

SUBMISSION ON WELLINGTON CITY PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

To: Wellington City Council

Name of submitter: Historic Places Wellington

1. This is a submission by Historic Places Wellington on the Wellington Proposed District Plan (PDP) that was notified on 18 July 2022.
2. Historic Places Wellington could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
3. Historic Places Wellington (HPW) is an incorporated society which aims to identify and protect heritage places in the Wellington region. We wish to be heard by the Panel of independent commissioners.
4. We make submissions on four aspects of the Proposed District Plan.
 - 4.1 Support for PDP proposals for heritage provisions;
 - 4.2 Proposals for additional heritage listings (paragraph 8 below);
 - 4.3 Proposals for new Historical and Cultural Heritage provisions (paragraphs 10–25 below);
 - 4.4 Proposals for inner city heritage/character suburbs (paragraphs 33–68 below).

General Comments

5. HPW supports provisions of the PDP aimed at planning for a capital city that is compact, resilient, energetic, prosperous, inclusive, connected, green, and partnered with mana whenua. In particular, we support the objective of protecting and enhancing heritage values, including heritage of significance to Māori.
6. HPW supports the existing sites and areas of significance to Māori and supports proposed additional sites and areas of significance to Māori.
7. HPW supports all proposed listings of historic sites and areas, (including retention of ODP listings).

HPW's Proposals for Heritage Listings

8. HPW proposes additional heritage listings as follows:
 - 8.1 Wellington Central Library, and Te Ngākau Civic Square
 - 8.2 Hurston house, 1 Mersey St, Island Bay
 - 8.3 Wilkinson holiday flats, 5-7 & 9-11 Grass St, Oriental Bay
 - 8.4 Newman House, 15 & 17 Hawkestone St, Thorndon
 - 8.5 Samuel Brown House, 22 Hanson St, Mt Cook
 - 8.6 Burns Upholsterer, 47-49 Martin Square, Te Aro
 - 8.7 Coffey House, 230 Oriental Parade
 - 8.8 Salvation Army Citadel, Jessie Street
9. These nominations are additional to the WCC proposed sites, and in each case either relate to significant people (including politicians); are rare survivors of an early colonial period; or have special architectural significance. Nominations and supporting information are **attached** to this submission.¹

Historical and Cultural Heritage: Proposed New PDP Provisions

10. HPW supports generally the heritage rules chapter and the clarification of rules for repair and maintenance of heritage areas and buildings as proposed in the PDP.
11. In particular, HPW supports continuing to promote seismic strengthening of heritage places.
12. HPW also supports WCC in encouraging and supporting work on heritage places that increases their resilience and accessibility, contributes to sustainable long-term use and recovers or restores heritage values.
13. HPW opposes however the degree to which the chapter has become too permissive in its drafting. HPW proposes a more mandatory, conservation and preservation focus. Our specific suggested changes are outlined in the following paragraphs.

¹ HPW will provide further evidence to support the nomination of Salvation Army Citadel, Jessie Street, (para 8.8) prior to the hearings.

Decorative and coloured glass

14. HPW proposes that replacement of decorative and coloured glass be disallowed and discouraged. We accordingly propose an additional rule to the Historic Heritage Chapter that requires resource consent for the removal of heritage decorative or stained glass as a restricted discretionary activity.

“Demolition by Neglect”

15. There remains a serious system gap in the current regulatory framework whereby property owners of heritage listed buildings can neglect to maintain or repair buildings so they are effectively “demolished by neglect”.
16. This matter must be addressed by including a new policy to the PDP’s Historic Heritage Chapter on Maintenance and Repair along the following lines:

“Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.”

17. That provision is taken from the English National Policy Planning Framework.
18. If included in the Wellington District Plan it would address the situation where an owner argues that the benefits of a new building (which substantially demolishes a listed heritage building) outweighs its value as an intact or restored heritage building. Such an argument should not be available to an owner who has contributed to that state of affairs through neglect and lack of maintenance. A practical example is the situation of the Adelaide Hotel heritage building at 114 Adelaide Rd.

Façadism

19. HPW does not support façadism, whereby an historic listed building is significantly demolished, retaining only the street façade, or part thereof.
20. HPW proposes that a further new policy or rule be included in the PDP’s Historic Heritage Chapter to make it clear that only in exceptional instances will façadism be appropriate, and only if consistent with ICOMOS guidelines.
21. HPW supports the guidance in the Heritage Design Guide on façadism.

Thorndon and Mt Victoria Heritage Areas

22. HPW supports the proposed heritage area designations in Mt Victoria and Thorndon.
23. The proposed Thorndon heritage area (DP ref #46) is however too small (equating to the area as it was first defined in the 1970s). It should be extended north to the motorway intersection opposite Harriett Street and along the west side of Tinakori Road. In other words the boundaries shown in the Operative District Plan should be retained.

Heritage Curtilage for Nearby Sites

24. HPW proposes there be controls at, and near to, the boundaries of sites which are near to each heritage listed site. We propose special height and design controls on those nearby sites to protect context and curtilage setting of heritage listed buildings. HPW proposes specific bulk and shading controls to address the principles set out in various High Court decisions such as: *Sydney Substation Ltd v WCC* [2017] NZHC 2489.

Heritage View Shafts

25. HPW supports the PDP's viewshafts of significant cultural heritage.
26. We propose additional viewshafts to protect views of the Carillon at Pukeahu National War Memorial Park and St Paul's Church.
27. In addition, we propose that the views towards Oriental Bay from (a) the top of Parliament Steps and (b) the top of the cable car should also receive enhanced protection.
28. The viewshafts just mentioned are important public heritage anchoring people in place and identity.

Policy for development adjacent to sites of significance to Māori, heritage places, or character precincts

29. The Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter contains a policy, NCZ-P7(2), which requires new development to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone by ensuring that development responds to the site context, particular where it is located adjacent to a scheduled site of significant to Māori, heritage buildings, structures or areas, character precincts, and other areas.

30. There is no equivalent policy for the High Density and Medium Density Residential Zones. We submit that this is anomalous, and that a policy similar to NCZ-P7 ought to be include in the High Density and Medium Density Residential Zone chapters.

Heritage Design Guide

31. We propose that the Heritage Design Guide be amended to refer to the heritage of all New Zealand peoples. While we recognise the special significance of tangata whenua as partners in Te Tiriti, we submit that other cultural backgrounds and heritages that contribute to New Zealand's multicultural society also warrant recognition.
32. To achieve this, we propose the following additional wording in the Outcomes section of the Design Guide:

"New development respects and responds to nearby scheduled sites and areas of significance to Māori, heritage areas of significance to all New Zealand peoples and cultures, buildings, structures and trees.

(Additional wording underlined).

Inner Suburbs Heritage and Character

Demolition Overlay

33. HPW proposes that demolition of any building or structure, excluding ancillary structures, built before 1930 be a restricted discretionary activity for such sites as were identified by Boffa Miskell as "primary/contributory" (olive colour in Boffa Miskell maps), or omitted from assessment (blank in Boffa Miskell maps) in its 2019 report for WCC.² This proposal is in addition to the proposal made below for the expanded spatial extent of the proposed Character Precincts.
34. The proposal means the proposed, or expanded, Character Precincts would be augmented by a wider overlay with a demolition control (ie a new rule along the lines of MRZ-PREC01-R4 but with wider application).
35. In such areas "intensification" provisions would otherwise apply (being the level of development enabled under MDRS and NPSUD Policy 3).

² Boffa Miskell 2019 report, at Appendix 4.

36. The demolition control overlay would be treated like earthworks or other non intensification related site controls not specifically related to the appropriate level of development for the site. Those sites would be outside Character Precincts and accordingly not require compliance with character design streetscape measures.
37. The s.32 report noted that ODP Rule 5.3.6 was introduced after litigation in which applicants successfully argued that the heritage of Thorndon and Mt Victoria were not sufficiently being protected under the now operative district plan.
38. This proposal is made because the Character Precincts together with the new “heritage areas” do not sufficiently protect heritage buildings from inappropriate development under RMA s.6. In particular, buildings with heritage value which are outside concentrations of buildings with similar values, or those in poor condition, will be at risk of inappropriate development. Both the Hawkestone and Tasman St heritage listing proposals are in this category. Further examples include the area comprising Green, Emmett and Wilson St areas in Newtown, and historic buildings in Mt Victoria and Thorndon identified by local historical societies.
39. While “heritage is not the same as character”, it has been through character protections in the ODP that heritage has been acknowledged and protected in the existing planning regime, (despite not being listed).
40. Wellington’s unique heritage and character is represented in its native timber oldest inner city suburbs. The heritage values of those buildings are irreplaceable and unable to replicate. They are important for Wellington’s sense of place and identity, and were planned with small sections and native timber houses perched in tiers on Wellington’s hills against the backdrop of the protected town belt. The resulting landscape reflects Wellington’s historic heritage and character, and in the aggregate is of national significance under RMA s.6.
41. The proposal covers all sites coloured olive in the Boffa Miskell Appendix 4 maps but would exclude sites with pre-1930 buildings which were identified by Boffa Miskell as either “neutral/detracting” (coloured red on the attached maps), and sites with post 1930 buildings.
42. Sites not coloured at all (ie blank) in the Boffa Miskell Appendix 4 maps would be covered by the overlay given the advice from Boffa Miskell that:

“The intent of this mapping was to group together clusters of related properties where obvious clustering occurredthere was no explanation in the report why there are areas ... not shaded at all.”

43. The proposal is consistent with, but smaller than the “overlay” proposed in WCC’s 2020 draft spatial plan.
44. The rationale for this proposal rests on protecting the heritage of specific buildings where there is not a sufficient cluster of higher quality character streetscape sites, which would otherwise make available a level of protection under RMA s.7.
45. The proposal ensures a resource consent process operates prior to demolition for most of the relatively modest number of 5,5000 dwellings currently protected in this way under the ODP, while making provision for an intensified level of development in those areas once a building is demolished.
46. Without such a procedural overlay, the effects on the environment (specifically on heritage) of any ‘level of development’ would be incompatible and inappropriate, by not being considered at all.
47. Implementing the demolition control overlay would see a negligible reduction in additional housing capacity. It would also provide an accumulative benefit from not demolishing NZ’s oldest native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions.

PDP Character Precincts

48. The relevant statutory considerations under s.6 and s.7 are different. The maintenance and enhancement of amenity values and quality of the environment in character precincts is a s.7 matter.
49. HPW supports the general idea of proposed Character Precincts and the rules and design regime for them. However, the description of Character Precincts and their rules are insufficient and do not recognise the important heritage entwined with those early, native timber, colonial neighbourhoods.

Residential Character Precincts

50. The residential Character Precinct provisions of the PDP inadequately protect those heritage values and require significant revision to instead include:
 - 50.1 Policies which promote adaptive re-use of existing buildings as a lower emissions alternative to demolition and rebuilding.
 - 50.2 Specific acknowledgement that inner city suburb character is in part derived from heritage
 - 50.3 The drafting of a robust multi-unit urban design guide to ensure that new development is well designed and will complement the predominant patterns of local neighbourhoods (not the loose version of a design guide which is now proposed). Urban design panels could be part of the guidance process.
 - 50.4 The retention of one large character area or precinct over the heritage suburb to avoid the creation within the suburb of separate development areas which themselves include many quality character houses and will have no character controls.
 - 50.5 Limiting the scope of non-residential uses to prevent the loss of character houses which can seriously undermine the character of an area.

Qualifying Matters

51. HPW supports the proposed application of a qualifying matter, to exempt from intensification, sites in the proposed Character Precincts.
52. HPW strongly supports the rule that demolition within a Character Precinct is a restricted discretionary activity for pre-1930 buildings (MRZ-PREC01-R4).

Expand Spatial Extent (Area Recommended by Officers and/or Boffa Miskell)

53. HPW proposes MDRZ apply in the inner residential suburbs. That would mean all areas of character protection under the operative DP would have similar rules and height controls of 11metres (3 storey).
54. For areas currently subject to National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPSUD) Policy 3 “upzoning”, HPW strongly

supports a “qualifying matter” being adopted for those inner suburb areas, to exempt them from mandatory 6-storey plus intensification otherwise applicable under NPSUD Policy 3 provisions.

55. The qualifying matter claimed is that the aggregation of pre-1930s buildings embodies the historical and cultural values of historic, physical, social, rarity and representativeness and should have special procedural care before they are demolished.
56. HPW proposes that the requirement in the operative DP which requires a consent prior to demolition of pre-1930s buildings, should remain a provision in the DP in respect of the same areas because those areas are of national significance under s.6 of the RMA.
57. The supporting evidence for that is:
 - 57.1 Boffa Miskell report of February 2019;
 - 57.2 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) submission on the draft spatial plan; and
 - 57.3 WCC officers recommended final spatial plan of 24 June 2021.
58. The Boffa Miskell report found that 80% of the existing houses subject to the demolition control were intact and were positive/contributory to the acknowledged character streetscape.
59. The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) submission made additional proposals for historic character protection.
60. WCC officers completed extensive walks-around and site visits of the inner suburbs and as a result they recommended character precincts should cover 49% of the existing character suburb areas. Such areas would retain the demolition control, even although their height limit may increase due to underlying zoning for MDRZ.
61. The online map is available at this link:
<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/26d22f28f04146709528714a4c4a2689>
62. For clarity, this is the version that went to the WCC committee for its consideration at the 24 June 2021 committee meeting.

63. The rejection of the WCC officers' recommendations for zoning of inner suburbs was an entirely political decision. No evidence was provided or considered — it was an “evidence-free decision”.
64. The effect of adopting that Officers Recommended proposal would be to add some 300 houses into such expanded character precincts.
65. HPW proposes the spatial extent of the proposed Character Precincts be expanded to include all or some of the areas recommended by the Boffa Miskell Report of 2019 and identified in that report as “primary/contributory” to character streetscape values.
66. HPW proposes to include in expanded Character Precincts the sites coloured olive and those coloured blank in the Boffa Miskell Appendix 4 maps.
67. Adopting the Boffa Miskell approach to extend character precincts to 80% of ODP areas presently covered by Rule 5.3.6 would have a slightly bigger effect on additional housing capacity.
68. These proposals to expand the spatial extent of the Character Precincts are consistent with the requirements of assessment under 77I, 77J and 77L at both the area or site-specific level and the wider level – including up to the whole of the city as required.

Support for other submissions

69. Historic Places Wellington expresses its support for the submission lodged by Wellington Heritage Professionals (Amanda Mulligan, Eva Forster-Garbutt, Cherie Jacobson, Michael Kelly, Chris Cochran, Lianne Cox, Russell Murray, Natasha Naus, Lara Simmons, Chessa Stevens and Dr Paulette Wallace). In particular, we support their proposed amendments to the Proposed District Plan.

Outcomes sought

70. Historic Places Wellington seeks the following decisions from the local authority:
 - 70.1 Heritage listing protection is added to 9 additional sites (refer paragraph 8 above);
 - 70.2 An additional rule is added stating that the removal of decorative or coloured glass in heritage buildings is a

restricted discretionary activity (refer paragraph 14 above);

- 70.3 A new policy is added that RMA decisions do not take account of the deteriorated state of a heritage asset where that is due to demolition by neglect (refer paragraph 16 above);
- 70.4 A new policy or rule is added that only in exceptional circumstances will facadism be considered appropriate where partial or full demolition of heritage buildings is proposed (refer paragraph 20 above);
- 70.5 The Thorndon heritage area should be enlarged to its corresponding extent in the Operative District Plan (refer paragraph 23 above);
- 70.6 Bulk and shading controls should be included for sites adjacent to or near heritage listed sites (refer paragraph 24 above);
- 70.7 Enhanced protected viewshafts should be identified for the Carillon at Pukeahu National War Memorial Park, St Paul's Church, and views towards Oriental Bay from the to of Parliament Steps and the top of the cable car (refer paragraphs 26 and 27 above);
- 70.8 An additional policy should be added for High Density and Medium Density Residential zones with equivalent wording to NCZ-P7 (refer paragraph 30 above);
- 70.9 The Heritage Design Guide should include reference to the heritage of all New Zealand peoples (refer paragraph 32 above);
- 70.10 A new "heritage demolition control" rule should be added for all areas identified by Boffa Miskell and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (refer paragraph 33 above);
- 70.11 The Medium Density Residential Zone and rules should apply in all areas of inner residential currently identified as character areas in the Operative District Plan (refer paragraph 53 above);
- 70.12 The spatial extent of character precincts should be expanded to the areas identified by Boffa Miskell (refer paragraph 65 above);

70.13 We support the proposed drafting amendments proposed by Wellington Heritage Professionals (refer paragraph 69 above).

- 71. HPW wishes to be heard in support of this submission and to have the opportunity to provide expert evidence.
- 72. If others make a similar submission then HPW will consider presenting a joint case with them at hearing.

12 September 2022

Felicity Wong
For Historic Places Wellington
Email Wgtn@historicplacesaotearoa.org.nz

Attachment: HPW's additional nominations for heritage listings

HPW makes the following proposals for listings:

- Wellington Central Library
- Hurston house, 1 Mersey St, Island Bay
- Wilkinson holiday flats, 5-7 & 9-11 Grass St, Oriental Bay
- Newman House 15 & 17 Hawkestone St, Thorndon
- Samuel Brown House, 22 Hanson St, Mt Cook
- Burns Upholsterer, 47-49 Martin Square, Te Aro
- Coffey House, 230 Oriental Parade

These nominations are additional to the WCC proposed sites, and in each case either relate to significant historic social identities (including politicians); rare survivors of an early colonial period; or special architectural significance. Nominations and supporting information are attached.

Appendices: Nominations of additional heritage buildings

1. Wellington Central Library, 65 Victoria Street. This is a Category 1 listed historic place with Heritage NZPT. We refer you to their listing for relevant information. <https://www.heritage.org.nz/the-list/details/9761>

2. Hurston, 1 Mersey St and Melbourne Road, Island Bay. This is a Category 2 listed historic place with Heritage NZPT. We refer you to their listing for relevant information. <https://www.heritage.org.nz/the-list/details/9954>

3. 5-7, 9-11 Grass St, Oriental Bay

2. Location

Where is the place you are nominating for evaluation?	Oriental Bay
Name of property or place (if applicable):	
Property address (include street number, street name, suburb and town or city).	5-7, 9-11 Grass Street, Oriental Bay, Wellington
Legal description (if known):	Lot 5 DP 8869

3. Owner/occupier

Do you know who owns and/or occupies the place?

Is the property:	(yes/ no/ don't know)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Privately owned	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> Publicly owned	

Name of owner(s):	Harbour Haven Limited
-------------------	-----------------------

4. Heritage features

Tell us what the main components or features of the place are.

(yes/ no/ don't know)

☒ Building or structure Yes

5. History

Include any information that you know of the history of the place. The more information you can provide the better. Attach further information if you have any.

These two storey flats were built by the Wilkinson family, nursery owners who owned land in the area around Grass Street in Oriental Bay. The original Wilkinson (David Norman Wilkinson)

arrived with his wife Isabella and family in Wellington in 1841. He established what became famous tea gardens on Town Acres 423-426 in 1850.

The gardens were hugely popular, especially on weekends. The Wilkinsons offered refreshments and food as well as plants for sale. The enterprise was an institution. It ran until the late 1910s and the last of the garden's buildings were removed in 1923, possibly to make way for the building of these flats.

In March 1923, the estate of David Norman Wilkinson II (under the name of his son, also David) sought tenders to build what were described as 'tenement buildings' on land that had been occupied by the nursery. The architect was Thomas Turnbull and Son (William Turnbull).³ The successful tenderer was builder John Baird at a price of £10,900.⁴ The land was right next door to the Wilkinson house, located at 13 Grass Street, and part of a subdivision.

The houses were owned by the estate of David Wilkinson and leased out to various tenants. There were eight flats in all, one on each floor of the buildings, which were each separated in two by a party wall. In 1937, for reasons that are not clear, both properties were sold to the Guardian Trust and Executors. The flats at 5-7 Grass Street were retained by the company until 1970. Over that period numerous tenants occupied the eight flats, which were numbered 5, 5a, 7, 7a, 9, 9a, 11 and 11a. Although there was a steady turnover of occupants, there were some long-standing early tenants. These included Norman Aitken, a bookseller and his wife Thelma (5), an elocution and drama tutor (1923-1936), Valentine Jones (7 & 7a), chemist (1930s and 40s) and John Skoglund (11), a clerk (late 1930s-50s).

In 1968, separate certificates of title were issued for the two properties and, in 1970, 5-7 was bought by Harbour Haven Limited. The company has owned the property ever since, with the shareholders being, for the most part, the occupants of the building. Arguably the most prominent occupants were Ann

³ *Evening Post*, 20 March 1923, p.12

⁴ 5-7a, 9-11a Grass Street [5, 5a, 7, 7a, 9, 9a, 11, 11a Grass Street], flats, A1791, 17 August 1923, Wellington City Archives

Mallinson and David Rendel at 5a, who formed the highly successful Mallinson Rendel Publishers in 1980, most famous for publishing Lynley Dodd's Hairy Maclary series. The firm was sold in 2009, but a number of its books remain in print under the Penguin imprint.

In 1971, 9-11 Grass Street was sold by the Guardian Trust and Executors to Eleftheria and George Pappafloratos, who, with Elisabeth Petsakos (since 2003), remain the owners of the building. It has been rental accommodation all its life.

The most conspicuous change to the houses, apart from internal modernising, was the removal of the gardens and walls in the front of the houses (an original feature) and their replacement with sealed car parks. This took place, in the case of 5-7, about 2007 and in 2009 for 9-11. This may have been linked to a WCC parking requirement for rental accommodation. Otherwise, externally, the buildings appear to be largely intact.

6. Description

Describe the place and its setting, including any changes that have taken place. The more information you can provide the better. Attach further information if you have any.

These two buildings are largely identical, semi-detached, two-storey flats in a bungalow style. Both flats have a party wall down the middle, presumably made of brick, but this is set back from the front wall of the flats. The ground floors have masonry walls while the upper storey is timber clad (lapped weatherboards) with a splay over the top of the masonry. The shallow, hipped roofs are clad with corrugated steel.

The main elevation of each building is highlighted by three main features. One is the arcade of masonry arches and columns that front the four flat entrances. Second is the set bay windows, one on each floor at either end of the building, which are adorned by an array of coloured glass along with casements and fanlights divided into narrow panes by mullions and transoms. The projections are supported, in part, on curved brackets. The third is the enclosed sun-rooms above the entrance, with its arched window frames fixed in front of square sashes divided into small panes. The timber arches deliberately mimic the arches beneath.

The windows on other elevations are mostly casements and fanlights, some with a small decorative canopy.

The flats sit behind paved parking areas that replaced what were gardens. Both buildings appear to have landscaped backyards.

7. Threats

Is the place at risk? Tell us about any immediate threat/s to the place that you know of.

None known.

8. Significance

Tell us why you think the place is significant. Who is it significant to?

These purpose-built semi-detached flats are idiosyncratic and highly-mannered inter-war buildings. Identical in design and still largely the same externally, they are highly unusual in Wellington and the most distinctive buildings on Grass Street. The principal façades are decorative and playful designs, showing an inventive use of the Bungalow style in the treatment of the fenestration and upper storey.

The flats have some historic significance for their association with former occupants of 5a, David Rendel and Ann Mallinson of publishing company Mallinson Rendel. Otherwise, the flats have provided nearly 100 years of accommodation for a wide range of occupants.

9. Further information



WCC GIS



5-7 & 9-11 Grass Street, 1978. (Charles Fearnley Collection, 50003-976, Wellington City Libraries)

4. 15-17 Hawkestone Street, Thorndon

2. Location

Where is the place you are nominating for evaluation?	Thorndon, Wellington
Name of property or place (if applicable):	
Property address (include street number, street name, suburb and town or city).	15-17 Hawkestone Street, Thorndon, Wellington
Legal description (if known):	PT Sec 563 Town of Wellington

3. Owner/occupier

Do you know who owns and/or occupies the place?

Is the property:	(yes/ no/ don't know)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Privately owned	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> Publicly owned	

Name of owner(s):	Raymond Ka Man Fong, Vicky Wing Yee Fong
-------------------	--

4. Heritage features

Tell us what the main components or features of the place are.

(yes/ no/ don't know)

☒ Building or structure Yes

5. History

Include any information that you know of the history of the place. The more information you can provide the better. Attach further information if you have any.

The two houses at 15-17 Hawkestone Street occupy the northern portion of what was Town Acre 563. It was originally purchased by J T Leader, a British MP, in 1840. The Crown Grant for the acre was issued to politician and businessman George Hart in 1852. He was the first Speaker of the Wellington Provincial Council.

In 1862, Hart sold 929m² (about a quarter of the town acre) to builder John McLaggan (1803-1886). There is a deed from 1862 which records that McLaggan used the Hawkestone Street land and other properties he owned as security for a loan to fulfil a contract for the construction of Queens Wharf.

McLaggan arrived in Wellington on the *Bengal Merchant* in February 1840. He established a building and contracting business which he conducted in the city for almost 40 years. He was also an undertaker. He was the original builder of Old St Paul's on Mulgrave Street, which was completed in 1866. Wellington City Council rate books from the 1860s show that he had two reasonably substantial houses on his property that he rented out.⁵

McLaggan brought his land immediately under the Land Transfer Act following its passing in 1870. In 1877, he sold a nearly square section of land (531m²) abutting Hawkestone Street to Charles Thomas Batkin (1822-1903). Batkin was a civil servant who arrived in New Plymouth in 1849. He initially worked as a teacher before becoming (in 1853) private secretary to the Taranaki Superintendent and provincial clerk and storekeeper. In 1859, he moved to Auckland to become chief clerk to the colonial secretary. He moved with the central government to Wellington in 1865 and rose through the ranks to become secretary to the Treasury in 1873 and finally assistant controller and auditor-general in 1878. He retired in 1890. In 1903, widowed and in poor health, he shot himself dead at his home in Salamanca Road.⁶

It was Batkin who built the two Hawkestone Street houses. He advertised for builders to submit tenders for the construction of

⁵ In 1863, the houses had a rateable value of £250 and £300 respectively. See Thorndon Rate Book, 1863, Wellington City Archives

⁶ *Evening Post*, 14 August 1903, p.4

two houses in May 1878.⁷ No architect appears to have been involved in the tender process and the houses may not even have been designed by an architect. The houses were certainly in place by the following year because in April 1879 rate books show two new houses on town acre 563 valued at £90 apiece. Construction was therefore completed in late 1878 or early 1879.

Although large dwellings, they were something of a sham, with a carefully composed and elegant front façade, complete with quoins, but corrugated iron-clad sides, in keeping with the practice of the day. As built, the two houses were largely identical but historic photographs show that at some time before the end of the 19th century the ground floor bay windows on 15 Hawkestone Street were extended up to the second floor. This remains the primary physical difference between the two houses.

Batkin retained ownership of 15 Hawkestone Street and lived in the house until 1892 when he sold it to Herbert Williams, a Wellington merchant. After a series of transfers, the house was bought in 1900 by Llewellyn Smith, a surveyor from Gisborne, who transferred to Wellington to become chief draughtsman for the Lands Department. He and his family lived in a large house next door (later 9-11 Hawkestone Street) and rented the house out. The house remained in the hands of the wider Smith family for decades. Smith died in 1920, his widow Emily died in 1922 and the house ended up in the hands of his unmarried sister Kathleen. After her death in 1952, Llewellyn Smith's daughter, Violet Earp-Thomas, inherited the house. Finally, in 1956, she sold it to Winifred Grey. For some of this period, the house was run as a boarding house. Winifred Grey remained the owner until her death in 1980.⁸

Number 17 was sold on completion to Albert Kingcome Newman (1849-1924), a pastoralist, doctor, merchant and politician. Born in Madras, he was part of land-owning family in Hawkes Bay, studied medicine in London and then, after briefly practising, he became a general merchant. He married Octavia Featherson, daughter of Isaac Featherston, former superintendent of Wellington province, in 1879. He took a great interest in ethnology and became a politician, serving as a Member of

⁷ *Evening Post*, 7 May 1878, p.3

⁸ See CT WN20/111, LINZ

Parliament and on the Wellington City Council. A man with a wide range of interests, he left a huge impact on Wellington civic, sporting and social life.⁹

The Newmans lived in the house until 1895, when he sold it to James Williams, ship owner, who sold it to Harston Heywood, a civil servant, in 1900. In 1904, the house was bought by the aforementioned Llewellyn Smith and the house, like 15, remained in the Smith family until it was sold by Violet Earp-Smith to Kathleen O'Brian in 1955. Again, the house was run as a boarding house for much of this time. The house was transferred to John O'Brian, a builder, in 1970 and the following year he sold it to Patrick Clarke, a contractor, and Kathleen his wife. After Patrick Clarke died in 1975, his widow sold the house back to John O'Brian.¹⁰

In 1980, both houses were purchased by the Dominion Federation of New Zealand Country Women's Institute in 1980. In 1981, the Institute was granted planning consent to construct a two-storey building over ground floor carparking to provide for office and transient accommodation but this consent was never implemented. Six years later approval was sought for an eleven-storey office tower above basement carparking, but this application was declined. An appeal was lodged but not prosecuted. In 1989, the Institute on-sold both properties to medical practitioner Raymond Ka Man Fong and his wife Vicky Wing Yee Fong. They remain the owners and rent the houses out. The houses have not been repaired in recent years.

In the period before and after the Fongs took over the houses, both were associated with the expansion of the New Zealand film scene. It was reported that 'filmmaker Peter Jackson used the property during pre-production and set design for his 1989 film *Meet the Feebles*. Whale Rider filmmaker Niki Caro was a tenant at one point. Actors Cliff Curtis and Marton Csokas used to live next door at number 15.'¹¹

⁹ John Stenhouse. 'Newman, Alfred Kingcome', Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, first published in 1996. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/3n4/newman-alfred-kingcome> (accessed 5 December 2021)

¹⁰ See CT WN19/28, LINZ

¹¹ *Dominion Post*, 4 February 2021

Some of this history is taken from:

'The Sad Sisters of Hawkestone Street', *Newsletter of the Thorndon Society Inc.*, Newsletter 182, April 2021 (courtesy of Brett McKay)

6. Description

Describe the place and its setting, including any changes that have taken place. The more information you can provide the better. Attach further information if you have any.

Situated on rectangular sections with generous rear yards, these two houses are relatively substantial Victorian dwellings, largely identical externally except for the double-height bay window on the front of no.15 (the counterpart on no.17 is only single storey) and the different arrangements of single-storey extensions to the rears.

The houses have timber weatherboard cladding on the front and rear and corrugated iron clad side elevations. The windows are double-hung sashes, although no.17 reveals that they were arched on the upper storey. There are quoins on the front elevation corners but these do not extend around the corner to the side elevations as they traditionally would.

The roof is hipped and clad in corrugated iron. There is one central chimney on both houses. A central entrance way / covered porch feeds both houses. A grassed right of way runs alongside the western side of no.17.

The interior was not inspected.

7. Threats

Is the place at risk? Tell us about any immediate threat/s to the place that you know of.

No.17 is presently on the market. Both houses must have very high development potential.

8. Significance

Tell us why you think the place is significant. Who is it significant to?

It is helpful if you can include any supporting information that helps to show us why a place is significant or important to you or the group that you represent.

These houses are rare examples of large 19th century merchant's houses that have survived on the eastern side of the Wellington Urban Motorway. With the exception of the area around the eastern end of Molesworth Street and wider Hobson Street, most houses have gone from this area of Thorndon, largely due to the expansion of the government centre. Their survival is more remarkable for the fact that they are so close to Molesworth Street, where significant commercial development has taken place since the 1960s. The houses are, despite their poor condition, remarkably authentic buildings and very much redolent of their 19th century origins.

The houses have some historic significance for their association with their builder, Charles Batkin, a notable early public servant. The houses have significance too for the association with the New Zealand film industry during the 1980s and 90s and for the remarkably long time they have been rented out.

9. Further information



WCC GIS



Courtesy of Tommy's Real Estate / Stuff



Courtesy of Tommy's Real Estate / Stuff



Left: Ground floor, rear of 17 Hawkestone Street. (Felicity Wong)

Right: Bay window, 17 Hawkestone Street (Felicity Wong)



Left: Fireplace, 17 Hawkestone Street (Felicity Wong)



Right: Bay window, 17 Hawkestone Street (Felicity Wong)



Bay window, 17 Hawkestone Street (Felicity Wong)

5. 22 Hanson Street, Mt Cook

2. Location

Where is the place you are nominating for evaluation?	Mt Cook, Wellington
Name of property or place (if applicable):	House
Property address (include street number, street name, suburb and town or city). If the place has no street address please provide	22 Hanson Street, Mt Cook, Wellington
Legal description (if known):	Lot 3 DP 60613

3. Owner/occupier

Do you know who owns and/or occupies the place?

Is the property:	(yes/ no/ don't know)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Privately owned	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> Publicly owned	

Name of owner(s):	Blue Key Properties Limited
-------------------	-----------------------------

4. Heritage features

Tell us what the main components or features of the place are.

(yes/ no/ don't know)

☒ Building or structure Yes

5. History

Include any information that you know of the history of the place. The more information you can provide the better. Attach further information if you have any.

This house was constructed about 1880 for politician and merchant Samuel Brown. The land, then sections 6-9 of Town Acre 75, was purchased in 1879 by Emily Brown, wife of Samuel Brown (1845-1909).¹² In 1880, rate books reveal a sudden jump in the rateable value of the land commensurate with the construction of a substantial house.¹³ That rateable value remained constant for the rest of the century. The architect is not known. By 1891, the boundary of the property containing the house had been reduced to almost exactly the same extent it is today, although it formed part of a wider property (see below).

Samuel Brown was a prominent Wellingtonian. He was born in Ireland and arrived in New Zealand, in 1862, at the age of 17. He first settled at Invercargill, where he set up in business as a contractor. He moved to Wellington in 1864 and set up in business as a coal merchant, which grew to become a successful enterprise. He also kept his hand in contracting, constructing tunnels on the Wellington-Manawatu railway and portions of the Midland and Westland railways. He was involved in the design of, among many things, Wellington's first tramway and the city destructor. He married Emily Pain in 1872 and they had five children. Brown took a keen interest in local politics; he was Mayor of Wellington (1887-1888) and sat on the council for a number of years. He was a member of the Harbour Board and of the Wellington College Board of Governors and was elected to the Arbitration Court.¹⁴

Samuel Brown died in 1909 and Emily Brown continued to occupy the property, along with her eldest son Stanley, who took taken over his father's business. In 1914, Stanley died from a brain haemorrhage after falling during a game of tennis. Emily Brown left the house in 1920 and after attempting to sell it (advertisements described it as an 11-room dwelling), she rented the house out. The first occupants were John and Margaret Hill.¹⁵ Emily Brown died in 1930 and soon after, one of her other sons, Albert, who inherited the property, sold it to a syndicate of five people which included, it would appear, the remaining sons and

¹² CT 18/49, Land Information New Zealand, Wellington. It was once very common for houses to be placed in a wife's name.

¹³ Cook Ward Rate Books, 1879-80, 1880-81, Wellington City Archives. The rateable value jumped from £8 to £70. The assessment was based on the amount the property could be let for from year to year, with certain deductions.

¹⁴ See obituary in *New Zealand Times*, 14 August 1909, p.5

¹⁵ *Evening Post*, 7 January 1921, p.1

daughters (or widows) of Emily and Samuel Brown.¹⁶ None of them lived in the house.

Three of these shares were quickly sold to daughter Lillias O'Shea and her husband John, Wellington City Solicitor for 40 years. By 1934, sections 6 and 7 were owned outright by John O'Shea.¹⁷ He sold his share to Bonds Hosiery Mills in 1940, at about the same time the company built its Wellington factory next door. Bonds was founded in Australia in 1915 by American George Bond, whose business went on to become the biggest hosiery manufacturer in the British Empire. It expanded to New Zealand in 1924. The New Zealand branch was eventually bought out. Bonds converted the house into three flats in 1943¹⁸ presumably as accommodation for its workers. (In the mid-1960s one of the flats was occupied by a hosiery knitter.) Bonds sold the house to softgood manufacturers Taylor and Renouf, later Renouf Industries and then Renouf Properties, the firm most closely associated with Sir Frank Renouf, merchant banker and property developer. A subdivision involving 22 Hanson Street and 181-183 Tasman Street (plus a boundary realignment with 18-20 Hanson Street) was undertaken by the company in 1986.

The house was then bought by art dealer Lindsay Park in 1987. Michael McCombie purchased the property in 1993 and he sold it to John Hudson and Miranda Walker.¹⁹ It is presently owned by Blue Key Properties and remains in three flats to this day. It was replied in 2013.

6. Description

Describe the place and its setting, including any changes that have taken place. The more information you can provide the better. Attach further information if you have any.

This two storey Victorian villa sits above the road. Timber framed and clad with rusticated weatherboards, it has a corrugated steel

¹⁶ CT 18/49, LINZ

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ WCC Permit (no. not listed), Wellington City Archives

¹⁹ CT 31D/105, LINZ. The section number seems to have been changed to Lot 3 from Lots 6/7.

roof and a deep verandah on the ground floor. The verandah is enclosed with a bay window at the south end and a fixed, multi-pane window at the north end. There is a cast iron valance inserted within a timber frame above the verandah posts, a most unusual feature domestically. The balcony above is also partially enclosed, which may have been a later alteration. The windows are, mostly, arched double-hung sashes, with the top of each arch picked out by an eave bracket. Regularly arranged quoins feature on the corners of the main elevation.

The front boundary is marked by a masonry wall. An aperture in the wall, which leads to an access staircase, is framed with vermiculated quoins – presumably pre-cast in cement plaster. The wall is lined out to resemble masonry. Above that is a row of vermiculated plaster casts that separate the bulk of the wall from an extension that is surmounted by a cast iron railing.

There are single storey extensions to the rear of the house of an uncertain age. An earlier, single storey lean-to that appears in the Ward Map of 1891, has long gone.

7. Threats

Is the place at risk? Tell us about any immediate threat/s to the place that you know of.

None known. However, it is tenanted, which poses a certain level of risk to heritage fabric and it is in an area that is coming under development pressure.

8. Significance

Tell us why you think the place is significant. Who is it significant to?

This house is a place of considerable historic significance, for its considerable age and for its association with several important owners. It was built for Samuel Brown, a prominent engineer and Mayor of Wellington for two years. During his career he made a notable contribution to Wellington city and region through the many public works he help design and construct. The house is also associated with Brown's son-in-law John O'Shea, City

Solicitor for 40 years, the once prominent firm of Bonds Hosiery, and well-known merchant banker Frank Renouf, through his company Renouf Properties. It has housed generations of tenants.

The house is of architectural value. It is a handsome two storey Victorian villa, and although sited above the road, has townscape value for its contribution to the street. Of particular interest is the ornate cast iron decoration and a central balcony porch. The property's wall and fence are also decorative and rare features, particularly the gate and stair arrangement behind the wall. The house is also relatively old, having been built in 1880. It is one of a handful of mid-Victorian dwellings in the immediate area.

9. Further information

It would be helpful if you could provide the following information:

- Map – a printed or drawn map showing the location and extent of the place or area you are nominating
- Photographs – recent photograph/s, preferably in digital electronic format
- Supporting documentary material – such as research reports, newspaper articles, historic maps/plans, a conservation plan or heritage assessment or historic photographs and illustrations

Note: Photographs, plans or information submitted will be kept for our records and will not be returned. Provide digital copies rather than the originals.



WCC GIS



Ward Map, 1891 (Courtesy of WCC)

6. 47-49 Martin Square, Te Aro

2. Location

Where is the place you are nominating for evaluation?	Te Aro
Name of property or place (if applicable):	Burns Upholsterer
Property address (include street number, street name, suburb and town or city).	47-49 Martin Square
Legal description (if known):	Lot 34 DP 69

3. Owner/occupier

Do you know who owns and/or occupies the place?

Is the property:	(yes/ no/ don't know)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Privately owned	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> Publicly owned	

Name of owner(s):	47 Martin Square Ltd
-------------------	----------------------

4. Heritage features

Tell us what the main components or features of the place are.

(yes/ no/ don't know)

☒ Building or structure Yes

5. History

Include any information that you know of the history of the place. The more information you can provide the better. Attach further information if you have any.

These semi-detached dwellings were built, most likely in 1878, on Lot 34, Town Acre 227, by Sven Bengtsen (1850-1897), a

cabinetmaker, and Christian Jensen, a carpenter, as part of a subdivision of several town acres off Taranaki Street that bore the name of Martin Square. The property has not changed in extent since and it retains the same certificate of title.

The square was named after Irish-born John Martin (1822-1892), a self-made man who started life in Wellington upon his arrival in 1841 as a pick and shovel hand and became a highly successful land owner and speculator. He made his money on the Otago Goldfields supplying miners and transporting gold. He arrived back in Wellington in 1862 and spent his significant profits on land speculation. He later bought large tracts of the Wairarapa and founded the town of Martinborough.²⁰ Martin bought Town Acre 227 and others adjacent from Elizabeth Barrett, who was married to John Barrett.²¹ Both were also early immigrants. Martin subdivided adjacent acres (228 and 229) in 1874 and it seems he had the square laid out at that time. The name of the square was in use by 1877, the year he began subdividing Town Acre 227.²²

Messrs Bengtsen and Jensen were part of contingent of Swedish émigrés who bought land off Martin in the same area. Although some of them remained in Wellington, many moved on as part of a Scandinavian exodus to the Tararua district. There is no record of when the houses were built, but given that a mortgage was taken out at the time the pair bought the property in October 1878,²³ it would seem likely the house was erected at that time, most likely by Bengtsen and Jansen themselves.

Neither Bengtsen nor Jensen lived at Martin Square, but it's not clear who lived in the houses early in their history because of the lack of street numbering. The first clear record of occupancy comes in 1902 when the two houses were occupied by George Avery (47) and George Matthews (49). Stephen Avery, a plasterer, is listed at no.47 in 1906, and 49 is occupied by Ann Walsh. There was a regular turnover of occupants after this, with

²⁰ Roberta Nicholls. 'Martin, John', Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, first published in 1993. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/2m35/martin-john> (accessed 7 December 2021)

²¹ Deeds Index - Wellington Town Acre - Folio 1 to Folio 355, Town Acre 227, Archives New Zealand

²² CT WN11/14, LINZ

²³ CT WN15/90, LINZ

the longest-standing being William McCutcheon, a blacksmith, who lived at 47 in the second half of the 1910s.²⁴

The first change in ownership came in 1884, when Bengtsen sold his share to Jansen. He retained ownership of the house until 1893, when it was sold to Robert Carpenter, a painting contractor.²⁵ Carpenter died in 1917 and there is no evidence he occupied either house. In 1921, the Public Trust sold the property to Patrick McGuire, a labourer or bricklayer.²⁶ He took over occupation of no.47. No.49 was occupied by Annie Edwards. McGuire owned the property (and occupied no.47) until his death in 1949 at the age of 96. For much of this period, no.49 was occupied by Peter Cumming, a labourer.²⁷ The property was sold by John McGuire (a relative of some sort) to Ronald Tomkins, a photographer, the same year.

In 1955, the property was sold to Oak Jewellers Ltd. It remained rented out, but at some point the property was taken over by upholsterer Patrick Burns and his wife Myra, who established their business in 1957. They subsequently bought the property in 1981.²⁸ In 1970, no.49 was identified as sub-standard by the Wellington City Council,²⁹ which may have prompted its conversion to a new use. Burns Upholsterers combined both houses into one workshop. When Patrick Burns died in 2021, the property was sold by his sons David and Brendan to 47 Martin Square Ltd.³⁰ It remains the home of Burns Upholstery to this day, with David Burns the proprietor.

6. Description

Describe the place and its setting, including any changes that have taken place. The more information you can provide the better. Attach further information if you have any.

²⁴ See *Wises New Zealand Post Office Directory*, 1890-1920

²⁵ CT WN15/90, LINZ

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ See *Wises New Zealand Post Office Directory*, 1920-1955

²⁸ CT WN15/90, LINZ

²⁹ 'Substandard dwellings', Record no.4043, 8 January 1970, Wellington City Archives (WCA)

³⁰ CT WN15/90, LINZ

The building is a two-storey, twin-gabled, semi-detached timber dwelling, symmetrical around its main elevation, which faces west. The west and north walls are clad with manufactured fibre cement (asbestos) lining over rusticated weatherboards. The remainder of the walls are rusticated weatherboards. The roof is corrugated iron of some vintage, hipped at the rear.

There is no brick party wall visible above the roofline, which suggests the partition is timber only. A formal set of steps leads to two separate doors (for the two houses). The windows on the main elevation are double-hung sashes, a tripartite grouping on the ground floor and two arched windows on the upper storey. There is another double-hung sash window on the north elevation. There are various mono-pitched lean-tos at the rear, most of which were either original or built early in the houses' history; they were in place by 1891.³¹ At this point, both houses contained seven rooms. The current configuration is not known. There is also an outbuilding to the rear of the property.

The building is abutted by mostly modern light industrial buildings to the north. Directly to the east is Mt Cook School, while there a transformer occupies the property on its south side. Beyond that is Pukeahu.

Note that the building was inspected from the street. Not interior inspection was undertaken.

7. Threats

Is the place at risk? Tell us about any immediate threat/s to the place that you know of.

The building is an area changing rapidly. It is (or will come) under great development pressure.

8. Significance

Tell us why you think the place is significant. Who is it significant to?

³¹ See Ward Map, 1891, WCA

It is helpful if you can include any supporting information that helps to show us why a place is significant or important to you or the group that you represent.

This building is significant for being a rare, surviving example of a domestic residence in Te Aro. It is one of only two houses surviving in Martin Square, which used to be a working-class enclave. The house is a reminder of the square's original appearance. The house is arguably most significant, historically, for its association with Burns' Upholstery, which has kept the house in use for over half a century.

Its distinctive Victorian appearance and slightly elevated site gives the house a presence in the square. With its proximity to Pukeahu, the building's profile has risen considerably in recent years and it is passed by many pedestrians and vehicles moving through the area.

9. Further information

It would be helpful if you could provide the following information:

- Map – a printed or drawn map showing the location and extent of the place or area you are nominating
- Photographs – recent photograph/s, preferably in digital electronic format
- Supporting documentary material – such as research reports, newspaper articles, historic maps/plans, a conservation plan or heritage assessment or historic photographs and illustrations

Note: Photographs, plans or information submitted will be kept for our records and will not be returned. Provide digital copies rather than the originals.



WCC GIS



47 Martin Square in 1978 (Charles Fearnley, 50003-1939, Wellington City Libraries)



The rear of the houses, 1970. (00158-4043-f, Wellington City Archives)



Front elevation. (M. Kelly)



South elevation. (M. Kelly)

6. 230 Oriental Bay

2. Location

Where is the place you are nominating for evaluation?	Oriental Bay, Wellington
Name of property or place (if applicable):	House
Property address (include street number, street name, suburb and town or city).	230 Oriental Parade
Legal description (if known):	Lot 2 DP 5903

3. Owner/occupier

Do you know who owns and/or occupies the place?

Is the property:	(yes/ no/ don't know)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Privately owned	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> Publicly owned	

Name of owner(s):	Annette Marie Miet
-------------------	--------------------

4. Heritage features

Tell us what the main components or features of the place are.

(yes/ no/ don't know)

☒ Building or structure Yes

5. History

Include any information that you know of the history of the place. The more information you can provide the better. Attach further information if you have any.

The house at 230 Oriental Bay was built about 1875 by Paul Coffey, a shipwright. Oriental Bay was not subdivided for settlement until the mid-1870s. Three of the town acres there –

411, 412 and 420 – were owned by Major Henry Coote, a former British Army officer. He died in 1866 and his executors sold the land to Messrs Allan and Tonks in 1874. They quickly sold sections to Coffey, along with George Wilson and Frank Stevens.³²

Paul Coffey's property straddled Town Acres 411 and 412. Although rate books reveal that Coffey paid rates on his house in March 1876, the assessment on the improvement to his property was made in November 1875,³³ which suggests that the house dates from 1875. The footprint of the house itself solely occupied Town Acre 412.

Paul Coffey (1835-1921), was a shipwright, businessman and local body politician. He was born in London and joined the British Navy while still a boy. He was involved in the Crimean War, but was invalided out of the Navy and arrived in Auckland in 1857, still only 22. A few months later he moved to Wellington and set up in business with Thomas Dickson as a boatbuilder. Their slip was at Clyde Quay. Coffey helped establish the Wellington Harbour Board, and was elected to the first board in 1880. He also stood unsuccessfully for the Wellington East parliamentary seat. He was a director of the Trustee and Agency Co. and the Te Aro Loan Co, president of the Shipwrights' Society and a Justice of the Peace. He married Clara Newman in 1865 and they had two sons and three daughters.³⁴ Clara Coffey died one year after her husband.

The property was brought under the Land Transfer Act in 1894. There are no plans of changes made by the Coffeys to the house but there is evidence in historic photographs. When built, the house had a slightly concaved verandah at the front, infilled on the sides. At some point after 1900 a bay window was added to the north end of the west elevation, alongside this verandah. One matter recorded archivally is that electricity was laid on in 1903.

³² TA 412, Deeds Index Folio 355-711, Archives New Zealand

³³ Cook Ward Rate Book, 1875-76, Wellington City Archives

³⁴ *Evening Post*, 21 December 1921, p.7

In the immediate wake of Clara Coffey's death, the property was subdivided into three sections. Lot 2, containing the house, was bought by James Rod, a butcher. His wife, Sarah Rod, bought Lot 1.³⁵ Rod immediately added a flat-roofed extension to the front of the house and replaced the hip at the front with two gables facing the street. The architect was William Page and the builder Thomas Page (possibly a relation). Despite removing the traditional front of the house, the rest of the dwelling remained largely intact, although the side bay window was later removed.

James sold the house to William Walker, a company manager, in December 1942. He occupied the house until 1960, when he sold it to Clara Hallam. Two years later she sold the house to Van Workhoven Flats Limited, who planned some unspecified alterations to designs by Czech émigré architect Frederick Ost and David Lough. It's not clear if anything was undertaken. Six months later, in May 1963, the house was sold to jeweller Andre Miet. The house remains in the ownership of the Miet family.³⁶ There is no evidence that the family occupied the house much, if at all, and it seems to have been rented out for much of the past 60 years.

6. Description

Describe the place and its setting, including any changes that have taken place. The more information you can provide the better. Attach further information if you have any.

Description

This single-storey house is timber framed and mostly clad with lapped weatherboards. The roof is corrugated steel. Originally the hip of the roof was U-shaped, with the gap at the rear for drainage. The hip at the front was replaced by gables and augmented by a mono-pitched, stucco addition to the front. The extension added about 3.7 metres to the house. The purpose of the gables is not known. It is entirely possible that the original arrangement to the front of the house is still intact inside.

³⁵ CT WN73/96, LINZ

³⁶ Summary of ownership courtesy of CT WN292/246, LINZ

The older windows (side elevations) are double-hung sashes. The windows to the front addition are three-pane sashes divided horizontally by transoms. The middle window appears to slide. These wider windows are flanked by narrow fixed, three pane windows. The plain, flush main door is accessed through an entrance flanked by brick posts that are incorporated into the boundary walls (also stucco). This suggests that the front wall dates from the same time as the front extension (1922).

The house was only inspected from the street.

7. Threats

Is the place at risk? Tell us about any immediate threat/s to the place that you know of.

None known.

8. Significance

Tell us why you think the place is significant. Who is it significant to?

It is helpful if you can include any supporting information that helps to show us why a place is significant or important to you or the group that you represent.

Statement of significance

This house is primarily significant for possibly being the oldest house in Oriental Bay. It has some historic significance for its association with Paul Coffey, who was a relatively well-known and early Wellington boat-builder and settler. The house itself retains much of its original external fabric, although its front elevation is obscured by a 1920s addition.

9. Further information

It would be helpful if you could provide the following information:

- Map – a printed or drawn map showing the location and extent of the place or area you are nominating
- Photographs – recent photograph/s, preferably in digital electronic format
- Supporting documentary material – such as research reports, newspaper articles, historic maps/plans, a conservation plan or heritage assessment or historic photographs and illustrations



WCC GIS



The house (arrowed) in 1881.



The house (centre) in 1890. (1/1-020596-G, ATL)



The house (centre) in 1912, with the bay window added to the north-west corner. (1/1-019986-G, ATL)



The house, 2021.