to suggest that the Station held a special place in Anderson's evolution or his practice; it is, in short, considered a relatively routine project.

5.10 Further, the nature of these larger institutional Departments (such as the Ministry of Works) was that projects tended to be credited to the Office Chief (i.e. Anderson) under whom a team of architects operated. We see this in the oeuvre credited to F Gordon Wilson who headed the Department of Housing Construction (later the Housing Division of the Ministry of Works) and later as Government Architect but under who many notable architects undertook the design including a number of refugee European architects such as Helmut Einhorn, Fred Farrar, Ernst Gerson, Friedrich (Fred) Neumann, and Ernst Plischke.

5.11 As such, while I accept on the evidence that the Ministry of Works had responsibility for constructing the Station, and that Frank Irvine Anderson as the District Architect had involvement in its design, I do not consider that that confers *high* significance in terms of the Station's *physical/aesthetic/architectural* qualities.

---

25 Supplementary Assessment, pages 2-3.
26 Methodology and guidance for evaluating Auckland's historic heritage (August 2020, version 2) (*AC Methodology*).
27 Supplementary Assessment, page 3.

5.12 In terms of architectural style, the HCC Supplementary Assessment *high* significance rating for the Station's *physical/aesthetic/ architectural* qualities (accepted by THS) is also attributed to its "notable example" as a "distinctive, largely intact, representative example of Brutalist architecture in the locality...[with] its scale and physical attributes, setting it apart from other local and regional buildings produced by the Hamilton office of the Ministry of Works."[28]

5.13 In my opinion, the Station is a conventional building construction type of its time, adopting a stylistic approach commonly adopted by the Ministry of Works (and others) through the 1960s and 1970s. A comparative analysis with the Peter Beavan-designed Lyttleton Road Tunnel Administration Building [a HNZPT Category 1 building, demolished as a consequence of the Canterbury earthquakes] or the sublime Karori Campus buildings and landscapes designed by Bill Toomath for the University of Victoria, Wellington [a HNZPT Category 1 place] shows the pinnacle of the Brutalist style in New Zealand.

5.14 Within the Hamilton district, there are other similar examples of Brutalist architecture, including buildings that also have direct association with the Ministry of Works.[29] As noted above, a number of these are not proposed for inclusion in the Schedule (which does not mean that they do not have heritage value); however, in my opinion, they are also comparable examples of the architectural style and association. As Ms Caddigan has herself recognised, the Station is not alone as a Brutalist building in the local context, and as such its rarity value in the context of this *physical/aesthetic/architectural criteria* has not been established. Further, its construction technology is conventional and its stylistic language common to its vintage and function at that time. It is, in other words, representative, but not unusual of the typology.

5.15 In the contextual references I have considered (identified at paragraph 4.2 above) the Station has not been referenced in any of the monographs that considered architecture of this period, typology, and style. In my opinion there is a difference between 'different' and 'distinctive' and in my opinion, the Station is the former but lacks the

---

28 Supplementary Assessment, page 4.
29 Supplementary Assessment, Appendix 1: Comparative Analysis.

values necessary to be considered 'distinctive'. I accept that the Station can be considered to be a "*representative example of Brutalist architecture*"[30] as Ms Caddigan has done, but while "representative", the building is not a high example. It has *medium*, regional significance at best.

5.16 Finally, I note that the Station's architectural and physical style reflects a "watchtower" typology found in other similarly functional buildings (for example, the now vacated Auckland Central Police Station which is not subject to any heritage protections under the Auckland Unitary Plan). The association between a building's style and function and a particular period of activity (for example, policing in the 1970s and 1980s) can of course enhance its *physical/aesthetic/architectural* qualities. Where, however, there is clear evidence that that association serves to detract from or impede a necessary transition away from that period of activity, it can, in my opinion, diminish those qualities and require a more nuanced assessment of where historic heritage values lie.

5.17 In that regard, Superintendent Bruce Bird's evidence makes it clear that that "watchtower" typology of the Station embodies a now-outdated expression of "policing" which no longer reflects the direction modern policing in New Zealand. In his opinion, the Station "is preventing NZ Police from progressing our strategies to reduce reoffending, improve outcomes with partners and agencies and meet Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations with Māori."[31] For Waikato-Tainui, the Station represents "*an embodiment of* [the] *grievance and an on-going reminder of that painful past for Waikato-Tainui*".[32]

5.18 In my opinion (and in line with the HNZPT Guidance), the evidence regarding those associations with the "watchtower" style of the Station has the effect of diminishing its *physical/aesthetic/architectural* qualities.

5.19 In that context, I remain of the opinion that those qualities of the Station are of *medium* [regional] significance only.

---

30 Supplementary Assessment, page 4.
31 Evidence of Superintendent Bruce Bird on behalf of NZ Police, dated 22 September 2023, at 6.1.
32 Papa Evidence, at 4.9.

Context qualities

5.20 The THS Assessment categorises the Station as having *high context* qualities on the basis of its location on "a prominent corner site, occupied by the Hamilton Police Station since 1911 – 1912, and of a scale and design that makes it conspicuous in the townscape". The THS Assessment also notes that "the place is an important landmark that is associated with the wider historical theme of law enforcement in the locality".[33]

5.21 Under the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology, the *context* qualities are described as:[34]

> The place or area is an important landmark or feature or contributes to or is associated with a wider historical theme, traditional, or cultural context, or physical setting.

5.22 Beginning first with the physical setting of the Station, I found that the Station has a limited relationship with, and makes little contribution to, its setting. Equally, I consider the highly modified setting for the Station is not representative of significant periods in the historic development of the place and makes no contribution to the significance of the Station.

5.23 Regarding the Station's "prominence" within the townscape, I consider that, owing to its typography (set down from Anglesea Street) and the presence of extensive street trees around the Station, any visual prominence of the Station is limited only to particular viewpoints along Tisdale Street (to the south) and Victoria Street to the north. As you travel further up Victoria Street, the Cathedral takes on greater prominence. I therefore disagree with THS and Ms Caddigan that it is of a "of a scale and design that makes it conspicuous in the townscape."[35] In my opinion, the Station's "landmark" values are compromised by the mature street trees on Anzac Parade which screen the Station and dominate the character of the street itself.

---

33 THS Recategorisation Report, page 8.
34 Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology, 8-1.2(c).
35 Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Ms Elise Caddigan on behalf of HCC dated 3 July 2024, at 81; THS Recateogrisation Report, page 8.

5.24 I acknowledge and agree with Ms Caddigan and THS that the Site and the Station is a place associated with the wider historical theme of law enforcement in the locality.[36] I do not however agree that it is a "landmark". Rather, it is a building of its time, expressing a didactic message through its stylistic references that no longer reflect NZ Police's role in society or its aspirations for working with the community, including tangata whenua, to support improved social outcomes. As set out earlier in my evidence, that historical association is not one which, in my opinion, enhances the heritage value of the Station.

5.25 Further, in light of Mr Papa's evidence, I consider that that association, as described in the THS Assessment and the HCC Supplementary Assessment:

(a) fails to account for Waikato-Tainui's historical relationship to the Site, which significantly pre-dates any occupation of the Site by the Police or other municipal organisations; and

(b) fails to account for the historical experience of tangata whenua in relation to the Station.

5.26 In my opinion, the effect of those considerations is to weaken the contextual significance of the Station. As above, I acknowledge that in some cases, negative historical and/or contextual associations with places can strengthen (rather than weaken) their case for heritage protection, serving as an important reminder of / monument to historical loss or grievance. In undertaking such assessments, it is my opinion (supported by the HNZPT Guidance) that the position of the party or parties most affected by that historical or contextual association (where it is available) should weigh heavily in assessing the significance of that criterion.

5.27 As Mr Papa's evidence makes plain, the historical theme of law enforcement is not a contextual quality that Waikato-Tainui wishes to have protected or remembered through the Station. Its reasons for that position, set out in Mr Papa's evidence, are obvious and compelling. For its part (as reflected in the evidence of

[36] Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Ms Elise Caddigan on behalf of HCC dated 3 July 2024, at 71; THS Recategorisation Report, page 8.

Superintendent Bird), the NZ Police recognises and supports that position.

5.28 For both parties, it is clear that neither NZ Police nor Waikato-Tainui would "experience a sense of loss if they were no longer able to engage with [the Station] in the way that gave it meaning to them."[37]

5.29 In light of that evidence and my analysis above regarding the physical context of the Site, I consider that the Station's *context qualities* are of *medium significance* only.

Final observations

5.30 In my opinion, the THS assessment needs to be carefully considered in that it was a desktop exercise only and no site visits were carried out. It is difficult to consider a desktop analysis alone as being sufficiently robust to determine the historic heritage values of a place. The opportunity afforded me in gaining access to the Site and the Station ensured that my observations and assessment against the various criteria could be place-specific and appropriately contextualised and from that analysis a considered assessment made.

6 CONCLUSION

6.1 In conclusion, I do not support the inclusion of the Station in the Schedule. In my opinion, it (at most) attracts *medium* significance at a regional level for its *physical/aesthetic/architectural* qualities and its *context* qualities. On that basis and in accordance with the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology, it is not eligible for inclusion in the Schedule.

Adam Wild
24 July 2024

[37] HNZPT Guidelines, at page 7.

Appendix 1

central police station, 12 anzac parade			
Heritage Assessment Criteria: **Original text: original ODP assessment methodology (Appendix 8.1.2). Underline and ~~strike out~~ reflects agreed changes to assessment methodology, endorsed by Panel (i.e. the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology).**			
	WSP	**THS / Caddigan**	**Archifact**
overall assessment and ranking	**High – plan ranking B**	**High – plan ranking B**	**Medium – plan ranking not warranted**
Assessment approach	**Assessment based on "rationalised and evolved" original assessment methodology.**	**Assessment based on Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology**	**Assessment based on Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology**
Historic Qualities	**High**	**Medium**	**Medium**
The place or area is directly associated with, or has a direct relationship to, an important person, group, institution, event or activity, or reflects important aspects of local, regional or national history, including development and settlement patterns, transportation routes and social or economic trends.	**High associative value.** The place has high associative value for its connection to the Ministry of Works (*MoW*), a nationally recognised organisation with a legacy of public architecture and infrastructure across New Zealand. The site also has a long association with the Hamilton police force.	**Medium historic value.** Completed in 1875, the place is associated with the more recent history of the Hamilton police force, but does represent centralisation of the police services that occurred in the city (and throughout the country) in the late 1960s and early 1970s.	**Medium associative value.** The association to both the MoW and the New Zealand Police is accepted, however the building is one of many of this nature that make up a large and varied collection of sites and buildings associated with both organisations. In its assessment of the Station, WSP appears to conflate direct association of the Station to national organisations as conferring national significance for the building. On this approach, all buildings designed and built by the MoW in Hamilton would achieve a 'high' level of significance through 'direct association' and would qualify all for promotion to Schedule 8A.

	Moderate historic pattern value. The place has moderate significance with regard to historic patterns in the region. The site was originally occupied by a previous Police Station, which was replaced by the current iteration in the early 1970's. The current building demonstrates patterns of upgrading existing facilities when they became outdated due to social and economic changes for the region.		As described in the Auckland Council Assessment Criteria Methodology (*AC Methodology*),[38] associations (such as a relationship with the national institution of the MoW) at a national scale do not necessarily confer national, regional or local significance. There is nothing specific about this building that makes its associative value to either organisation at a regional scale warrant an assessment of high significance. The HCC Supplementary Assessment refers to the "esteem and celebration" of the new Station (at the time it was built). By comparison, for Waikato-Tainui, the Station's historic association with NZ Police is a reminder of historic grievances that should not be the subject of protection. **Low historical pattern value.** The site has been associated with Police use since 1911. Prior to that it had been a hospital site continuing the theme of public services and, of course, prior to that had been associated with, and owned and occupied by Waikato-Tainui prior to confiscation in the 1860s. The Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Deed of Settlement (Raupatu Settlement or Deed) was signed by the Crown and Waikato-Tainui at Tuurangawaewae Marae on 22 May 1995 and saw the land returned to Waikato-Tainui.

[38] Methodology and guidance for evaluating Auckland's historic heritage (August 2020, version 2) (*AC Methodology*).

			A Māoritanga approach to understanding heritage value as espoused in the Preamble and at Principle 3 of the Aotearoa New Zealand ICOMOS Charter supports recognition that the existing building obstructs a Māori approach to 'upgrading existing facilities when they became outdated due to social and economic changes for the region'. As the evidence of Mr Papa makes plain, the fortified nature and distinctly European programme of the current building is contradictory to the social values and tikanga Māori of Waikato-Tainui.
b. Physical / Aesthetic / Architectural Qualities	**High**	**High**	**Medium**
~~The style of the place or area is distinctive or has special attributes of an aesthetic or functional nature, uses unique or uncommon building materials, or demonstrates an innovative method of construction, or is an early example of the use of a particular building technique, is representative of, or associated with, a significant development period or activity (for example institutional, industrial, commercial or transportation), or the work of a notable architect, designer, engineer or builder in the locality, region or nation.~~ OR The place or area is a notable or representative example of: i. A significant development period or activity; and/or ii. Distinctive or special attributes of an aesthetic or functional nature; and/or	**High style/design/type value.** The building has high architectural significance as a representative example of the Brutalist structures designed and built by the MoW in the late 20th century. The robust aesthetic but functional styling is in keeping with its defensive and protectionist purpose. **Moderate designer or builder value.** Ted Hill of the MoW is thought to have been the lead designer, although the place also has moderate significance for its connection to the MoW within the Hamilton region.	**High physical / aesthetic / architectural value.** A distinctive and largely intact representative example of Brutalist architecture in the locality, reflecting the style favoured by the MoW during the 1960s and 1980s. It is also considered a notable local example of the work of architect Frank Irvine Anderson, who made a significant contribution of MoW projects during his time as District and then Government Architect.	**Medium style/design/type value.** The building references post-war Brutalism that evolved from the monolithic beton brut experiments in light and mass of Le Corbusier, principally at La Tourette, to become a popular post-war reconstruction solution in Britain, and, later in New Zealand. This was due to its low-cost modular production, durability, low maintenance, and relative speed of construction. The construction type was likely favoured by MoW and its government clients for similar reasons. **Medium designer or builder value.** Evidence of Ted Hill as architect of the project is tenuous and unsubstantiated. Hill's practice within the city, region, or nation is not well recognised. The evidence regarding Frank Anderson's involvement in the design is more compelling.

~~iii. Unique or uncommon building materials, an innovative method of construction or is an early example of the use of a particular building technique.; or~~ iv. The work of an architect, designer, engineer or builder.	**Moderate rarity value.** The place has moderate rarity value as an example of the Brutalist architecture designed and built by the MoW in the late 20th century within Hamilton. **High integrity value.** The place appears to have high authenticity and has undergone little modification externally since its completion.		Identification of the designers or builders does not however automatically confer significance. While the evidence makes it clear that Anderson had significant involvement in the design, that evidence stops short of confirming he was lead architect. The nature of these larger institutional Departments (such as the MoW) was that projects tended to be credited to the Office Chief (i.e. Anderson) under whom a team of architects operated. We see this in the oeuvre credited to F Gordon Wilson who headed the Department of Housing Construction (later the Housing Division of the MoW) and later as Government Architect but under who many notable architects undertook the design including a number of refugee European architects such as Helmut Einhorn, Fred Farrar, Ernst Gerson, Friedrich (Fred) Neumann, and Ernst Plischke. There is no evidence of innovation or invention on the part of the designers to distinguish the Station within the MoW catalogue of public building projects. Similarly, without evidence that the Station represents a special place in Anderson's evolution or practice, it is considered a relatively routine project. **Medium rarity value.** The place has moderate rarity value as an example of the Brutalist architecture designed and built by the Ministry of Works in the late 20th century within Hamilton. **Medium integrity value.** There has been a succession of modifications and alterations to the building and site.

c Context Qualities	Moderate	High	Medium
The place or area is an important ~~visual~~ landmark or feature or contributes to or is associated with a wider historical theme, traditional or cultural context, ~~streetscape, townscape, landscape~~ or physical setting.	**Moderate setting value.** The property has moderate significance for its setting and visual character, having been the site of a former Police Station in the 1940s and for its prominent corner location in the city centre of Hamilton. **Moderate landmark value.** The place has moderate landmark value as a tall and highly visible, well-known building at a prominent corner in the central city. The property has an overbearing appearance within the local streetscape. **Moderate continuity value.** The place makes a contribution to the continuity and established built character of the street by providing evidence of material use and architectural design for ministry buildings in this part of Hamilton during the late 20th century. The property has moderate significance for its continuity for the area, having also been the site of a former Police Station in the 1940s.	**High context value.** Occupying a prominent corner site occupied by the Hamilton Police Station since 1911 – 1912 and of a scale and design that makes it conspicuous in the townscape, the place is an important landmark that is associated with the wider historical theme of law enforcement in the locality. Designed in c.1971 by the MoW and completed by 1975, the new Hamilton District Headquarters and Central Police Station represents the centralisation of police services in the region. It includes purpose designed cell-blocks, accommodation, social and operational spaces.	**Low setting value.** The Station has a limited relationship to its setting, and that the highly modified setting is not representative of significant periods in the historic development of the place and makes no contribution to the significance of the Station. **Medium landmark value.** The prominence of the Station in the townscape is associated to its mass and height. It is important because it is the central Police Station, but arguably impedes more historic and significant views to and from the High Court and St Peter's Cathedral. I disagree with the opinion of Ms Caddigan and THS that it is prominent or conspicuous in the townscape. Owing to its typography and the significant mature trees which obstruct views to the Station, I consider that the Station is only visible (to the point of any notable prominence) from limited locations. The 'robust' aesthetic and 'defensive and protectionist purpose' are at odds with modern policing and does not support the core values and the critical function mandates of NZ Police, therefore the Station no longer represents its purpose-built function. Put simply, it is a building of its time, expressing a didactic message through its stylistic references that no longer reflect NZ Police's role in society or its aspirations for working with the community, including tangata whenua, to support improved social outcomes. I also consider that THS/Ms Caddigan's assessment:

	Moderate group value. The place has moderate group value as one of a number of key government and or agency structures designed and built by the MoW in the late 20th century.		1. fails to account for Waikato-Tainui's historical relationship to the Site, which significantly pre-dates any occupation of the Site by the Police or other municipal organisations; and 2. fails to account for the historical experience of tangata whenua in relation to the Station. Accounting for those matters and in view of the NZ Police's support for Waikato-Tainui's position, I consider that those considerations detract from, rather than enhance, the *contextual* quality of the Station. **Low continuity value.** The streetscape character is highly modified and historic continuity has been eroded. The existing context is dominated by a modern supermarket and carpark, an extension to the rear of the High Court building, some highly modified 20th century commercial buildings. One 19th century building is evident to the northeast of the Site but it demonstrates no continuity or relationship to the Station. **Low group value.** The group identified in the WSP assessment is recognised as 'key government and or agency structures designed and built by the MoW in the late 20th century'. This is a loose description which is of questionable importance and geographical relevance. It is also not clear what degree of contribution the Site makes to this group. The absence of this place from this ranging group description would have no discernible impact on the understanding or representation of the group. This suggests that the group is too broadly drawn and/or that this place makes little or no contribution to it.

d. Technological Qualities	**Moderate**	**Low**	**Low**
The place or area shows a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular time, ~~or~~ is directly associated with scientific or technical innovations or achievements, or is associated with scientific "break-through". The place uses unique or uncommon building materials, or demonstrates an innovative method of construction, or is an early example of the use of a particular building technique.	**Moderate technological value.** The place has moderate technological significance for its use of materials and construction methodologies, mostly for its innovative use of concrete as an expressive architectural material. The place has potential to contribute to knowledge of building engineering.	**Low technological value.** Demonstrates relatively common methods of construction and building techniques of the time.	**Low technological value.** The Station is of reinforced concrete post and beam structural composition with a structural core accommodating vertical circulation and services. The exterior cladding comprises modular concrete panels and steel framed windows. This is considered to be a conventional construction system for the time.
e. Archaeological Qualities	**Unknown**	**Unassessed**	**Not assessed**
The potential of the place or area to define or expand knowledge of earlier human occupation, activities or events through investigation using archaeological methods, or to provide evidence to address archaeological research questions. For example, but not limited to: The place or area is registered by Heritage New Zealand for its archaeological values, or is recorded by the New Zealand Archaeological Association Site Recording Scheme, or is an 'archaeological site' as defined by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.	**Unknown archaeological value.** The archaeological value of the site is unknown. The place is not listed as a historic place with HNZPT.	**Unassessed.**	**Not assessed.** The Thematic Review identifies a hospital building on the Site prior to the first police station being built in 1912. The Site may have archaeological potential associated with its occupation prior to 1900; a condition Waikato Tainui would attest to. HNZPT has acknowledged that listing does not afford historic heritage value, it simply acknowledges it.

f. Cultural Qualities	Low	Low	Low
~~The place or area is important as a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment, or is a context for community identity or sense of place, and provides evidence of cultural or historical continuity, has symbolic or commemorative significance to people who use or have used it, or to the descendants of such people. The interpretative capacity of the place or area and its potential to increase understanding of past lifestyles or events.~~ ~~OR~~ The place or area is important or significant: (i) As a focus of ~~spiritual, political, national or other~~ cultural sentiment; <u>and/or</u> (ii) As a context for community identity or sense of place, and provides evidence of <u>social</u>, cultural or historical continuity; <u>and/or</u> (iii) For having symbolic or commemorative significance to people who use or have used it, or to the descendants of such people. The ~~interpretative capacity of the~~ place or area <u>has a high degree of interpretative potential to</u> ~~and its potential to~~ increase understanding of past lifestyles or events.	**Low cultural value.** The place has low cultural value for its use as the site of a police station for almost a century within Hamilton. The use of the setting as a police station for many years provides evidence of cultural and historic continuity.	**Low cultural value.**	**Low cultural value.** The Site is owned by Waikato-Tainui who have demonstrated that they do not hold the Station in esteem, or that is representative of Waikato-Tainui tikanga. For Waikato-Tanui the Station is an embodiment of that grievance and an ongoing reminder of that painful past for Waikato-Tainui.

g. Scientific Qualities	Low	Low	Low
The potential for the place or area to contribute scientific information about how the natural environment has influenced, events, phases or activities related to development. ~~a historic figure, event, phase or activity, or the degree to which the historic place may contribute further information and the importance of the data involved, its rarity, quality or representativeness.~~	**Low scientific value.** The place has some potential to contribute to information about the history of architectural development and building engineering in the Hamilton area during the late 20th century.	**Low scientific value.**	**Low scientific value.** This place is not considered to hold any special potential to contribute information about history. It is a place with no more potential than any other site for historical attributes and information that may emerge from analysis of those values.

Appendix 2 – Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology

Appendix 8: Heritage

8-1 Assessment of Built Heritage

8-1.1 Rankings of Significance

Rankings for built heritage places listed in Schedule 8A have been established as follows.

Plan Ranking A: Built heritage places of outstanding heritage significance locally, regionally or nationally.

Plan Ranking B: Built heritage places of high heritage significance locally, regionally or nationally.

The below scale represents the levels of significance against which built heritage places shall be considered for inclusion on Schedule 8A.

- Outstanding significance.
- High significance.
- Medium significance.
- Low significance.
- None/No significance.
- Unassessed significance.

The heritage significance of built heritage places has been assessed based on evaluation against the following individual heritage criteria. A place must meet one or more of the criteria at the level of "High" significance or above to be eligible for inclusion within Schedule 8A. While a place only has to meet one of the criteria, in practice it will usually satisfy multiple criteria. The evaluation criteria are not weighted or hierarchical. There is no correct number or combination of values required to determine overall significance.

8-1.2 Heritage Assessment Criteria

a. Historic Qualities

The place or area is directly associated with, or has a direct relationship to, an important person, group, institution, event or activity, or reflects important aspects of local, regional or national history, including development and settlement patterns, transportation routes and social or economic trends.

b. Physical /Aesthetic/Architectural Qualities

The place or area is a notable or representative example of:

(i) A significant development period or activity; and/or

(ii) Distinctive or special attributes of an aesthetic or functional nature; and/or

(iii) The work of a notable architect, designer, engineer or builder.

c. Context Qualities

The place or area is an important landmark or feature or contributes to or is associated with a wider historical theme, traditional, or cultural context, or physical setting.

d. Technological Qualities

The place or area shows a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular time, is directly associated with scientific or technical innovations or achievements, or is associated with scientific "break-through". The place uses unique or uncommon building materials, or demonstrates an innovative method of construction, or is an early example of the use of a particular building technique.

e. Archaeological Qualities

The potential of the place or area to define or expand knowledge of earlier human occupation, activities or events through investigation using archaeological methods, or to provide evidence to address archaeological research questions. For example, but not limited to: The place or area is registered by Heritage New Zealand for its archaeological values, or is recorded by the New Zealand Archaeological Association Site Recording Scheme, or is an 'archaeological site' as defined by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.

f. Cultural Qualities

The place or area is important or significant:

(i) As a focus of cultural sentiment; and/or

(ii) As a context for community identity or sense of place, and provides evidence of social, cultural or historical continuity; and/or

(iii) For having symbolic or commemorative significance to people who use or have used it, or to the descendants of such people. The place or area has a high degree of interpretative potential to increase understanding of past lifestyles or events.

g. Scientific Qualities

The potential for the place or area to contribute scientific information about how the natural environment has influenced, events, phases or activities related to development.

Note: the evaluation criteria defined in the section above could be considered against a number of existing guidance documents and baseline evidence, including, but not limited to:

- Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, "Significance Assessment Guidelines", March 2019. [Note that there are semantic differences (e.g., values / qualities / attributes) but the common intent remains the same.
- Thematic Study of Hamilton [Lynette Williams, 2021].
- Auckland Council "Methodology and guidance for evaluating Auckland's historic heritage", August 2020.