

BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL

FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Stream 3 (Historic
Heritage Chapter 26)

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JACQUELINE SARAH HILDA GILLIES

SUBMITTER 604

HISTORIC HERITAGE

21 June 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1.0 INTRODUCTION

2.0 SCOPE

3.0 FORMAT

COMMENTARY ON S42 RECOMMENDED REVISED PLAN

4.0 (26.2.1) Definitions of Listed Heritage Categories

5.0 (26.5.1.2) Protect, maintain and enhance of historic heritage.

6.0 (26.5.1.5) In relation to demolition, destruction and relocation beyond the site:

7.0 (26.5.4) Objective – Historic Heritage features are enhanced where possible

RULES

8.0 (26.6) Terms – Heritage fabric

9.0 (26.6) Table 2 Buildings, structures and features

10.0 (26.6) Evaluation Criteria for (26.6.22)

11.0 (26.6) Table 3 - Heritage Precincts

12.00 (26.9) Schedule of Protected Features

13.0 (26.9.1) Maps of Extent of Place

14.0 Additional / Supporting evidence for changes to category compared to RK or RPDP

15.0 St Peter’s Church Parish Centre (Old Vicarage) (Ref 101)

16.0 McNeill Cottage (59)

17.0 Glenarm Cottage (Ref 69)

18.0 Arrowtown Masonic Lodge (Ref 330)

19.0 Other category changes and proposed new features

APPENDICES

Conservation Report – Arrowtown Masonic Lodge

Conservation Plan – Old Vicarage Queenstown

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Jacqueline Sarah Hilda Gillies and I am a registered architect with specialist heritage qualifications and experience. I qualified as an architect in the UK in 1980, and registered as an architect in New Zealand in 1990 following my move to this country in 1988. I have a specialist qualification in historic heritage conservation following a year at York University in the UK where I gained a MA in Conservation Studies (Historic Buildings) in 2003.
- 1.2 I have lived and worked in the Queenstown Lakes District Council area since 1988. Until 2014, I was the principal of Jackie Gillies + Associates, after which time I sold the company. In 2016, the name of the company was changed to Origin Consultants, but I have remained as an employee since 2014.
- 1.3 I would like to clarify at the outset, that my original submission on the Proposed District Plan (number 604) was made as a personal submission under my own name, and was not under the aegis of Jackie Gillies + Associates Ltd. I note that in a number of documents, (the Section 42 report and the Evidence of Mr Richard Knott for example), my submission has been referred to as "JGAA", implying that the submission was made by the company when this was not the case.

2.0 SCOPE

- 2.1 The scope of my evidence relates to the following documents:
- My original submission (number 604)
 - The Section 42 Report prepared by Ms Vicki Jones
 - Section 42 Report Appendix 1., Recommended Revised Chapter
 - Evidence of Mr Richard Knott.
- 2.2 In my evidence I will review the Recommended Revised Chapter, with reference as appropriate to the other three documents.

3.0 FORMAT OF EVIDENCE

- 3.1 For clarity and simplicity, I will only include comment on the Recommended Revised Chapter where I do not agree and will set out my reasoning for that accordingly.
- 3.2 However, I would like express my strong support for many of the amendments made to the Plan in the Section 42 Report and the Recommended revised Plan attached to it. In particular, the clarity provided for the assessment of heritage significance and the reference to these criteria as matters for discretion will allow Council to properly and consistently assess development applications on a case by case basis. This is particularly important due to the wide variation in characteristics of many applications involving heritage places.

COMMENTARY ON THE SECTION 42 RECOMMENDED REVISED PLAN

(Please refer to the Recommended Revised Plan for paragraph numbers)

4.0 (26.2.1) Definitions of Listed Heritage Categories 1 - 3

4.1 While I support the inclusion in the chapter of definitions of terms used in the chapter, I do not agree with the proposed wording and would suggest the following:

“Category 1 – The heritage resource warrants the highest level of protection because it is ~~extremely~~ very significant to the District and is also ~~extremely~~ very significant regionally and/or nationally. Category 1

“Category 2 - The heritage resource warrants permanent preservation because it is very significant to the District.”

“Category 3 – The heritage resource warrants permanent protection because it is significant to the District, but the Council will be more flexible regarding significant alterations.”

5.0 (26.5.1.2) Protect, maintain and enhance historic heritage.

5.1 I believe this should be amended to read “Protect, maintain and enhance the understanding of historic heritage, since this more clearly describes the presumed intention of the clause in line with Objective 26.5.4, and Policy 26.5.4.1 which refers to interpretation.

5.2 Also, simply leaving the word “enhance” without qualification may produce unintended consequences, since this word can have different meaning to different people. One person’s “enhance” may mean another person’s “heritage vandalism”. For instance, a situation may arise where a new Colorsteel roof is seen by an owner as enhancing his property, while the loss of the original corrugated iron in good condition, with its short lengths and patina of age may be seen as completely inappropriate by another person.

6.0 (26.5.1.5) In relation to demolition, destruction and relocation beyond the site:

6.1 I believe the use of the word “destruction” throughout the document is unnecessary since it duplicates the term “demolition” and is anyway not defined in the document.

6.2 If, however, it is intended to imply a different action to “demolition” such as “demolition by neglect” for example, then this should be clarified in the Definitions.

6.3 (26.5.1.5 a a ii) This paragraph refers to “productive use” and “unreasonable financial burden”. I believe this should be deleted, since there is no framework for assessing what is “unreasonable” in this context, and the paragraph may allow for unnecessary loss of historic heritage without contest of this factor. I have had personal experience on numerous

occasions where a view has been tabled that such and such is not feasible or economically viable, but when other options are explored which had not been previously considered, a solution is found which still suits the needs of the owner and retains a greater degree of the heritage significance than originally thought.

- 6.3 (26.5.1.5 c) & (26.5.1.8) I believe that it would be helpful to add the proviso shown in 26.5.1.6 which reads “Applicants will be required to show that the above options have all been investigated” to both these paragraphs to ensure that the presumed intention of the clause is capable of being upheld.

7.0 (26.5.4) Objective – Historic Heritage features are enhanced where possible

- 7.1 As noted above, I support the reference in clause 26.5.4.1 to interpretation as a way of enhancing a historic heritage feature.
- 7.2 However, I believe inclusion in the same paragraph of “possible relaxation of Rules elsewhere in the Plan” is confusing since it is a separate matter entirely. This should be dealt with as a separate clause within 26.5.4.

8.0 RULES

8.1 26.6 Terms used in this Chapter – 1. Heritage Fabric

- 8.2 I support the inclusion of definitions of terms used in the chapter. However, I do not agree with the definition of heritage fabric and character.
- 8.3 I have spent considerable time working alongside the Heritage Team in the Christchurch City Council and the definition of “heritage fabric” was subject to considerable input from a large number of well qualified heritage practitioners both within and outside the Council.
- 8.4 My own view is that “heritage fabric” is best defined in the simplest way, without riders and examples such as are set out in sub paragraphs a), b) and c) in the recommended version of the Plan. I believe that providing examples of what might be included merely highlights these aspects with the result that other elements of heritage fabric may be ignored and the examples given become the defacto definition.
- 8.5 I believe that the definition of “heritage fabric” should read as set out in the Plan as follows “...any physical aspect of a heritage feature which contributes to its heritage values as assessed in accordance with the criteria provided in 26.6.22.”
- 8.6 Assessment of the building fabric made in accordance with these criteria allow the identification of heritage fabric on a case by case basis.

9.0 Table 2 Buildings, structures and features

- 9.1 I believe that “Total demolition” and “relocation to another site” should be separated into different clauses. These are very different activities and should be set out separately. In the ODP, there was no reference to “relocation” which was often frustrating, and I was very supportive of its inclusion in the PDP as a separate activity. Combining “demolition” and “relocation” in the same Rule seems to me a backward step and I would prefer to see separate clauses for Total Demolition, Partial Demolition, and Relocation.
- 9.2 I support the concept of “Total” and “Partial” demolition and the percentages proposed. However, I have not had enough time to assess the usability of the volume and area criteria in practice.
- 9.4 I do not support the Permitted Activity status of internal alterations to a Category 3 listed feature. While a Category 3 rating implies that the heritage values of the feature are at the lower end of the scale, it does not necessarily mean that there is no valuable internal heritage fabric. I believe that if the same matters for discretion are applied to Category 3 features as 1 and 2, that the activity status for Category 3 features should be Conditional, not Permitted. This will allow greater flexibility at category 3 as intended by the Plan but can still protect potentially valuable internal fabric.

10.0 Evaluation Criteria for (26.6.22)

- 10.1 I believe that this heading should read “Evaluation criteria for inclusion on the Schedule of Protected Features and their category.”
- 10.2 I also believe that the first paragraph of the clause should read “The following criteria are used to determine inclusion on the Schedule of Protected Features and their category.”
- 10.3 I strongly support the inclusion of the criteria for assessing the heritage values of protected features and the reference to this description in other parts of the Plan.

11.0 Heritage Precincts

- 11.1 I believe that it would be helpful to have the feature reference numbers of all the scheduled buildings within all the Heritage Precincts added to the Precinct maps. This allows a ready understanding of the range and variety of identified heritage features within the Precinct and would contribute to an understanding of the characteristics of each precinct. This is in addition to, not instead of, the Statement of Significance which is also included.
- 11.2 The map showing the Queenstown Courthouse Precinct and its new exclusion of the “Pig N Whistle” building is ambiguous. I would prefer that it was amended (or text added) to clearly show that the boundary of the precinct runs along the NE wall of the “Pig N Whistle” allowing the full width of the walkway between it and the Courthouse. This is because the close proximity of this building to the Courthouse is, in my view, already at its limits and any reduction would adversely affect the setting of the historic Courthouse building.

12.00 Schedule of Protected Features

12.1 **Skippers Road** (Ref 5): This feature is identified as a category 1 item in the HNZPT List. It has extremely high heritage value of national significance. I agree with Mr Richard Knott and the proposed definition of category 1 features that there should be a correlation of value between the HNZPT and council categories with respect to Category 1 features.

I therefore believe that this should be upgraded to a Category 1 feature.

12.2 **Frankton Boatshed** (Ref 16): I believe the description should be amended to read “Boatshed, Slipway, NZR Ticket Office” not “original” since this may mislead readers into thinking the building was original to the site and the other features which it is not. It was relocated from Queenstown to Frankton in the 1930s.

12.3 **McNeill Cottage** (Ref 59): In my submission, I noted that the building had been considerably modified from its original form and that for consistency with other Category 2 items it should be downgraded to a Category 3 feature. I will return to this feature at the end of my evidence and set out the modifications and reasoning for arguments regarding its downgrading of its listing.

12.4 **St Peter’s Church Hall** (Ref 100): the address given is the old one prior to relocation. This should be amended to reflect its new location in Camp Street.

12.5 **St Peter’s Parish Centre** (Ref 101): As with McNeill Cottage, I will expand on the heritage significance of this building at the end of my evidence in support of my submission that it should be upgraded from category 3 to category 2.

12.6 **Arrowtown Masonic Lodge** (Ref 330): in accordance with Mr Knott’s recommendation that the HNZPT Category 1 rating of features should be reflected in the Council’s, I believe that this should be upgraded to Category 1. I have personal experience of working with this building, and I have attached additional evidence (over and above the connection with Mr Knott’s evidence) below.

12.7 **Glenarm Cottage** (Ref 69): I believe that this building should be upgraded to a category 1 feature and I have set out my reasoning below.

13.0 Maps of Extent of Place

13.1 I support the amendment which provides more certainty relating to the area of the setting of a scheduled feature which may be affected by inappropriate development.

13.2 However, I believe that most of the maps included in the Section 42 Recommended Plan are inadequate due to their scale and the quality of the reproduction. To be as useful as the introduction of the concept of “Extent of Place” was intended, these should be radically improved in the final version.

14.0 Additional / Supporting evidence for changes to category compared to RK or RPDP

14.1 In his evidence, Mr Knott has commented that he was unable to approve or reject my proposals for modification of categories in the Schedule in certain cases due to a lack of information. I would like to take this opportunity to provide for the Panel with this additional information for St Peter's Church Parish Centre (Ref101), Glenarm Cottage (Ref 69), McNeill Cottage (Ref 59) and Arrowtown Masonic Lodge (Ref 330).

15.0 St Peter's Church Parish Centre (Old Vicarage) (Ref 101)

15.1 In my submission, I proposed that the Old Vicarage should be upgraded from a category 3 to a category 2. I have a number of reasons for this which include its high heritage value and for reasons of consistency compared to other category 2 buildings in the schedule.

15.2 In 2005 I was commissioned to prepare a Conservation Plan for the Vicarage and the Church Hall. A copy of the Plan is attached as Appendix A of my evidence.

15.3 As part of preparation of the Plan, I carried out a detailed investigation into the physical characteristics of the building as well as historical research relating to its construction, use and modifications.

15.4 From this I drew up the following Statement of Significance:

Historical Significance

The Old Vicarage was built in 1869 only nine years after Rees settled in Queenstown and established his very extensive sheep run. Rees was a devout Anglican and laid on services for his family and staff from his home from a very early time. He became one of the principle lay-readers in the church before the Parish employed its first Vicar.

The building was built for the Parish's first Vicar, the Rev. Coffey and his family.

The Old Vicarage is one of very few houses of this age which remain in the district.

Physical Significance

The building is an early example of colonial timber-framed construction. Beech shingles, cut from the head of the lake still cover the two earliest gable roofs, with later corrugated iron or later timber structure over.

The building has been altered and extended throughout its life, but it remains remarkably intact. Only the final modifications in 1978 to create the current Parish Rooms and separate flat have impacted on the original fabric to any great extent.

The final form of the building remained intact after its relocation from the north west corner of the Church site in 1932 to make room for the new stone and concrete church.

Cultural Significance

The role of the Vicar in the community was much greater in the past. The Vicarage was the hub of much of the pastoral work carried out by the Vicar and a symbol of the support of the Church in the day to day lives of the community.

- 15.5 I also set out a schedule of significant heritage fabric and this included all wall, floor and roof structure, external wall claddings, part timber shingle roof under the corrugated iron, doors, windows and internal linings.
- 15.6 Modifications over the years can be logged into eight phases (the Plan was prepared prior to the last, eighth phase) and while these have involved loss of some heritage fabric, this has not been extensive and have not affected the high heritage significance of the building. They do in fact show the changing use of the building over time from the residence and pastoral care of the Vicar through to a parish community use.
- 15.7 I believe that the heritage significance of the building as described in the Conservation Plan demonstrates that the building would merit inclusion in the schedule as a category 2 feature.
- 15.8 I also believe that it is important for the Schedule of Protected Features to be consistent in its allocation of heritage categories and in my opinion, the heritage values of the Old Vicarage are compatible with most of the category 2 features already identified in the Plan. These include Hulbert House (59), 28 Park Street (63) Bordeaux Store (57), Fred Daniels House (60), Paddy Mathias Cottage (62), Glenarm Cottage (68), Threepwood Homestead (70a), Tomanovitch Cottage (79), and Ayrburn Homestead (110).

16.0 McNeill Cottage (59)

- 16.1 The McNeill Cottage is currently scheduled as a category 2 building and I suspect that this is a result of rolling over previous categories from the ODP and possibly before that. However, the cottage is a prime example of incremental loss of heritage value by repeated but relatively minor modifications over a number of years.
- 16.2 When I first visited the cottage in 1990, it was still intact, with a front portion in stone and a timber framed lean-to at the rear. There were a total of five rooms, including two facing the street with a corridor linking them to the rear lean-to which contained the kitchen and another room.
- 16.3 Sometime after that, the rear was demolished and a new larger addition constructed onto the back, filling the entire site behind the stone part of the cottage to create a restaurant and micro-brewery. A few years after that, the two front sash windows were removed and the openings converted to French doors and the internal passage walls removed. Then the plaster was removed from the stone walls of the remaining internal space.
- 16.4 The result is that now all that remains of McNeill's original fabric is a stone shell, with timber roof and floor structures, its roof and timber floor boards.

16.5 With respect to my comments in paragraph 15.8 regarding consistency of values for categories, I do not think that McNeill's Cottage now justifies inclusion as a category 2 building and believe it should be downgraded to category 3.

17.0 Glenarm Cottage (Ref 69)

17.1 Glenarm Cottage is included in the OPDP Schedule of Protected Items, as a category 2 item. It is not included in the HNZPT List. In my opinion, the cottage is worthy of a rating of category 1 due to its unmodified condition and its rarity as being one of only a small number of such buildings remaining in the town centre. I have visited the cottage in the past and have carried out a brief analysis its history. I have concluded that the heritage significance of the building may be described as follows:

Historical and Social - (High)

The cottage was built by an Irish family who arrived in the district in 1873 and who worked the Moonlight gold fields. In 1878 they moved into Queenstown and constructed the cottage themselves using the revenue from their gold workings.

The building has remained in the same family from 1878 through to 2006, which is most unusual, and this is even more significant when it is understood that it was in the care of three generations of women from 1886 through to the 1950s. This is a parallel with the Williams Cottage on Marine Parade which also remained in the ownership of strong female matriarchs for a similar proportion of its life.

Architectural - (High)

The building consists of a single gable roofed form with low pitched lean-to roofs on two sides. The painted timber weatherboards and corrugated iron roof with tall masonry chimney are typical of the early settler cottages in the region. While some of the windows have been modified, most remain original and the overall composition is pleasing and attractive. The scale of the cottage is small and low and relates well to its site and to the human scale of early colonial architecture.

Technical - (Moderate)

The building was constructed by the owners using local beech from the head of the lake for framing and weatherboards, Kahikatea for the floor boards and Blue Gum for the pile foundations. The roof is corrugated iron and remained unpainted until the 1950s. This was typical of local construction and the building therefore remains as a representative example of its type.

Rarity - (High)

While typical and representative of Queenstown cottages when it was built, and for a century or more afterwards, it is now one of only seven such cottages remaining in the town

centre area. The loss of such buildings has taken place at an alarming rate and appears to be increasing. The rarity value of the cottage has therefore considerably increased.

Townscape - (High)

While the cottage is currently hidden by a Pittosporum hedge which has been allowed to grow to eaves height of the cottage, the building provides visual interest and variety on a prominent corner of the streetscape. It also provides a visual link with the town's history over time.

Archaeological - (Moderate)

The site has been occupied and modified since before 1900 and will therefore be subject to an application for and Archaeological Authority from Heritage New Zealand. With its long occupation and its sheds, long drops and garden structures it is likely to provide information about the way of life of early New Zealand.

The Recommended Revised Chapter notes that a category 1 feature is "extremely significant to the district" . My assessment of the heritage significance above would lead to the conclusion that the overall significance of the cottage is High, and therefore fits comfortably within the description of the building as a category 1 heritage feature.

In terms of consistency with other category 1 features, I believe it sits alongside the Williams Cottage (Ref 66) in its heritage value due to its lack of modifications, consistent ownership within one family (or extended family), its technological significance and its increasing rarity.

18.0 Arrowtown Masonic Lodge (Ref 330)

- 18.1 In accordance with Mr Knott's comments regarding consistency between HNZPT cat 1 places and the PDP, and the definition of category 1 features at 26.2.1, I believe that this building should be upgraded to a category 1.
- 18.2 In 2006 I prepared a Conservation Report for the building which set out its heritage significance as follows:

Symbolic

The design of the building follows the traditional pattern for the layout of a Lodge. This includes a self-contained Lodge Room with vestibule and entrance in front. There were usually no windows to the Lodge Room itself and skylights were frequently the only means of daylight. This derives from the secrecy which built up over many years in the Middle Ages and Renaissance in Europe when the Freemasons met in secret to discuss ideas which were heretical to the Church of the day.

Inside the Lodge Room, the arrangement of the room and all the details of the fittings, paintings and objects have deep symbolic meaning and are common to all Masonic Lodges throughout the world. A description of this symbolism is beyond the scope of this document,

but a detailed description can be found in “Freemasonry, A Journey Through Ritual and Symbol”, W. Kirk MacNulty. 1991. London. Thames & Hudson.

The Arrowtown Masonic Lodge retains many of these traditional symbolic features in their original condition and this is becoming increasingly rare. The Lodge Room itself has considerable significance, both locally and nationally, for the intact nature of the space, its contents and its use

Historical

The building was constructed in 1888 and has value for this fact alone since buildings of this age are increasingly rare. It was built towards the end of the gold rushes which began in the Arrow River in 1862 and which established the town of Arrowtown.

The first Masonic Lodge meetings in Arrowtown were held in 1878 before a purpose-built building was constructed.

Social

In the early days of pioneer towns like Arrowtown, groups and organizations such as the Freemasons held a critical role in the wellbeing of the population. Each group supported its members and their families in times of hardship, providing financial support for loss of earnings due to accidents, death or even the cost of a funeral. Before the introduction of the Welfare State membership of such organizations was more widespread than it is today, but the role of fundraising and philanthropy remains key to the purposes of the Masons.

Technological

The building is a typical example of an early stacked stone schist building, although the classical details of the front parapet are not common. Much of its original features and details, both internal and external remain intact.

- 18.3 However, after work commenced on the building additional features were revealed which, in my opinion, are exceptional and demonstrate the building’s category 1 qualities . When Pinex wall and ceiling linings were removed a complex and delicate collection of original wall paintings was revealed. The timber dado panelling was topped with a frieze of repeated Masonic compass and dividers motifs, the tops of the walls were decorated with a generous depiction of pelmets, swags and tassels, and a large Masonic motif completely covered the chimney breast. Later when the floor finishes were lifted, the original painted canvass floor was revealed showing the tessellated pavement in black and white squares.
- 18.4 Without these features, which the Lodge believe are unique or unknown elsewhere in New Zealand, the building would rate a category 2 listing. However, with these additional features and their uniqueness, I believe that a category 1 is justified.

19.0 Other category changes and proposed new features

- 19.1 I included a number of other features in my evidence whose categories I believed should be reassessed but which have not been amended in the S42 Recommended Plan. I do not have the time or resources prior to the Hearing to provide the additional evidence required to assist the Panel in assessing my submissions with respect to these but my submissions still stand.
- 19.2 However, I withdraw my submission with respect to the rating of Ayrburn Farm Buildings, (110). I accept the rating at category 2 for all the buildings at Ayrburn, rather than the three different ones I proposed, as I believe the category 2 rating will provide sufficient protection for this important group of buildings.

APPENDICES

Conservation Report – Arrowtown Masonic Lodge

Conservation Plan – Old Vicarage Queenstown

Jackie Gillies + Associates

Level 5 QRC House 7 Coronation Drive Queenstown
PO Box 213

Tel +64 (0)3 409 0607

jackie.gillies@xtra.co.nz

15th August 2007

ARROWTOWN MASONIC LODGE

WILTSHIRE STREET
ARROWTOWN.

CONSERVATION REPORT

LOCATION

The Arrowtown Masonic Lodge is located on the south eastern side of Wiltshire Street, Arrowtown. It sits on a raised section overlooking the commercial part of historic Buckingham Street, the avenue of mature trees and small miners' cottages on the residential part of Buckingham Street and the Arrowtown Library.

STATUTORY PROTECTION

The building, more correctly known as "Arrow Kilwinning Lodge # 86", is registered with the NZ Historic Places Trust, category II, and is listed on the QLDC District Plan, item 330, category 2.

This means that any alteration to the building is a Discretionary Activity and will require resource consent. The NZ Historic Places Trust will be consulted in any decision relating to this consent and must approve any such alterations, including alterations to the interior.

HISTORY

General History

“This historical account is intended only to provide a general background to the area in question, and is taken from a number of secondary sources. It is not intended to be a definitive account.

The first settler in the Wakatipu basin was William Gilbert Rees, a pastoralist in search of new land in the interior. Rees and Nicholas von Tunzlemann had come up the Cardrona Valley and over the Crown Range to the Wakatipu Basin in 1859, von Tunzlemann establishing his station on the western shore of lake Wakatipu, and Rees establishing his homestead where Queenstown now stands.

Rees established his homestead and woolshed on the shore of the lake where Queenstown stands today. In November 1862 gold was discovered in the Shotover River, and the area was soon rushed. A goldfield was declared, and a tent town quickly grew up around Rees' homestead.

Some distance away, at the point where the Arrow River leaves the Arrow Gorge, a new mining settlement was also established. Arrowtown was initially known as Fox's, after William Fox who was one of the first to work the Arrow River in late 1862. In early October of that year Fox, O'Callaghan, Macgregor and Low were the first four men mining in the river, and they were slowly joined by a number of others until the location of the diggings were discovered by the wider mining community and rushed. By the end of the year there were some 1,500 men at the Arrow (Miller 1966: 34-42).¹

Freemasonry in Arrowtown

Freemasonry was established early in the history of New Zealand due to the harsh conditions of early colonial life. It was not the only such organization, others including the Oddfellows and the Forresters, but all had as a central purpose the welfare and care of their members. This included payment in sickness or injury, support for widows of members and payment of funeral expenses and education of their families. This function was essential especially in the early mining communities in remote areas and mirrors the purposes of the Welfare State system today.

The first Lodge was built in Queenstown in 1864, the Lake Lodge of Ophir and it remains the oldest Lodge still functioning from its original premises. It is now the oldest building remaining in Queenstown. It was established under the English Constitution received its Charter from London in 1867.

Another Lodge in the district was mooted in the 1870s when a small number of Brethren met in the upstairs rooms of Pritchards Store, now the Arrowtown Pharmacy. Roads were unreliable and bridges were often down and attendance at monthly meetings may have been difficult.²

¹ Peter Petchey, pers comm. 2007

² Historical notes provided by Lodge members, 2005

In November 1878 a meeting was held in the Royal Oak hotel to establish a Masonic Lodge in Arrowsmith and a month later officers appointed. The first meeting was held on 13th February 1879 in the Oddfellows Hall. The Arrowsmith Lodge was formed under the Scottish constitution and was formally named the "Lodge Arrow Kilwinning, No 637 ", (now no 86 under the New Zealand Constitution.) The contract was let for construction on 12th March 1887 and completed and consecrated on 23 January 1888.³

DESCRIPTION

The Lodge building has a simple rectangular stone form, with a more decorative raised stone pediment to the front elevation. This includes some concrete elements to the capping and a plastered Freemason's motif in the centre. The only openings are to the front with two sliding sash windows and a central door. The door is solid with raised bolection mouldings to its four panels and a fanlight over. The door and windows are painted blue, in accordance with the constitution of the Scottish Lodges. An addition was made to the building in 1991 comprising a matching stone lean-to on the south western side. This also has a raised stone parapet and sliding sash window to the front but the other sides of the addition are in modern construction.

The roof is corrugated iron, with a gable roof and skylights mounted in the ridge near the centre. There are no spoutings or downpipes. The walls are typical local construction of random rubble stacked schist in two courses, mortared in mud, with a lime plaster weathering coat over.

A set of concrete steps with concrete posts and tubular steel handrails leads up to the entrance from the road. The steps are unusually low, each one only approximately 110mm, which is surprisingly hazardous, especially with the limited lighting available after dark. It is not known when these concrete steps were constructed, but an early photograph shows a shorter flight of timber steps set at a steeper angle. The earth bank in front of the building also appears to be steeper in this photograph. A timber picket fence surrounded the property at this time also.

A small painted signboard is set on a timber post in front of the building and this has been reversed with back of the sign appearing to be older than the current face of the sign.

Internally the original part of the Lodge comprises an entrance foyer and the Lodge Room itself. The new addition provides a small kitchen, two toilets and a passage leading to a back door.

The entrance foyer has been created out of three original spaces – a central hall with two smaller rooms off each side. Part of one of the original partitions (to the right on entering) remains in place but has been cut back to create a wider opening, and the line of the other partition is visible in the ceiling

³ FWG Miller, 1962. 121

and walls on the other side. The remaining walls are all clad in varnished t&g paneling running vertically on the walls and on the ceiling. There is a door leading into the Lodge Room, four paneled and varnished, and another door now blocked off which also once lead into the Lodge Room. An opening in the stone wall was formed into the new kitchen when the addition was made and this is roughly finished with cement plaster. There also appears to have been another door, or pair of doors, leading directly into the Lodge Room from the Hall, as evidence remains of infill and architraves in this position.

The Lodge Room is a magnificent space. It is 6 metres by 9 metres and approximately 3metres high. The room is dominated by the canopied Master's chair at the opposite end to where one enters and by the blue painted dome in the centre. This sits directly over the black and white tiles of the tessellated pavement and includes a flat glazed skylight at the top which brings in light from the two roof lights above that again. This is the only source of natural light into the Lodge Room. Originally there were woollen blackout blinds operated by chords and pulleys over these roof lights which allowed the light to be cut out completely from the Lodge Room when required. Remains of these blinds and the operating system still exist. The walls of the room are covered in Pinex panels over the top of lime plaster with painted timber t&g dado paneling below. Heating was by means of an open fire built into the south western wall. This fireplace has been modified and the fire box depth extended by the addition of a concrete fire surround and new mantle. The Master's chair is set upon a podium reached by three steps and is semi-circular in shape. Over the top of the Chair is hung a semicircular canopy comprising a printed woollen curtain with swags and ornate tie backs. The Master's chair is not original to the Arrowtown Lodge, but has been re-circulated from another Lodge. The original one is located adjacent to it, however, also on the podium. At the opposite end of the room is the Senior Warden's chair and this is set on a podium of two steps. This podium is also semi circular. A third podium of just one step is set on the south western wall for the Junior Warden. The tessellated pavement at the centre of the room is made from black and white vinyl tiles and has various symbolic objects placed around it. The remainder of the floor is covered in blue carpet.

The interior of the addition is very simple, with a small basic kitchen – sink, hot water cylinder, bench space and two toilets – one with a stainless steel urinal, and one with a toilet pan, cistern and hand basin. The passage leads out to a back door.

CONDITION

The building has been subject to some movement in the past which has caused a small crack to open up in the stonework of the north wall. This may be related to a significant drop in the ceiling around the dome. On close inspection it appears that the weight of the dome has caused deflection on the ceiling joists trimming the dome and this may have also caused outward pressure on the wall at this point. (See engineer's report, Hadley & Robinson.) This has been exacerbated by the lack of

rainwater goods and the sodden nature of the ground causing some settlement of the wall on the north elevation.

There is some rot in other roof members caused by ingress of moisture around the perimeter of the roof, particularly around the chimney and up against the parapet.

The glass is missing in the fanlight over the front door and this has been blocked off with plywood.

The concrete steps leading up to the entrance to the building from the road are in poor condition and are in fact dangerous in places. Many of the steps are out of level and most of the concrete posts supporting the hand rail are loose or broken away from their base altogether and have been removed recently for safety reasons and stored behind the building.

The building is in need of some deferred maintenance and conservation but, apart from the issues noted above, is in a good condition for its age.

SIGNIFICANT FABRIC AND SPACES

In this categorisation, upper case letters (ABCetc) refer to spaces and major elements, whereas lower case letters (abc etc) refer to components

KEY

Items to be protected, repaired and retained.....A a

Items to be retained and repaired but may be modified with conditionsB b

Items which may be removed, no heritage value.....C c

Items which are intrusive and should be removed.....Intrusive

Category/ Location	Description of Element or Component
<u>Exterior</u>	
A	West (front) elevation of the original rectangular building
A	North, South and East elevations of the original rectangular building
A	West (front) elevation of addition
A	South elevation of addition
a	Schist stone walls to original rectangular structure including mud mortar, lime plaster weathering coat, front parapet details, door and window cills and lintols,
a	Corrugated iron roofing, including ridge and parapet flashing,
a	Roof light, including flashings, frames, sashes and glazing
a	Timber sash windows to original building (2), including frames, cills, sashes, glazing, original hardware
a	Timber door to original building, including frame, cill, door, hardware and hinges, glazed fanlight over

C	Lean-to addition, including stone front façade, Hardies sheet side and rear walls, recycled timber sliding sash window and back door, toilet windows, corrugated iron roof
b	Concrete front steps including upstands, concrete posts and steel pipe handrails
b	Painted sign
<u>Interior</u> <u>Lodge Room</u>	
a	Floor boards and floor structure,
a	Tessellated pavement (*)
a	Original timber plinths (see drawings)
a	T&g dado paneling including skirtings and dado rail
a	Lime plaster finish to walls
a	T&g ceiling including possible cornice moulding
a	Plastered and painted dome, including timber frame, lathe and plaster, timber skylight and glazing
b	Evidence of blackout blinds mechanism, including pulleys, hooks and chords
a	Semi-circular canopy and frame over Master's Chair, including rail, swags, curtains, tie-backs
a	Original Arrowtown Master's Chair
a	Chimney breast and fireplace, excluding concrete facing
a	Door to Entrance, including architraves, hardware and hinges
b	Blocked up door to entrance, including architraves, hardware and hinges

a	Symbolic objects, including all located on tessellated pavement, paintings and roller blinds,
Intrusive	Pinex wall and ceiling linings,
Intrusive	Modern electric wall mounted radiant heaters
Intrusive	Concrete fire surround
<u>Entrance</u>	
a	Floor boards and floor structure,
a	T&g paneling, including skirtings and ceiling trim
a	T&g ceiling
a	Door and window architraves (2 windows, 3 doors)
b	Wrought iron hat and coat hooks
Intrusive	Rough cement render to opening to addition
Intrusive	Hardboard window reveals and cills
<u>Addition</u>	
	This has no heritage value as such but has been carried out in a sensitive manner which does not greatly impact on the overall heritage values of the original building. However, the rough cement rendered opening between the original and new sections is somewhat intrusive.

SIGNIFICANCE

The Lodge has considerable heritage significance and this can be categorised as follows;

Symbolic

The design of the building follows the traditional pattern for the layout of a Lodge. This includes a self-contained Lodge Room with vestibule and entrance in front. There were usually no windows to the Lodge Room itself and skylights were frequently the only means of daylight. This derives from the secrecy which built up over many years in the Middle Ages and Renaissance in Europe when the Freemasons met in secret to discuss ideas which were heretical to the Church of the day.

Inside the Lodge Room, the arrangement of the room and all the details of the fittings, paintings and objects have deep symbolic meaning and are common to all Masonic Lodges throughout the world. A description of this symbolism is beyond the scope of this document, but a detailed description can be found in "Freemasonry, A Journey Through Ritual and Symbol", W. Kirk MacNulty. 1991. London. Thames & Hudson.

The Arrowtown Masonic Lodge retains many of these traditional symbolic features in their original condition and this is becoming increasingly rare. The Lodge Room itself has considerable significance, both locally and nationally, for the intact nature of the space, its contents and its use

Historical

The building was constructed in 1888 and has value for this fact alone since buildings of this age are increasingly rare. It was built towards the end of the gold rushes which began in the Arrow River in 1862 and which established the town of Arrowtown.

The first Masonic Lodge meetings in Arrowtown were held in 1878 before a purpose-built building was constructed.

Social

In the early days of pioneer towns like Arrowtown, groups and organizations such as the Freemasons held a critical role in the wellbeing of the population. Each group supported its members and their families in times of hardship, providing financial support for loss of earnings due to accidents, death or even the cost of a funeral. Before the introduction of the Welfare State membership of such organizations was more widespread than it is today, but the role of fundraising and philanthropy remains key to the purposes of the Masons.

Technological

The building is a typical example of an early stacked stone schist building, although the classical details of the front parapet are not common. Much of its original features and details, both internal and external remain intact.

POLICIES

NZ ICOMOS

All work must be carried out in accordance with the NZ ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Significance, see Appendix.

QLDC Partially Operative District Plan

All work must be carried out subject to the provisions of the District Plan, Section 13 Heritage, Rules and Objectives for a Category 2 registered building

Significance

All decisions relating to proposed or future work must be guided by the significance identified above and have regard for the heritage fabric and spaces listed.

Repair

All repairs should be carried out in like materials using traditional methods. The philosophy should be to repair not replace wherever possible.

Where traditional materials are not available modern materials and techniques may be used so long as they are discreet and do not adversely affect the traditional construction.

Recreation

Any recreation of lost elements or details should be based on sound evidence and not conjecture. In the absence of such evidence and where an element must be re-instated for functional reasons, this should be carried out in a sympathetic but subtly contemporary manner.

Minimum Intervention

Any intervention, whether repair, upgrade or alteration should be the minimum necessary. There should be no intervention (other than maintenance and repair) to the form of the original rectangular building.

IMPLEMENTATION

The Lodge is in need of some work to remedy various minor structural issues and to carry out deferred maintenance. It also requires limited upgrading to allow its continued use as a meeting place for the members and to allow the membership to grow. It is cold with no suitable heating, its wiring is old and potentially dangerous and some of the fittings in the Lodge Room are worn and uncomfortable. A brief Scope of Work follows which itemizes the work identified as part of this project. An allowance for other complimentary uses, such as exhibitions or small recitals will broaden the scope for financial input into the organization, which will, in turn, improve the outlook for the retention of this highly significant building.

BRIEF SCOPE OF WORKS

General

Structural repairs

Repointing of stonework

Drainage , stormwater and ground

Spoutings and downpipes

New steps

Wiring

Heating

Lighting

Kitchen

Toilet facilities

Entrance lobby

Interpretation

Lodge room

Plinths, reinstatement of original form

Pinex, removal and repair of plaster walls

Tessellated floor, reinstatement

Original furniture, repaired and upgraded

Canopy, repaired

Fireplace, concrete facing removed

Painting internally and externally

Carpet, repair and relay or new second hand

The Old Vicarage Conservation Plan 2005.

Jackie Gillies

Chapter

1 Introduction

Background

Commission

Purpose of the Report

Acknowledgements

2 Research

History of the Property, Timeline

Physical Investigation

The Old Vicarage

The Church Hall

Modifications

The Old Vicarage

The Church Hall

Influences or constraints on conservation

3 Identification of Significance

Statement of Significance

Significant Fabric

4 Conservation Approach & Philosophy

NZ ICOMOS Charter

Significance

Record

Repair

Rebuilding

Alterations

Skills

Layers of History

Setting

Relocation

New Buildings

Change of Use

5 Implementation

The Proposals
The Old Vicarage

The Church Hall

6 Conclusion

7 References

8 Copyright

9 Illustrations

Historical Photographs
The Old Vicarage

The Church Hall

Appendix

NZ ICOMOS Charter
Floor Plans showing Modifications over time.
Proposed Floor Plans

1 Introduction

Background

The Anglican Church was the first to be established in the Wakatipu. William Rees, the first runholder and founder of Queenstown, was a devout Anglican and led his family and workers in worship and was the first lay preacher. A wooden church was built in 1863 following the huge expansion of the town as a result of the gold rush. The Old Vicarage was not built until 1869 when the first Vicar was appointed. The old wooden church was replaced in 1932 with a stone and concrete church which remains today. The Old Vicarage was relocated on its site at this time to make way for the new church.

A purpose built Sunday School was erected in 1905 behind the Church and this, too, still remains.

A new Vicarage was built in 1964 and the Old Vicarage took on a variety of roles linked with the parish.

In 2002 the decision was taken to capitalise on the value of the land on which the church complex sits and to develop part of the site in order to provide future income for the Church's community activities. A limited architectural competition was held and one design was taken forward to detailed design stage.

The design incorporates retention of all three historic buildings on the site but with the relocation of the Sunday School adjacent to the Old Vicarage to create an integrated and expanded community facility. New commercial development is proposed along all of the Earl Street boundary of the site and across the end of the Camp Street side.

Commission

This Conservation Plan has been commissioned by the Vestry Committee of the Wakatipu Anglican Parish, under the direction of the Secretary, Tracy Maclean.

Purpose of the Report

The Conservation Plan has been commissioned to identify the heritage significance of the Old Vicarage and the Church Hall, and assess the impact of the proposed development on the significance identified.

Acknowledgements

Grateful thanks are directed to Alan de la Mare for the use of his book "*A History of the Anglican Church in the Wakatipu 1863-1982*" in understanding the history of the buildings and in compiling the Timeline, and to Mr Bill Taylor for his time in explaining some of the changes made to the buildings in the recent past, and to Karen Swaine, Archivist for the Lakes District Museum, in carrying out further research and providing copies of the historical photographs.

2 Research

History of the Property, Timeline

Much of the historical material employed in this report derives from “A History of the Anglican Church in the Wakatipu, 1863 – 1982” written by A.J.de la Mare in 1982 as a project to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the consecration of the new stone church of St Peters in 1932. This book provides a full and detailed history of the buildings to be studied, and so a full historical narrative is not include in this report.

Other sources are listed in the Reference section in the Appendix.

1860 William Rees arrived in the Wakatipu.

Rees established a huge sheep station extending from Kingston to Mount Earnslaw with his homestead and farming base on present-day Queenstown Bay.

Rees was a devout Anglican and held services for his family and his workers in his own home.

1861 Gold was discovered in Gabriels Gulley near Lawrence setting off a widespread gold rush in Otago.

1862 Gold was discovered in the Arrow River and then the Shotover. Queenstown became the base for hundreds of miners arriving daily to try their fortune.

Rees continued to hold Anglican services for the wider community with additional lay preachers and in other suitable rooms.

1863 The first church was built - a small wooden building facing present-day Church Street. Rees contributed the timber and an advance towards the labour costs. Fundraising continued to allow further additions and improvements.

1867 Rees left the Wakatipu area.

1869 The Old Vicarage was built for the first permanent Vicar, the reverend Coffey. Originally known as the “Parsonage”, it was built for 49 pounds, 10 shillings. It seems likely that this figure included labour only with most materials donated by parishioners.

Since finances for a permanent Vicar were extremely limited in the 1860s it is quite possible that the first Vicarage or “Parsonage” described was a far more humble building than the elegant bay-fronted villa with verandah which appears in slightly later photographs, and consisted of the east/ west gable only, possibly with a lean-to roof behind.

The church was also extended at this time.

1871 Additions were made to the Vicarage, these may have been the bay-fronted gable and verandah facing Church Street.

1883 The church was consecrated and dedicated to St. Peter.

1900 Further additions were made to the Vicarage.

1900 The Parish of St Peter was extensive. The Vicar was responsible for an area covering Mt Aspiring, Nokomai, Maitai, the Von River and up to Big Bay on the West Coast.

1904 W. Searle offered a piece of land adjoining the church to build a Sunday School.

1905 The Sunday School was completed and opened on October 18th 1905 with an anonymous donation of 250 pounds. It became known later that this benefactor was Mrs Kate Mason, the second wife of William Mason, New Zealand’s first architect and Dunedin’s first Mayor. Mason had retired to Paradise in 1883 after a significant career in New Zealand architecture and politics. He died in 1897.

1905 Further additions were made to the Church with a new south transept to house the organ. Without electricity in the town, this was powered by waterpower and a pelton wheel.

1911 A parishioner by the name of Thomas Hicks died leaving 1500 pounds for the building of a new church in stone or concrete, on condition that it was completed within 21 years.

1923 Electricity was installed in the town following the destruction of the acetylene plant in an explosion.

1924 Electricity was installed into the Sunday School.

1932 Work commenced on building the new church. It was designed by Dunedin architect J. McDowell Smith in a Gothic Revival style. The work included erection of the new church for 2862 pounds, relocation of the Vicarage for 70 pounds and reconditioning of the Vicarage for 458 pounds.

It was decided to build the new church on a more prominent part of the site, on the corner of Church and Camp Streets, and this required the relocation of the old Vicarage towards the west.

The old wooden church was donated to the Parish of Dunstan and relocated to Omakau. As a consecrated building, the Vestry Committee were not permitted to sell the building. They could only give it away or burn it.

1946 Fundraising was begun for a new Vicarage.

? At some time in this period the Church Hall was used as a temporary class room for the High School. Two toilets were built at the back, one for girls, one for boys. Only one of these remain.

1961-64 A new Vicarage was built behind the Church and facing onto Earl Street. It was designed by Mason & Wales (William Mason's old firm in Dunedin) and built for a cost of 3,700 pounds.

1962 The Centenary of the Parish was celebrated. Many men of the Parish grew beards such as were the fashion one hundred years before.

1964-70 The Old Vicarage fell into disrepair.

1970 The Old Vicarage and the Church Hall began to be used as a Hostel for growing number of young visitors to Queenstown travelling on low budgets. 25 mattresses were kept in the Hall and spread out as required. Showers were installed in the Old Vicarage. This use provided a greatly needed service, before the opening of the Youth Hostel Association at the One Mile and before any of the now common backpackers accommodation, but it proved to be a problem for the church itself, with conflicting interests and some behavioural problems.

1978 Major repairs were carried out to all the church buildings. This included converting one half of the Old Vicarage into a flat for lease and creating a Parish Centre with a large meeting room, kitchen and toilets in the other half.

It is possible that the side addition at the front of the Church Hall was made at this time to provide a small kitchen and servery, and the addition at the rear as a back-of-stage facility for small performances.

c1990 The Salvation Army took over use of the Church Hall as a shop for the sale of donated second hand goods. A large steel shipping container was added to the rear for additional storage.

Physical Investigation

The Old Vicarage

The Old Vicarage is a simple weatherboard building, typical of early colonial architecture. It comprises a bay-fronted gable with verandah and gable at right angles and later gabled additions and lean-to roofs to the rear. See Figs. 10, 11,13,14.

All timber for the earliest phase of the building, including framing, weatherboards and shingles is beech from the sawmill of W. Robertson at Kinloch, one of the earliest timber merchants in the district

EXTERNAL FEATURES

Roof:

Over the earliest sections of the building, the front gables, original beech shingles remain beneath the iron and are visible at the eaves. See Fig.17. The roof was later covered in painted corrugated iron in short single lengths. Original galvanised iron valley gutters also remain between the shingle roof slopes. Modern ridge flashings and barge flashings have been installed, the latter replacing original timber cover boards. The roof over the rear additions includes a mixture of original corrugated iron and modern long-run roofing with matching flashings. A modern fixed roof light is fitted at the centre of the lean-to roof. Matching corrugated iron patches cover where original chimneys pierced the roof.

The roof structure to the earliest sections of the building consists of beech rafters and ceiling joists with vertical ties of flat board between the ridge and the centre of the ceiling span. The shingles on the east/west gable are supported on 75x25mm beech battens, (see Fig. 36), while those on the gable facing the street are fixed directly to solid 150x25mm sarking boards, (see Fig. 37). Rafters are simply butted into each other on the east/west gable with no ridge board which is unusual, while the gable facing the street includes the more common ridge board. Wall studs remain in the join between the two gabled roofs with evidence of previous nailing of weatherboards, (see Fig. 38). This, together with the different construction details described above, seems to indicate that the oldest part of the building was actually constructed at two different times with the first part being the east/west gable.

Fragments of a corrugated iron lean-to are visible at the rear of the east/west gable, (see Fig. 39).

The ceiling over the Meeting Room is curiously constructed with 200mm deep but only 20mm thick, secondary 'joists' and 150x25mm ceiling battens which are fitted into rebates in the main ceiling joists, (see Fig. 40). It is not clear whether this construction is original, or whether it was carried out in the 1978-80 refurbishment of the building.

Later additions are constructed with rimu framing and corrugated iron roofing, (see Fig. 41), while the most recent roof comprising the long lean-to and the roof light are constructed with a mixture of recycled timber and new pine with black building paper over.

Pink fibre glass batts are laid over the ceiling. Foil backed paper has been laid over the top of the joists in the east/west gable.

Framing for the original chimneys remains visible from within the roof space.

The eastern gable has a turned timber finial at its peak. The front, northern gable also has a finial but this has been cut off flush with the ridge.

Walls:

The walls of the building are in painted 150mm shiplap weatherboards, with either square or moulded corner trims. Weatherboards to the earliest phases of the building are beech, while later boards may be a mixture of rimu and modern pine. The front elevation has a deep timber base board. This has been removed on the side and rear elevations and replaced with a plastered skirt on wire mesh.

Sub-floor:

There is a crawl space under the building of approximately 400mm and the subfloor construction consists of timber joists on bearers and concrete piles. Many of the piles to the oldest section of the building visible from the access hole have been cast into old kerosene tins, (see Fig. 25). The chimney in this part was supported on a solid concrete footing in rimu shuttering.

Verandah:

The verandah is constructed with a corrugated iron roof on purlins and rafters and is supported on four bevelled posts, (see Fig. 18). These have been repaired in the past by splicing at their bases and are now set into a solid concrete verandah floor. This finishes at approximately 300-400mm above surrounding ground level. It appears that the edge of the verandah slab adjoining the building is supported against a rock wall, although this may require further investigation.

Windows:

All windows are in timber, but include a number of different types and styles. The bay window on the front elevation includes a large central double hung sliding sash window with narrow sashes on each side of the bay. They have no glazing bars and there is no evidence that these have been removed at a later date. The windows are built into a moulded and panelled bay with dentils and moulded details at the top, (see Fig. 10).

The two windows under the verandah on the front elevation and the window on the gable of the eastern elevation, are also sliding sash, but with fixed upper sashes, a common practice in very early buildings. They too have no glazing bars or evidence of original such bars. The window on the western side wall is different, being a 12-pane double hung sash window with pegged and morticed joints. All these sliding sash windows incorporate moulded exterior architraves, galvanised head flashings and solid cills, (see Fig. 14).

The windows to the later additions at the rear are all of a common pattern and feature multiple modules of similar casement windows divided into two small panes at their tops. Some are side-hung casements and some are sliding/folding windows, (see Fig. 14). These windows have flat square exterior architraves. The two toilets at the rear have louvred windows, one with louvres fixed permanently into its timber frame, the other with modern aluminium-framed moveable blades, (see Fig. 12).

Doors:

The front entrance door to the building was originally a typical four-panelled moulded door, but this has been modified with a recent 6-pane glazed frame inserted above with the lower panels remaining intact, (see Fig. 15). Evidence of the removal of the upper panels remains on the frame. The glazing is modern obscured glass. This door still retains its original lock and latch set and central pull knob but has an additional modern cylinder lock. The frame and

bull-nose cill are original, as are the exterior moulded architraves. The cill has been covered in polished brass sheet.

The door to the south eastern addition is similar, with four moulded panels, original frame and cill and exterior moulded architraves, although these are of a different pattern to those at the front entrance. It too still retains its original hardware, (see Fig. 16).

The other door on the south elevation is a modern flush panelled door with square, flat architraves.

INTERNAL FEATURES

Ceilings:

The ceilings to the entrance hall, the meeting room and the two rooms facing the verandah of the Old Vicarage have been renewed in Gib board with flat timber battens and chamfered timber cornice, (see Fig. 19). These rooms correspond to the earliest phase of the building and it is not known what the original ceilings may have been. There are joints and patches in the ceiling of the meeting room and the rooms facing the verandah where the original chimney breasts were removed, (see Fig. 22). Ceilings to the remainder of the building are in v t&g boards, some with Pinex sheet over.

Walls:

Walls to the earliest phase of the building have been relined in Gib board. This probably replaced solid sarking with wall paper over. Elsewhere in the building, walls are also lined with Gib board or painted, v t&g boards, (see Fig. 23). Further investigation is necessary to confirm the extent of any further original v t&g which may remain under the Gib board.

Skirtings to the new Gib lined walls are modern 100x20mm square profile, although some walls, both Gib-lined and t&g, have 150mm bevelled skirtings.

Architraves include a similar mix of modern square timber and bevelled, although the window architraves in the meeting room are original and moulded.

Floors:

All floors are in timber t&g boards. Those to the two earliest phases of the building are 150mm Baltic pine. It was not possible to examine the floors in the remainder of the building due to existing floor coverings and to the quantity of stored material from the Salvation Army. It is likely that they will be 75mm t&g in rimu or beech.

Internal Doors:

Most internal doors are four-panelled moulded. Some are in original frames. None have original hardware. One four-panelled door has been converted to include obscured glass above. There are two modern flush doors set into sliding gear to the existing kitchen and bathroom in the rear addition.

Fittings:

There are a number of modern fitted cupboards in the house together with two fitted kitchens. The larger one is complete and intact although it may have been relocated from elsewhere and fitted in the 1978 modification, (see Fig. 24). It includes solid Rimu panelled cupboard fronts, bins, framing and bench tops with face-fixed hinges and painted galvanised pull handles.

The Church Hall

The Church Hall is also a delightful building erected in 1905 to serve as a Sunday School for the Parish. It has a simple gable form with similar gabled front entrance porch. It has been designed in timber Gothic revival style with contrasting, decorated and moulded barge boards, gable details and pointed windows which enliven the simplicity of the form, (see Fig. 26, 27, 28).

There have been a number of later additions including one on the side at the front, and a timber-framed store room and WC at the rear. A steel shipping container has been used for additional storage at the rear, supported on a heavy timber frame.

EXTERNAL FEATURES

Roof:

The building is roofed in two short lengths of corrugated iron with original ridge flashings and galvanised barge flashings. There are two large roof ventilators mounted on the ridge. Original colonial profile spoutings remain on both sides of the roof with uPVC and painted galvanised downpipes. Eaves are lined with painted v t&g boards. The painted timber barge boards were originally finished with pierced trefoil details and a large timber Celtic cross was mounted at the front peak of the gable. These have been removed. A patch has been made on the eastern elevation where the original brick chimney extended through the roof.

The side and rear additions are roofed in modern corrugated iron.

Walls:

The walls of the Hall are clad in 200mm painted rusticated weatherboards with wide contrasting moulded corner trims. The subfloor is clad in painted plaster on wire mesh possibly over the original flat timber base boards. A chamfered weathering strip divides the weatherboards from the base board. A brick chimney with exposed corbelled haunches is situated on the eastern wall, cut off and sealed at eaves level.

The side addition is clad in matching, but modern, weatherboards, while the rear additions are clad in vertical corrugated iron. The steel container is left exposed.

Windows:

Windows are painted timber four-pane fixed casements with pointed tops and flat square architraves, simple cills and galvanised flashings at their heads, (see Fig. 31). Two of these windows have been modified to allow them to open inwards for fire escapes. There are four windows to each side elevation and three to the front.

Doors:

The front entrance porch has two pairs of heavy doors accessed from each side, possibly to allow boys in one side and girls in the other, which was common practice at the time of building, (see Fig. 30). These doors would have been reached by timber steps up from the road level, although one set has been removed completely and the other side replaced in concrete and now with a timber ramp over the top.

The doors themselves are also pointed and are substantial. They are framed, ledged and braced with t&g infill. The infill on the eastern doors has been modified to incorporate raised

chamfered panels. Both sets of doors have original frames, cills, hinges and central knob, while the western door also still has its original, highly decorative escutcheon.

INTERNAL FEATURES

Ceilings:

The ceiling to the Porch is raking and finished in painted v t&g boards, with no cornice moulding.

The ceiling to the main Hall is in varnished v t&g boards with wide moulded cornice mouldings all in rimu. The ceiling follows the roof pitch at first and then becomes flat with two boxed in ceiling ventilators. These may very well have decorated grilles and if so should be exposed. There are two steel tension rods spanning the Hall at eaves height supported from the ceiling above by matching loops and rods, (see Fig.32). The ceiling to the stage is similar, but is flat, and has no ventilators.

There is a false dropped ceiling in painted timber and hardboard at the south eastern corner of the Hall.

The ceiling to the Office/Kitchen in the side addition is in Pinex.

Walls:

The walls in the Porch are painted v t&g boards, but in a slightly smaller profile to the ceiling boards. In the main Hall, the walls have been covered in flat wood-grain effect sheets at low level and Pinex above. A small picture rail runs around the walls at approximately 3m height. Original rimu v t&g linings are still visible in the gables. Walls and ceiling in the Stage are in varnished v t&g. (see Fig. 33).

The Office/Kitchen is lined in painted hardboard.

Skirtings:

Skirtings in the Hall are modern square 100x20mm. There are no skirtings in the Porch or on the Stage.

Floors:

Floors are generally 100mm t&g boards, although they are covered with carpet in the Porch and on the Stage and vinyl in the Office/Kitchen.

Doors:

Two large double-hinged doors lead from the Porch to the Hall. These are panelled and moulded with wide moulded architraves and appear to be still in their original frame, (see Fig.34). The double action hinges are recent as are the pull handles and bolts.

The door between the Stage and the rear Store room is a modern flush panelled door in a modern frame.

Fittings:

Part of the original timber fire surround remains including the uprights and the lintol, although the mantle shelf and the brackets have been removed.

Kitchen fittings remain in the Office/Kitchen including solid timber cupboards and bench tops and a stainless steel sink.

A shelving unit is built into the back of the stage, with v t&g panelled walls, solid shelves and decorative moulded top which may be original. The rear store room is fitted out with rough shelving.

Modifications

The Old Vicarage

The Old Vicarage has grown over time from a very simple cottage into an elegant villa and then been modified slowly over its life to accommodate the changing needs of the local parish community.

The various phases of the building are indicated in the Floor Plans in the Appendix. There is not a great deal of documentary or physical evidence relating to each stage of the development of the building and much of the following description has had to be compiled from photographic evidence, some site evidence, previous narratives and deduction from all three sources.

Phase I (1869)

Evidence in the roof space seems to indicate that the 'Parsonage' which was built for the Rev. Coffey in 1869 was in fact a far more modest building than perhaps previously believed. A line of timber wall studs extend up into the roof space on the western side of the present entrance hall with nails and nail holes in a pattern which suggest the fixing of weatherboards forming an external gable wall facing west. Church records at this time seem to indicate that funds for this sort of work were extremely scarce, which would reinforce this theory.

The cottage would then have consisted of one room with central fireplace on the back wall and possibly a lean-to kitchen at the rear. There may not have been a verandah at that point.

The internal layout of this first phase is not typical, however. Cottages of this size usually comprised either one or two rooms with a central door and one window on each side. This phase, with a hall along an end wall suggests that perhaps the building was planned to be built in stages and the end gable was always intended to be joined to a grander transverse gable form.

Phase II (poss. 1871)

Alan de la Mare indicates that 'additions were made to the vicarage' in 1871, and this may have been the second stage described above and comprising the gable with bay front which remains today. In several early photographs from this period it seems that this addition was much longer than the current one and included three, not two, rooms. This is particularly obvious in the photograph from before 1976 which is shown in Fig. 1

Phase III (by 1905, poss. 1887)

The Old Vicarage is visible in the background of the photograph commemorating the opening of the new Sunday School in October 1905., (see Fig. 27). In this photograph, two gables are visible at the back of the Vicarage with a lean-to roof between. The gable nearest the new Sunday School is longer than the one which remains today, which reinforces the view that the Phase II building was originally longer.

The Lakes County Press describes in 1887 that new additions were made to the vicarage and that a new fence was erected around the property. It is possible, therefore that the additions described above took place in that year.

Phase IV (post 1905)

At some time after the opening of the Sunday School, the rear south eastern gable was extended again. This is visible in the post card shown in Fig.7 . The old corner trim was left

in place to butt the new weatherboards against and this is visible in the photograph and remains today on the east elevation.

Phase V (1932)

The old wooden church was removed and the vicarage moved to make way for the new long-awaited stone and concrete church. When the building was relocated, the original brick chimneys were replaced in concrete, although their positions seem to have remained as original. The chimney foundations were also renewed in concrete, the new piles formed from concrete-filled kerosene tins and the verandah reformed in concrete. It is possible that the early gable roof described in Phase II above was either shortened by one room, or remodelled into its current form, at this time and joined to the other gable by a lean-to roof. Further investigation during construction may throw light on this question. An internal room may have been created at this time, lit by a fixed ventilated rooflight above. It is also possible that the new casement windows throughout the back date from this time, and that the weatherboards on the rear elevation were renewed at the same time. A toilet, bathroom, kitchen and laundry were included in the new layout.

Phase VI (1970)

A new Vicarage was completed in 1964, and the old building began to deteriorate through lack of use. The Rev. Neilson established a Hostel in the Old Vicarage. Twenty five mattresses were stored in the Church Hall and spread out on the floor of the Old Vicarage for young travellers to Queenstown on limited budgets. Two showers were installed in the bathroom. This was seen as a much-needed facility in the years before the Youth Hostel Association opened in Queenstown at the One Mile and before the 'backpacker' market was even conceived. There were conflicts however, between the needs of the church for the space and in the behaviour of some of the 'guests', and it was not continued after Rev. Neilson's departure.

Phase VII (1978)

The most recent modifications were made to the Old Vicarage in 1978 to provide independent parish facilities and a stand-alone lettable flat for revenue generation. These alterations were the most significant in the life of the building and much historic fabric and evidence were lost. The building was divided into two parts, the western half including a newly enlarged meeting room, created by the demolition of the chimney and wall between the two existing rooms, and toilet and kitchen facilities at the back. The eastern part contained the flat with a new wall dividing the front room, demolition of the chimney and part of the old back wall and creation of a kitchen and small bathroom at the rear.

The original wall linings to the earliest phases of the building (I – IV) were removed at this time and replaced with hardboard, Gib board and Pinex.

The Church Hall

The Church Hall has remained very much intact over its one hundred year life. The greatest changes have been in small-scale additions and in a general decline in its use and condition.

The various phases of the building are indicated in Figure >> in the Appendix.

Phase I (1905)

The original Sunday School consisted of a single large space with raised stage at one end and an entrance Porch with two separate doors on each side. It was decorated on its Earl Street façade with trefoil pierced barge boards, moulded struts and ties and a Celtic cross at the finial. It is shown on its opening on the 18th of October 1905 in Fig. 27

Phase II (by 2005)

The building has been extended on several occasions after it was built, although it is not clear when these additions were made. A new room was added to the rear of the stage with a door between them. Two toilets, (one for girls, one for boys), were erected at the rear, although only one of these remains today.

A Kitchen was added onto the eastern elevation at the front with a servery through the original wall to the Hall.

The chimney was truncated at eaves height and blocked off.

One of the toilets was removed and a steel shipping container installed as extra storage.

Internally, the original wall linings were covered in flat wood-grain effect sheets at low level and Pinex above and the mantelpiece removed from the fireplace.

Influences or constraints on conservation

Historic Places Trust

Both the Old Vicarage and the Church Hall are registered with the Historic Places Trust, Category II as “*Places of historical or cultural heritage significance*”. Any alterations to the buildings requires the consent of the Dunedin Regional Office of the NZ Historic Places Trust.

Both sites will also require an Archaeological Authority from the Trust before any work to identified sites is carried out. The Historic Places Act 1993 defines an archaeological site as a place associated with pre-1900 human activity, where there may be evidence relating to the history of New Zealand. An archaeological assessment will be required relating to those areas identified as being associated with pre-1900 activity.

District Scheme

The Old Vicarage and the Church Hall are listed in the Inventory of Protected Features in the QLDC District Scheme (Ref No 100 and 101) and classified as Category 3. The Plan states;

“Preservation of the heritage resource is encouraged. The Council will be more flexible regarding significant alterations. Category 3 shall include all places of special historical or cultural significance.”

The buildings are also included in Town Centre Precinct 2 and any development associated with them in the Precinct will be subject to the specific requirements of the District Plan.

Building Act

Any new building work must comply with all aspects of the 2004 Building Act. Work which can be described as repair and maintenance is not subject to the Building Act. However, it seems that any change of use of a building, including subdivision even when there is no actual change of use, requires compliance with the provisions of the Act as regards fire safety, protection of other property, sanitary facilities, structural performance and access for disabled people.

These requirements may impinge on the historic or heritage values of certain areas of the two buildings in question. Careful consideration of the detailed design of the affected areas will have to be carried out with full consultation with the local authority.

Skill Base

The work to all the historic buildings on the site should be carried out in a sensitive manner by tradesmen with appropriate skills and understanding of the required conservation approach. This will generally require a proven track record in treatment of historic buildings as opposed to experience with new-build.

Structural stability

The structural stability of the buildings does not appear to be an issue, apart from normal repair and maintenance to some structural members.

Condition of the Buildings

The condition of the buildings is reasonably good and their continued use with appropriate repair and maintenance will be quite feasible.

Future use

Recent proposals for the development of the Church site include for the relocation of the Church Hall to adjoin the east elevation of the Old Vicarage and the lifting of the Old Vicarage to align floor levels with the Church Hall. An assessment of the impact of the proposals on the heritage significance of the buildings is included in Section 5 – Implementation.

3 Identification of Significance

The Old Vicarage and the Church Hall are important features of the Anglican Church in Queenstown. Their continued presence and use by the Church on the site will contribute to an understanding of the historical and social significance of early Queenstown.

1.0 The Old Vicarage

Historical Significance

The Old Vicarage was built in 1869 only nine years after Rees settled in Queenstown and established his very extensive sheep run. Rees was a devout Anglican and laid on services for his family and staff from his home from a very early time. He became one of the principle lay-readers in the church before the Parish employed its first Vicar.

The building was built for the Parish's first Vicar, the Rev. Coffey and his family.

The Old Vicarage is one of very few houses of this age which remain in the district.

Physical Significance

The building is an early example of colonial timber-framed construction.

Beech shingles, cut from the head of the lake still cover the two earliest gable roofs, with later corrugated iron or later timber structure over.

The building has been altered and extended throughout its life, but it remains remarkably intact. Only the final modifications in 1978 to create the current Parish Rooms and separate flat have impacted on the original fabric to any great extent.

The final form of the building remained intact after its relocation from the north west corner of the Church site in 1932 to make room for the new stone and concrete church.

Cultural Significance

The role of the Vicar in the community was much greater in the past. The Vicarage was the hub of much of the pastoral work carried out by the Vicar and a symbol of the support of the Church in the day to day lives of the community.

2.0 The Church Hall

Historical Significance

The Church Hall was built in 1905, and is approaching its centenary on the 18th of October 2005.

The building owes its existence in a significant way to two important Queenstown characters. The land was donated by William Searle, a leading parishioner and the owner of Eichardt's Hotel at the time, and a significant donation was made by Kate Mason, who was the second wife of William Mason, New Zealand's first architect and Dunedin's first Mayor, who retired to Paradise in 1883. Kate Mason made the donation anonymously, and stipulated that the Hall should not be used for dancing.

Physical Significance

The building is designed in timber in the Gothic Revival style. It has good quality, simple detailing, although some of these have been removed.

The building is still in its original location and is relatively intact.

Cultural Significance

The provision of a purpose built Sunday School was obviously much welcomed, as indicated by the number of children and adults shown in front of the building in the photograph taken on the day of its opening.

The building was used by the Church for social functions and other meetings.

In recent years it has been leased by the Salvation Army and used as a Christian charity shop.

3.0 Significant Fabric

The Old Vicarage

(Note: Please refer to the Floor Plans in the Appendix for details of phases of Modifications, eg I-IV).

Roof: Short length corrugated iron
Beech shingles, including support battens and solid sarking and galvanised valley flashings
Remaining fragments of lean-to roof and flashing
Roof structure to all phases I – IV
Framing around now removed chimneys
Framing between two shingle-covered roof spaces complete with remaining nails
Painted timber barge boards, finials, eaves etc

Extl Walls: Painted weatherboards
Panelling to front bay window and front base board
Wall structure to phases I – IV

Windows: Double-hung windows to east, north and west elevations including moulded facings, architraves, cills, frames, pulley gear (bay window), sashes and glazing.
Fixed louvred window to toilet on west elevation (adjacent to meeting room)

Extl Doors: Front entrance door, including moulded facings, frame, cill, hardware but excluding infill glazed panel.
Back door, south elevation, including moulded facings, frame, cill, hardware

Verandah: Corrugated iron roofing, timber roof structure and four posts.

Intl Walls: Timber framing to phases I – IV, including remains of original door openings, windows etc revealed during construction
V t&g timber wall linings

Intl Doors: Moulded and panelled doors to meeting room and toilet including frames, moulded architraves (not plain) and hardware
Moulded and panelled doors elsewhere which may have been recycled from the original building in the modification of 1978, phase VII.

Ceilings: V t&g timber ceiling linings

Floors: Timber t&g floorboards throughout

Subfloor: Timber floor joists and bearers to phases I – IV
Concrete piles in kerosene tin formwork
Concrete bases to demolished chimneys

The Church Hall

Roof: Short length corrugated iron
Original flashings
Roof structure to original Hall and Porch including wrought iron tie-rods to Hall
Two ridge-mounted roof vents
Decorative barge boards, and gable detailing

T&g boards to eaves

Extl Walls: Painted rusticated weatherboards including moulded corner trims
Wall structure to original Hall and Porch

Chimney: Brick chimney to east elevation

Windows: All original pointed timber windows including external facings, frames, cills, sashes, architraves and glazing

Extl Doors: Ledged and framed t&g entry doors to Porch, including facings, frames, cills and original hardware

Intl Walls: V t&g timber wall linings
Any remaining original timber architraves
Proscenium arch

Intl Doors: Pair moulded and panelled doors from Porch to Hall including frames and architraves

Ceilings: V t&g timber ceiling linings
Ceiling vents including any pierced or decorative 'grilles' which may be revealed during construction
Moulded timber wall and ceiling cornices

Floor: Timber t&g floor boards throughout, including raised stage

Subfloor: Floor joists, bearers

Fittings: Built-in timber shelving to rear of stage
Engraved brass plaque commemorating the generous donation of Mrs W. Mason.
Fireplace, hearth and remains of timber fire surround

4 Conservation Approach & Philosophy

1.0 ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value.

All conservation work will be carried out in accordance with the ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value. A copy is reproduced in the Appendix.

2.0 Significance.

All decisions regarding the conservation, repair or adaptive re-use of the historic buildings should be based on an understanding of their significance as identified above in Section 3.

3.0 Record.

The current condition of the buildings should be recorded prior to commencement of any work to the historic buildings.

Any early elements of the building which are revealed during stripping-out should be noted, recorded and a conservation professional notified prior to covering up or removal.

All work carried out to the heritage buildings should be documented and recorded as it proceeds.

Any more recent layers of history which are removed should be fully recorded and documented before removal.

4.0 Minimum Intervention and Repair

Any work to the historic buildings should be the minimum necessary to stabilise or repair the historic fabric.

The philosophy should always be to repair rather than replace.

Repairs should be carried out in materials which match the original.

New materials may be used where they are not visible.

Any investigation which involves the destruction of historic fabric should be the minimum necessary to allow an understanding of the heritage values of the place or to allow appropriate repair to be specified.

5.0 Rebuilding

Rebuilding lost or damaged areas must be based on clear evidence of the lost material or construction and not on conjecture.

It should be discreetly identifiable as new work.

Rebuilding should only be carried out where the stability of the building is in question or where the cultural heritage value of the place has been compromised.

6.0 Alterations

Any alterations or modifications to the building should be the minimum necessary to achieve modern requirements. They should be carried out in areas with the least heritage significance and affect the least significant fabric. They should include construction details which are reversible to allow the possibility of recovering or understanding the original heritage significance at some later date.

7.0 Skills

All conservation work to the buildings should be carried out by craftsmen with an understanding of historic building construction and of their trade in particular.

8.0 Layers of History

Layers of history which are visible on the face of the historic buildings are also of value. More recent layers should only be removed if they compromise an understanding of the significance of the building.

9.0 Setting

The setting of a historic building is an integral part of its significance. The curtilage of each building should be respected as should the relationship of each building to the others in the group.

10.0 Relocation

The original location of each of the historic buildings in the group is part of its significance. Relocation is not a preferred option.

Relocation results in a reduced understanding of the building's original heritage significance, including the reasons for its location on that original site, its original relationship with its neighbours and the loss of the buildings original foundation and subfloor construction. However, there are occasions where relocation is the only option which will allow the ongoing use of a building.

11.0 New Buildings

The design of any new buildings associated with the historic ones or additions to them should be sympathetic to the cultural heritage values of the original buildings, but such that they can be obviously identified as new.

Replication of historic buildings confuses the understanding of the significance of the original ones and should be avoided.

12.0 Change of Use

Any change of use of the historic buildings should involve the minimum impact on the heritage significance and require the least change to the significant fabric.

It is important to recognise, however, that unless buildings are in use they will deteriorate and eventually be lost. New uses which are sympathetic to the identified cultural significance will allow historic buildings to remain alive.

5 Implementation

Since the design for the redevelopment of the Church site was completed before the Conservation Plan was commissioned, this section will analyse the impact of the proposals on the heritage significance identified in Section 3. Copies of the design proposals are included in the Appendix.

1.0 The Proposals

The approved Plan proposes that the Church Hall be relocated and joined to the Old Vicarage at the east to create extended and improved Parish and community facilities. The two buildings will be joined by a new glass link. New toilets and kitchen facilities will be installed centrally in the rear of the Old Vicarage building and be able to serve either the activities in the Parish meeting room, or a community function in the relocated Church Hall. Access to the Church Hall will be from Camp Street, while access to the Old Vicarage remains unchanged from Church Street.

The Church site slopes from Camp Street down to the western boundary by approximately 1 metre. The Church Hall is to be relocated to the higher end of the site. The Old Vicarage must therefore be lifted so that floor levels of the new joined complex are consistent.

2.0 The Old Vicarage

1. All work should be carried out in accordance with Section 4 – Conservation Approach and Philosophy.

2. All significant fabric noted in Section 3 should be retained and repaired as necessary.

3. Any change of use to the building should be carried out with the minimum impact on the original architectural form and should respect the existing and original internal layout as far as possible. This not only preserves the historic fabric and allows an understanding of the building's heritage significance, but allows for continuing understanding of the building in the future.

4. The Old Vicarage can absorb some modification with limited impact on its heritage values if the changes are confined to the interior and such internal modifications are confined primarily to the rear and later additions.

5. The proposed lifting of the building to accommodate higher floor levels is unfortunate. While it has been relocated on its site once before in 1932, its original relationship to the ground at that time was maintained. The ground level at the front of the

building is to also to be raised, however, and this helps to retain the original architectural appearance, although care must also be taken to address the relationship of the new ground level to the Church.

By contrast, the west and south elevations will have a large expanse of plastered concrete foundation wall exposed and this adversely affects the original architectural form and the heritage significance of the place. Mitigation of these adverse effects might include raising the ground levels on all sides of the building or allowing for ramped access between the two buildings.

6. The plans show new foundations, timber piles and bearers. The building should be carefully lifted and all original timbers should be retained. Where timbers are rotten or damaged in part, they should be repaired by splicing new timber to the old and leaving the original in place. Wholesale replacement of all subfloor timbers should not be an option.

Consideration should be given to allowing the kerosene tin formed piles from 1932 to be left in their original position as evidence of this typical 'make-do' approach to building in that period, especially in the Depression years.

All remaining chimney bases should be retained as evidence of their existence and original (1932) location.

7. The lifting of the building allows the reinstatement of a timber verandah floor, which is positive and allows a better understanding of the building's original form.

8. The four existing verandah posts should be retained and not amended to three as shown on the plans.

9. The original south east corner trim of the rear gable extension shown in phase III which is now incorporated into the east elevation should be retained as evidence of the development stages of the building.

10. The original timber finial to the front gable should be repaired and the point reinstated. From discussions with an active member of the parish, it is possible that this is still in existence and if found should be reinstated.

11. Care should be taken in the stripping out of existing linings. If evidence of earlier forms of the building is revealed then a conservation professional should be informed and the evidence recorded and analysed prior to covering up or demolition.

Particular attention is drawn to the possibility of evidence relating to the following;

- original door openings with or without original door frames to the meeting room, entrance hall and assistant Vicar's rooms,
- original exterior walls which are now enclosed within the building, with evidence of nailing of weatherboards and wall linings,
- additional room at the southern end of the meeting room.
- Original ceiling construction in the Meeting Room and the two Vicar's rooms.

12. If earlier forms can be incorporated without disadvantage to the new layout, then this should be actively encouraged.

Particular attention is drawn to the re-use of the original door openings from the Hall into the meeting room and the proposed assistant Vicar's room.

Consideration should be given to reinstating the south west gable to its full width as suggested in the historical photographs and as shown at Phase III, rather than the proposed lean-to.

This allows a better understanding of the history of the building and fuller recovery of its heritage significance.

13. The timber framed wall between the Vicar's and his assistant's rooms should be relocated a minimum of 200mm to the right of the architrave to window WG-1 to allow a more authentic relationship between the two. This wall was erected in 1978 and has no heritage significance. (This action might result in the enlargement of the current assistant Vicar's room and hence allow it to be re-allocated to the Vicar with access for him from the entrance hall and not off the kitchen, which might be preferable).

14. Appropriately detailed skirtings should be fitted in the meeting room, the hall, assistant Vicar's room, Vicar's room and the office.

15. The original t&g wall linings to the rear additions should be retained and incorporated into the new layout where possible.

16. There should be no further disturbance of the original roof shingles. Any work in the roof space such as new services should be carried out making use of previously formed holes etc.

17. No evidence of previous forms of the building which are manifested in the roof space should be removed or modified. This includes framing out for chimneys, old flashings, framing and nailing patterns to studs between the two earliest gable roofs.

3.0 The Church Hall

1. All work should be carried out in accordance with Section 4 – Conservation Approach and Philosophy.

2. All significant fabric noted in Section 3 should be retained and repaired as necessary.

3. Any change of use to the building should be carried out with the minimum impact on the original architectural form and should respect the existing internal layout as far as possible.
4. Relocation of a heritage building from its original site is not the preferred option, as stated in the NZ ICOMOS Charter for Conservation of Places of Cultural and Heritage Significance, and is not accepted as good conservation practice. It has been decided that the Church Hall use cannot be sustained in its present location and that it can resume an active role in the parish as a community facility by relocating it close to the Old Vicarage where their uses can overlap and complement each other.
5. The relocation of the Church Hall results in an agreeable grouping of the three historic buildings on the site, the Church, the Old Vicarage and the Church Hall. It could be further enhanced by the installation of some interpretation of the history of the site, from the earliest church through to the present day.
6. The front of the Church Hall is to face Camp Street. It is important that the front elevation of the building retains its original relationship to ground levels in front of it. Setting the building lower on the ground because of the slope of the site behind it reduces the proportions of the front façade and reduces its heritage value. Two steps up on one side should be reinstated with a ramp on the other.
7. The decision to relocate the Hall in this position has more serious adverse effects internally. In order to allow a connection through to the Old Vicarage, it is proposed that half of the existing stage is removed and cut back to floor level. This destroys an extremely important, original building element with significant heritage value and changes the internal design to an unacceptable degree. Further design investigation may find a solution which mitigates this effect.
8. The plans show that the internal double doors from the porch into the Hall are to be removed. It is not clear if this is really intended and may be a drafting error. The doors are an important architectural feature and have high heritage significance and should not be removed. They also have a sensible and practical purpose in forming a draught lobby to the exterior.
9. The later additions to the rear and the side are to be removed and the original architectural form reinstated which is very positive. Linked with this is the removal of the later servery and reinstatement of window WG-8 in its original form and detail.
10. All the lost timber detailing to the front elevation, including the finial cross and trefoil details to the barge boards should be reinstated.
11. The plans do not show the re-erection of the brick chimney and fireplace. As an original element in the design and function of the old Hall, both should be reinstated, and the chimney taken up to its original height. A new or recycled mantelpiece should be fitted internally, even if the fireplace is not intended to be functional.
12. The modern internal wall linings, including Pinex and wallboards, should be removed and the original v t&g boards repaired or reinstated, complete with appropriately detailed moulded skirtings.

13. The original ceiling vents should be opened and any decorative grilles or covers repaired or reinstated.
14. The two windows converted in the past into fire escapes should be carefully refitted as original.
15. The brass plaque commemorating the donation of Mrs W. Mason should be retained. Consideration might be given to the possibility of adding interpretation explaining who Mrs Mason was and her links with New Zealand's early history and the history of the district.

6 Conclusion

1. The Old Vicarage and the Church Hall are highly significant buildings in Queenstown.
2. The repair and refurbishment of these two important historic buildings is to be welcomed.
3. The proposed new configuration of the buildings allows for a compatible and sustainable future use with recognisable benefits for the parish and the community.
4. In general, the proposals achieve this new configuration with minimal adverse effects on the heritage significance of the buildings.
5. The issue of relocation and lifting the buildings is of concern, however, and will have adverse effects on the heritage significance of the buildings. Further examination of the design options should be considered to mitigate these effects.

7 **References**

A.J. de la Mare, (1982) *A History of the Anglican Church in the Wakatipu 1863 -1982*, Queenstown.

F.W.G. Miller, (1962) *Golden Days of Lake County*, Christchurch et al, Whitcombe & Tombs Ltd.

Otago Witness, 21 August 1863.

Lakes County Press, 19 May 1887.

8 Copyright

All historical photographs are reproduced with the permission of the Lakes District Museum, Arrowtown for the purpose of compiling this report and may not be used for any other purpose without their permission.

This Conservation Plan is the copyright of Jackie Gillies and may not be reproduced for a purpose other than the project described without permission.

9 Illustrations

Historical Photographs

The Old Vicarage, record photographs.

The Church Hall, record photographs.

Appendix

NZ ICOMOS Charter

Floor Plans showing Modifications over time.

Proposed Floor Plans