

**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 #2424 of Ray and Wendy Pickett, the owner of the property at 13 Hammond Street

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ADAM WILD ON BEHALF OF RAY  
AND WENDY PICKETT, 13 HAMMOND STREET**

Heritage

25 July 2024

---

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 My name is Adam Wild.
- 1.2 I am the director of Archifact – Architecture & Conservation Ltd, an Auckland-based architectural practice specialising in conservation architecture and the management of places of historic heritage value.
- 1.3 Archifact – Architecture & Conservation Ltd is an Auckland-based architectural practice accredited in accordance with the rules of the New Zealand Institute of Architects (NZIA) and the Registered Architects Board with particular skills and experience in architecture, building conservation, and the management of buildings, objects, places and areas of historic heritage value.
- 1.4 I hold a Master of Arts degree in Conservation Studies (Historic Buildings and Landscapes) from the Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies at the University of York and a Bachelor of Architecture from the University of Auckland. I am a registered architect and Fellow of the NZIA.
- 1.5 I was the founding Chairman of the NZIA Heritage Task Group and in 2005 drafted the Institute’s first Heritage Policy. I am a member of the NZIA Resilience Working Group and made written and oral submissions to the Parliamentary Select Committee for the Building (Earthquake-prone buildings) Amendment Bill. I was, for 15 years, the NZIA’s Auckland Branch Committee spokesperson for Heritage.
- 1.6 I am a full member of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (*ICOMOS*) New Zealand, a member of *ICOMOS* Pasifika, and an expert member of the International Polar Heritage Committee (a scientific committee of *ICOMOS*). I am a full member of the New Zealand Conservators of Cultural Materials association, a member of, and peer reviewer for, the International Association for Preservation Technology International, a peer reviewer for the Endangered Wooden Architecture Programme at Oxford Brookes University, and a member of the International Cities, Town Centres and Communities Society. I am a member of Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, a member of the Urban Design Forum; and a member of the Resource Management Law Association (*RMLA*) and have been a contributor to the Resource Management Law Association’s Journal. In 2017 I was awarded the *RMLA*’s Outstanding Person Award for my “Significant contribution to conservation architecture in New Zealand and internationally”.

- 1.7 I am currently, or have been, a conservation architect for a number of nationally and internationally significant building conservation projects. Included amongst these projects are the Treaty House at Waitangi (1834); Christ Church Kororareka Russell (1836), Hulme Court, Auckland (1843), the Old Government House Precinct, Auckland (1840 and 1856); the Heroic Era huts of Scott and Shackleton in the Antarctic; the former Court House in Apia, Samoa; the Wellington Town Hall (1905); and, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Temple (and other associated buildings) at Temple View.
- 1.8 Since 2009, I have been associated with the Department of Architecture at the Unitec Institute of Technology (*Unitec*) in Auckland as external examiner for its Master of Architecture candidates, as guest reviewer, and as lecturer in a range of architectural conservation subjects including contributions to the "History of New Zealand Architecture" series. Unitec has established a building conservation elective within its Master of Architecture programme and I have lectured in this elective on conservation practice.
- 1.9 In the professional roles I have had and perform today as outlined above, I have acquired a sound working knowledge in the specialist discipline of building conservation, issues relating to the recognition and assessment of historic heritage values, and methodologies for conserving these in accordance with national legislation and national and international conservation Charters.
- 1.10 I have been engaged by Ray and Wendy Pickett to assist with their submission on Plan Change 9 (Historic Heritage and Natural Environment) to the Hamilton City Operative District Plan (*ODP*) (*PC9*). Their submission opposes the proposed scheduling of their property at 13 Hammond Street, Hamilton (*the Site*) also referred to in the WSP assessment as "A. Ebbett's Residence" as a "B" ranked Heritage Item in Schedule 8A of the ODP as Built Heritage Item #H217.
- 1.11 I was approached by the Picketts to support their submission in April 2024. This late approach is directly related to matters outlined in their original submission dated 27<sup>th</sup> of August 2023 and the delays they experienced in receiving notification from the Council concerning the proposed classification of their property as built heritage through the PC9 process.
- 1.12 The Pickett's subsequent letter to the Panel of the 22<sup>nd</sup> of March 2024 acknowledges the Memorandum of Counsel for the HCC granting an extension of time for responses to the proposed listing.

1.13 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*).

### **Code of conduct**

1.14 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 EVIDENCE**

2.1 My evidence is presented on behalf of Ray and Wendy Pickett.

2.2 Specifically, it:

- (a) briefly addresses the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology;
- (b) outlines my assessment of the Pickett's property at 13 Hammond Street using the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology; and
- (c) compares my assessment against the initial WSP assessment of the property and the revised heritage assessment of the property 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 original WSP heritage assessment of this place commissioned by Council;
- (b) the supplementary statement of evidence of Elise Natalie Caddigan (3 July 2024);
- (c) 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*); and,

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

### **3 ENDORSED BH ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY**

3.1 Ms Caddigan's supplementary statement summarises the genesis of the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology, which I will not repeat here.<sup>1</sup>

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 13 Hammond Street.

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 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Plan Change 9 to the Operative Hamilton City District Plan, Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Elise Caddigan on behalf of Hamilton City Council dated 3 July 2024, at [22] – [32].

(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 Based on her review of the THS Recategorisation Assessment and the HCC Supplementary Assessment, Ms Caddigan considers that 13 Hammond Street has *high historic* and *high physical/aesthetic/architectural* qualities. For that reason (and in accordance with the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology), she recommends that 13 Hammond Street is included in Schedule 8A.<sup>2</sup> As set out below, these qualities – *historic* and *physical/aesthetic/architectural* – 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 mine).

3.5 Before addressing the comparative differences between those assessments, I briefly summarise the findings of my own assessment of 13 Hammond Street, using the Endorsed BH Assessment Methodology.

#### **4 ASSESSMENT FINDINGS**

##### *Assessment approach*

4.1 In preparation for my assessment of 13 Hammond Street, I undertook a site visit in April this year and have continued to review the photographs I took during that visit. I also reviewed the various assessments provided on behalf of HCC, including the WSP assessment, the HCC Supplementary Assessment and the THS Assessment. 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 various architectural styles through the twentieth century in New Zealand from which I have been able to place 13 Hammond Street within a wider context which suggests its value lies at a local level at best. Those monographs include:

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

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

---

<sup>2</sup> Caddigan Supplementary, at [51].

- 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) Justine Clark and Paul Walker, *Looking for the Local: Architecture and the New Zealand Modern* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2000)
- g) Wintec, Venetia Sherson (ed), *Heritage Hamilton: a celebration of the city's historic buildings* (Hamilton: Wintec and Hamilton City Council, 2006)
- h) Geoffrey Thornton, *Cast in Concrete: Concrete construction in New Zealand 1850-1939* (Auckland: Reed Books, 1996)
- i) Charles Walker (ed), *Exquisite Apart: 100 years of Architecture in New Zealand* (Auckland: Balasoglou Books, 2005)
- j) Michael Fowler, *Buildings of New Zealanders* (Auckland: Landsdowne Press, 1984), and
- k) "Block Map 5: Waikato: Hamilton, Huntly, Te Awamutu & Cambridge: A Guide to Waikato Architecture" (Andrew Barrie and Taylor Chen, 2020).

4.3 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.<sup>3</sup>
- (b) Aesthetic, architectural and technological significance (often labelled "physical" values) generally reflect how well a historic place or area meets the ideals of a

---

<sup>3</sup> HNZPT Guidelines, page 7.

particular field or discipline, or further develops it. Aesthetic qualities go beyond what is visual. It includes how a place makes people feel.<sup>4</sup>

*Assessment summary*

- 4.4 My own assessment of 13 Hammond Street found that it has an overall ranking of *medium* significance at a local. That was based on 13 Hammond Street 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 "Significance Assessment Guidelines".
- 4.5 My full assessment of 13 Hammond Street against the relevant criteria is set out in Appendix 1 of my evidence, and is summarised below:
- (a) *Historic qualities – medium [local]*. 13 Hammond Street's associations with Alfred Ebbett is acknowledged, but his significance is more generally associated with the automotive business in in Hamilton 1928. The Ebbett's automotive dealership established in 1928 was a success under the ownership of Alfred Ebbett. The Ebbett Group now represents 25 brands across 20 dealerships in New Zealand. There is a risk of conflating the significance of the Ebbett dealership with the 22-year ownership by Alfred Ebbett with the house at 13 Hammond Street.
  - (b) *Physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities – medium [local]*. 13 Hammond Street has medium value as a representative example of Arts and Crafts architecture. There is supposition by WSP and in the Supplementary Assessments that the building was designed by local architect JE Chitty. References to the work of Chitty as being stylistically similar, contemporaneous, and local are not unreasonable, but without evidence to that attribution cannot be made. While there has emerged more contemporaneous links between the consent for a house in Hammond Street in 1935 and the tender for a house by Chitty in Hammond Street in the same year, direct lines connecting these two actions need more research to be reliable. The comparative analysis undertaken by HCC also shows that there are other examples of Arts and Crafts and Spanish Mission-styled buildings of various typologies. Notably a number notified as built heritage

---

<sup>4</sup> HNZPT Guidelines, pages 7, 12.



via PC9 have not been pursued by HCC and whose presence collectively suggests an absence of rarity. 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 'rarity' sub-criterion considered "moderate" in the WSP assessment and not described in the THS assessment.

- (c) *Context qualities – medium [local]*. 13 Hammond Street has a limited relationship to its setting; a setting that has changed dramatically in recent years in response to local intensification. This is a relatively large house of some vintage with a deep setback from the street boundary in a street of increasingly intense modern development.
- (d) *Technological qualities – low [local]*. 13 Hammond Street is of a conventional construction.
- (e) *Archaeological qualities – not assessed*.
- (f) *Cultural qualities – low [local]*. The place is not a focus of cultural sentiment and does not have symbolic or commemorative significance.
- (g) *Scientific qualities – low [local]*. This place has little potential to contribute to information through documentary records associated with the place as well as physical and archaeological investigations.

4.6 On the basis of my assessment of the property at 13 Hammond Street its heritage values have overall medium significance at a local level and as such I do not consider that 13 Hammond Street 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. In comparison, the THS Recategorisation Assessment generally aligned with the WSP position, landing at a similar overall *high [local]* rating. My own assessment arrived at a medium *[local]* rating.

	<b>WSP</b>	<b>THS</b>	<b>Wild</b>
<b><i>Historic</i></b>	High	Medium <sup>5</sup>	Medium [local]
<b><i>Physical / aesthetic / architectural</i></b>	High	High	Medium [local]
<b><i>Context</i></b>	Moderate	Medium	Medium [local]
<b><i>Technological</i></b>	Low	Low	Low [local]
<b><i>Archaeological</i></b>	Unknown	unassessed	Not assessed
<b><i>Cultural</i></b>	Low	No commentary provided	Low [local]
<b><i>Scientific</i></b>	Low	Low	Low [local]
<b><i>Overall</i></b>	<b>High</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b> <b>[local]</b>

Table 1 – Comparative analysis summary

### **Comparative analysis**

5.3 In considering the criteria of *historic* qualities of 13 Hammond Street, both the WSP and THS assessments appear, in my opinion, to conflate the association of Ebbett’s automotive dealership with the occupation of the house at 13 Hammond Street with Alfred Ebbett. To that end I acknowledge the lower assessment determined by the THS evaluation of this criterion. I am reminded of the consent granted by the Auckland

<sup>5</sup> 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

Council that did not recognise its historic heritage values (being the home of Sir Edmund Hillary designed by the prestigious architectural practice of Gummer Ford) and enabled its removal from the site in Remuera, Auckland.

- 5.4 In the consideration of the *physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities* the WSP and THS assessments found common ground where I determined a lower value. Where WSP and THS considered the architectural values to be *high*, I considered that was only of *medium significance* and that references to the Spanish Mission-style were unfounded, but those of the Arts and Crafts were warranted.
- 5.5 In considering the *physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities* criterion I note that both the WSP and THS assessments attribute the design of the building on the site at 13 Hammond Street to the work of the local architect JE Chitty. While I accept stylistic parallels to other known local residential works by Chitty, I would need more direct lines of attribution to formally declare that attribution.
- 5.6 The HCC *Supplementary Assessment* helpfully provides comparative material including contemporaneous known works by Chitty illustrating (including scheduled and unscheduled places).
- 5.7 While the building at 13 Hammond Street is a conventional building construction type of its time, it has adopted a stylistic approach. This is a clearly an Arts and Crafts-styled dwelling. References to Spanish Mission are less apparent and less convincing. While it might be late in the style (even in New Zealand) the Arts and Crafts style had, by the 1930s, been adopted by the wealthier conservative section of society. The style followed the stylistic mantra expressed by James Chapman-Taylor in being bold in conception and rugged in handling; masculine in frame; and, feminine in finish. There is evidence of that here, however I remain of the opinion that the *physical / aesthetic / architectural qualities* of the building at 13 Hamond Street are of *medium [local]* significance.
- 5.8 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. The assessment is often silent in its commentary concerning many of the primary criteria and sub-criteria making comparative assessment problematic. It is also 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 13 Hammond Street 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.

5.9 I agree with Ms Caddigan (at 55) that the condition of a building's fabric or structure is not a determinant to an assessment of its historic heritage values. I do however recognise that these can be compelling factors for any property owner faced with the costs of repair, maintenance, and the enhancement of structure. This is where listed heritage properties can be afforded incentives to recognise the responsibility of the public in benefitting from that recognised heritage. Without meaningful incentives for recognised heritage assets the process of including these places in the District Plan can risk loving them to death.

## **6 CONCLUSION**

6.1 My assessment of the historic heritage values of 13 Hammond Street have recognised values evident there, but not found these values to be of sufficient import to warrant inclusion in the District Plan through the PC9 pathway.

6.2 Evidence provided by Mr Pickett addressing the condition of the building and those factors affecting it are, not matters of historic heritage, but they are no less real.

6.3 In my opinion 13 Hammond Street does not warrant inclusion in the District Plan.

**Adam Wild**

**25 July 2024**

## **Appendix 1**

# memorandum

**for:** Ray and Wendy Pickett

**attn:** Ray Pickett

**from:** archifact – architecture & conservation ltd (**Archifact**)

**date:** 4 July 2024

**re:** **heritage assessment**  
**13 hammond street, hamilton**

## 1 introduction

This heritage assessment uses the heritage assessment criteria found at Volume 2 Appendix 8 *Historic Heritage* of the Operative Hamilton City District Plan. These criteria and their descriptors are attached at Appendix 1.

The assessment has transposed the earlier HCC assessment of this place (draft June 2022) against these criteria as best as possible in an attempt at providing a constructive parallel objective and independent assessment as a direct comparison. That parallel assessment is based, in part, on research summarised in Appendix 2 and a site visit undertaken in April this year which included access to the site and building interiors.

Each of the principal criteria are given an overall assessed value, while the sub-criteria have also been given value ratings that have informed the overall rating. The rating values are those redefined through the recent Plan Change 9 expert caucusing and associated Joint Witness Statement (**JWS**), the Appendix 1 contained in the Memorandum of Counsel on behalf of Hamilton City Council (**HCC**) dated 13 December 2023, and aligned with the Hearings' Panel endorsement of the JWS outcome (Direction 21) dated 14 December 2023.

<b>13 hammond street</b>			
<b>Heritage Assessment Criteria</b>			
	<b>WSP significance assessment</b>	<b>THS significance recategorization assessment</b>	<b>Archifact significance assessment</b>
<b>overall assessment and ranking</b>	<i>High – plan ranking B</i>	<b>High – plan ranking B</b>	medium – plan ranking not warranted
<b>Historic Qualities</b>	<i>high</i>	<b>high</b>	<b>medium</b>
<b>a.</b>			
<b>i. Associative value:</b>  <i>The historic place has a direct association with or relationship to, a person, group, institution, event or activity that is of historical significance to Hamilton, the Waikato or New Zealand</i>	<b>high</b>  <i>Explanation:</i>	<b>high</b>  Direct association with Alfred Ebbett	<b>medium</b>

	<p><i>13 Hammond Street has high associative value as it was likely built for Alfred and Lillian Ebbett, who resided there for about 20 years. Alfred Ebbett was the founder of Ebbett Motors, a well recognised and highly successful business established in 1928. Ebbett Motors still exists, though in a different form, to the present day.</i></p>		<p>The Ebbett's are not the current residents of the property, nor have been since 1957. The property was built by Mr A. Ebbett, who established Ebbett's automotive business in in Hamilton 1928 and died in 1951. The property was sold in 1957 to Mr G. Burtenshaw, a dental surgeon and then to the Barrett's (1980-1995), and then to the Melson's (1995-2000). The Picketts' (being the current owners) purchased the property in 2000 with a tenure of 24 years (and counting).</p> <p>The Ebbett's automotive dealership established in 1928 was a success under the ownership of Alfred Ebbett, the Ebbett Group now represents 25 brands across 20 dealerships in New Zealand.</p>
--	--	--	--



			There is a risk of conflating the significance of the Ebbett dealership with the 22 year ownership by Alfred Ebbett with the house at 13 Hammond Street.
<p><b>ii. Historical Pattern:</b></p> <p><i>The historic place is associated with important patterns of local, regional, or national history, including development and settlement patterns, early or important transportation routes, social or economic trends and activities</i></p>	<p><b>moderate</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p> <p><i>The place has moderate significance in terms of historic patterns. The property was gradually subdivided from a large estate and then a residence was built in the popular architectural styles of the time – a process which can be seen all over the region, and the country, in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.</i></p>	No commentary provided	<p>The 1916 (deposited 1918) plan of the subdivision of Lots 17-20 Hamilton East Town Belt for HT Gilles describes a generally regular subdivision of new 77 Lots of a generally common size. Lot 56, being the subject site and No. 11 Hammond Street, represents one of a small number of larger Lots being exceptions to the norm. Notably Lot 56 was further subdivided in 1935 further distancing the site from its original subdivision pattern. One half of the original Lot 56 was sold to Lilian and Alfred Ebbett at this time.</p>

<b>b. Physical / Aesthetic / Architectural Qualities</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>medium</b>
<b>i. Style/Design/Type:</b>  <i>The style of the historic place is representative of a significant development period in the city, region, or the nation. The historic place has distinctive or special attributes of an aesthetic or functional nature which may include its design, form, scale, materials, style, ornamentation, period, craftsmanship, or other design element.</i>	<b>high</b>  <i>Explanation:   The dwelling has high significance as an unusual blend of the Arts and Crafts and Spanish Mission architectural styles. The design includes distinctive use of contrasting materials, including painted render and terracotta tiles, the combination of casement and arched fanlight windows using leaded glass, and the architectural flourishes such as the buttresses. The craftsmanship with the design is executed is notable.</i>	<b>high</b>  An architecturally distinctive residence exhibiting Arts and Crafts and Spanish Mission influences.	<b>medium</b>  This is a clearly an Arts and Crafts-styled dwelling. References to Spanish Mission are less apparent and convincing. While it might be late in the style (even in New Zealand) the Arts and Crafts style had, by the 1930s, been adopted by the wealthier conservative section of society. The style followed the stylistic mantra expressed by James Chapman-Taylor in being bold in conception and rugged in handling; masculine in frame and feminine in finish. There is evidence of that here.

			The flared buttresses are expressive and the shallow-eaved heavy-tiled roof overhang are common to the Arts and Crafts style, but the buttresses are rather two-dimensional compositionally. The arched-headed windows and first floor dormer are simple, while the casement windows feature greater detail.
<p><b>ii. Designer or Builder:</b></p> <p><i>The architect, designer, engineer, or builder for the historic place was a notable practitioner or made a significant contribution to the city, region or nation, and the place enlarges understanding of their work</i></p>	<p><b>Unknown (possibly high)</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p>	<p><b>high</b></p> <p>Understood to be designed by notable architect JE Chitty.</p>	<p><b>medium</b></p>

	<p><i>Neither the architect nor the builder are known. However, it is possible that the architect was J.E. Chitty, who was well known in the Waikato, particularly during the late 1910s to the late 1930s. Chitty designed buildings in both the Spanish Mission and Arts and Crafts styles which align with the dwelling at 13 Hammond Street; and he published a call for tenders for construction of a house in Hammond Street in 1935, which aligns with the Ebbett's purchase of the property.</i></p>		<p>References to the work of Chitty as being stylistically similar, contemporaneous, and local are not unreasonable, but without evidence attribution cannot be made. While there has emerged more contemporaneous links between the consent for a house in Hammond Street in 1935 and the tender for a house by Chitty in Hammond Street in the same year, direct lines connecting these two actions need more research to be reliable.</p>
<p><b>iii. Rarity:</b></p> <p><i>The place or elements of it are unique, uncommon, or rare at a local, regional, or national level, or in relation to particular historic themes</i></p>	<p><b>high</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p> <p><i>The place appears to be relatively authentic, with minor modifications and alterations. The addition of a separate residence at the rear of the property has not fundamentally changed the integrity of the original dwelling.</i></p>	<p>No commentary provided</p>	<p><b>low</b></p>

			<p>The subject building and site speak to a subdivision pattern from 1935 that in itself was a change from the earlier 1916 development pattern. In the context of current development intensification in the area, the subject place represents an exception to the original and emerging subdivision pattern evident in the area.</p>
<p><b>iv. Integrity:</b></p> <p><i>The place has integrity, retaining significant features from its time of construction, or later periods when important modifications or additions were carried out</i></p>	<p><b>high</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p> <p><i>The place appears to be relatively authentic, with minor modifications and alterations. The addition of a separate residence at the rear of the property has not fundamentally changed the integrity of the original dwelling.</i></p>	<p>No commentary provided</p>	<p><b>medium</b></p> <p>Evidence from the site visit and from the property owner indicates a number of changes and interventions over time. The greatest of these being the addition to the rear, which while not dominant from within the streetscape, has directly affected by the relationship with the site and the original dwelling to the east.</p>

			Original joinery includes crafted lead light casements and top-lights.
<b>c Context or Group Qualities</b>	<i>moderate</i>	<b>medium</b>	<b>medium</b>
<b>i. Setting:</b>  <i>The physical and visual character of the site or setting is of importance to the value of the place and extends its significance</i>	<b><i>moderate</i></b>  <i>Explanation:</i>  <i>The place has moderate significance for its setting. While the addition of a separate dwelling at the rear has changed the setting of the building, this cannot be observed from the street. The garage, to the north of the house, appears to be in a consistent style, and is set well back, ensuring that the house remains the dominant feature. It is highly visible for the street through the fence, and has a strong street presence despite being set back on the property.</i>	No commentary provided	<b>low</b>  The original site within which the dwelling was designed has been compromised with the addition of the additional building. This changes the relationship of the original dwelling to its setting to the east, recognizing that the original dwelling occupied the centre of the site enabling a landscape setting around the whole.
<b>ii. Landmark:</b>	<b><i>moderate</i></b>  <i>Explanation:</i>	No commentary provided	<b>low</b>

<p><i>The historic place is an important visual landmark or feature</i></p>	<p><i>The place has moderate landmark value as a highly visible historic building constructed in an unusual blend of architectural styles, with contrasting materials.</i></p>		<p>This is a relatively large house of some vintage with a deep setback from the street boundary in a street of increasingly intense modern development. While these factors help to distinguish the building and site from its immediate context, it is not an important visual landmark in a wider context.</p>
<p><b>iii. Continuity:</b></p> <p><i>The historic place makes an important contribution to the continuity or character of the street, neighbourhood, area, or landscape</i></p>	<p><b>moderate</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p> <p><i>The place has moderate continuity value for its contribution to the character of the street and the area, which was being developed during the early decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.</i></p>	<p>No commentary provided</p>	<p><b>low</b></p> <p>The immediate area is becoming increasingly discontinuous with the emergence of consented modern development intensification around it. While the subject building and site speak more to subdivision patterns from 1935, that in itself was a change to the earlier 1916 development pattern.</p>
<p><b>iv. Group:</b></p>	<p><b>low</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p>	<p>No commentary provided</p>	<p><b>low</b></p>

<p><i>The historic place is part of a group or collection of places which together have a coherence because of such factors as history, age, appearance, style, scale, materials, proximity or use, landscape or setting which, when considered as a whole, amplify the heritage values of the place, group and landscape or extend its significance.</i></p>	<p><i>The place has some technological value for its use of materials and construction methodologies which were standard practice at the time.</i></p>		<p>There is no readily recognisably associated group to which this place contributes collectively.</p>
<p><b>d. Technological Qualities</b></p>	<p><b>moderate</b></p>	<p><b>low</b></p>	<p><b>low</b></p>
<p><b>i. Technological</b></p> <p><i>The historic place demonstrates innovative or important methods of construction, or technical achievement, contains unusual construction materials, is an early example of the use of a particular construction technique or has potential to contribute information about technological or engineering history.</i></p>	<p><b>low</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p> <p><i>The place has some technological value for its use of materials and construction methodologies which were standard practice at the time.</i></p>	<p>No commentary provided</p>	<p><b>low</b></p> <p>This place exhibits conventional methods of construction of its time.</p>



<b>e. Archaeological Qualities</b>	<b>unknown</b>	<b>unassessed</b>	<b>not assessed</b>
<b>i. Human, Occupation, Activities or Events:</b>  <i>The potential of the historic place to define or expand knowledge of earlier human occupation, activities or events through investigation using archaeological methods</i>	<b>unknown</b>  <i>Explanation:</i>  <i>Although the building at 13 Hammond Street was constructed in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the area is known to have been occupied prior to 1900 and therefore may have some archaeological significance. The place is not registered on the ArchSite database.</i>		<b>not assessed</b>
<b>ii. HNZPT:</b>	<b>none</b>  <i>Explanation:</i>  <i>The place is not listed as a historic place with HNZPT.</i>		<b>none</b>  The place is not listed as a historic place with HNZPT.

<p><i>The place is registered by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga or scheduled in the District Plan 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.</i></p>			
<p><b>f. Cultural Qualities</b></p>	<p><b>low</b></p>	<p><b>low</b></p>	<p><b>low</b></p>
<p><b>i. Cultural:</b></p>	<p><b>low</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p> <p><i>The place has some cultural significance for its evidence of historical continuity and contribution to a sense of identity in the area. It is likely to have significance to the people who lived there, and their descendants, particularly descendants of the Ebbett family.</i></p>	<p>No commentary provided</p>	<p><b>low</b></p> <p>The place is not a focus of cultural sentiment and does not have symbolic or commemorative significance.</p>

<p><i>The historic place is important as a focus of cultural sentiment or is held in high public esteem; it significantly contributes to community identity or sense of place or provides evidence of cultural or historical continuity. The historic place 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 can potentially increase understanding of past lifestyles or events.</i></p>			
<p><b>g. Scientific Qualities</b></p>	<p><b>low</b></p>	<p><b>low</b></p>	<p><b>low</b></p>
<p><b>i. Scientific:</b></p>	<p><b>low</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p>	<p>No commentary provided</p>	<p><b>low</b></p> <p>The place has little potential to contribute to information through documentary records associated with the place as well as physical and archaeological investigations.</p>

<p><i>The potential for the historic place to contribute information about a historic figure, event, phase, or activity. The degree to which the historic place may contribute further information and the importance, rarity, quality, or representativeness of the data involved. The potential for the place to contribute further information that may provide knowledge of New Zealand history.</i></p>	<p><i>The place has some potential to contribute to information through documentary records associated with the place as well as physical and archaeological investigations.</i></p>		
--	--	--	--

## **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.

## 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.

## **Appendix 3 – research**

**13 Hammond St Hamilton 1949**





Alfred William Ebbett (1901-1951)

Born in Opunake, New Plymouth, New Zealand

Married Lillian Ebbett in 1932

Residence in Hamilton in 1935

Died in 1951

Alfred was born in 1901. He was the son of William Henry Ebbett and Emily Sarah Duffill, and grandson of William Wilkins Ebbett. Alfred became a motor (car) dealer in Hamilton. He married Lillian Henry in 1932.

- Fact: Residence (1935) Hamilton, Waikato, New Zealand
- Fact: Residence (1942) Hamilton, New Zealand
- Fact: Residence New Zealand

Alfred owned his own business, which was Ebbett Motors Limited, and had interests in other companies as well.

He passed away in 1951 in Rotorua, Bay of Plenty. Alfred was 50 years old when he died. He was buried in Hamilton East Cemetery.

Lillian Ebbett (1911-1956)

Lillian was born in 1911. She was the daughter of William Henry and Annie Cheyne. In 1932 Lillian married Alfred William Ebbett who was a motor car dealer and they had four children: 1 son and 3 daughters.

- Fact: Residence (1938) Hamilton, Waikato, New Zealand
- Fact: Residence (1946) Hamilton, Waikato, New Zealand

She passed away in 1956 in Hamilton.

## Sources:

- **New Zealand Marriage Index** - Ancestry.com. New Zealand, Marriage Index, 1840-1937 [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2014. Name: William Alfred Ebbett; Gender: Male; Marriage Year: 1932; Marriage Place: New Zealand; Spouse: Lillian Henry; Relation: Bridegroom; Folio Number: 3861
- **WWII Ballot Lists** - New Zealand, World War II Ballot Lists, 1940-1945 [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2014. Name: Alfred William Ebbett; Gender: Male; Residence Place: New Zealand; Inferred Residence Year: 1942; Publication Date: 22 Dec 1942
- **Death** - "New Zealand, Civil Records Indexes, 1800-1966," database, FamilySearch (<https://familysearch.org/ark:/61903/1:1:Q66K-HZG1> : 4 January 2018), Alfred William Ebbett, 1951; citing Death, New Zealand, registration number 1951/30429, Archives of New Zealand, Wellington

- **NZ Cemetery Transcriptions** - "New Zealand, Cemetery Transcriptions, 1840-1981," database, FamilySearch (<https://familysearch.org/ark:/61903/1:1:QG8M-DKHW> : 28 June 2018), Alfred William Ebbett, 16 Nov 1951; citing Death, New Zealand, New Zealand Society of Genealogists, Auckland
- **New Zealand Cemetery Records** - Ancestry.com. New Zealand, Cemetery Records, 1800-2007 [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2014. Name: Alfred William Ebbett; Birth Date: abt 1901; Death Age: 50; Death Date: 16 Nov 1951; Burial Place: Waikato, New Zealand; Cemetery: Hamilton East
- **Probate** - "New Zealand, Archives New Zealand, Probate Records, 1843-1998," database with images, FamilySearch (<https://familysearch.org/ark:/61903/1:1:QK9V-VPMP> : 12 November 2017), Alfred William Ebbett, 1952; citing Hamilton, Hamilton Probates - Second Sequence, 1910-1953, record number 8971, Archives New Zealand, Auckland Regional Office; FamilySearch digital folder 100019161
- **Find-a-Grave Index** - Find A Grave: Memorial #127877290