

COMMUNITY PLANNING AS IF CULTURAL HERITAGE MATTERS

Lutz-Strulik, Heike

Heike Lutz-Strulik, Director of Archifact Limited, is an architect with specialist skills in building conservation. Her work experience in New Zealand and overseas over the last 20 years has involved buildings of all ages, new and historic. Societal and professional awareness regarding building conservation is one of her special foci and forms part of her PhD research.

She is a board member of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New Zealand and Head of their Teaching and Education Committee. She is also member of the New Zealand Institute of Architects (NZIA), the New Zealand Professional Conservators Group (NZPCG), the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT), where she contributes to the Auckland Branch Committee and its sub-committee Buildings and Sites and the Association of Preservation Technology International (APT).

Mouat, Clare

Clare is a Lecturer and Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Planning at the University of Auckland. Her thesis is entitled *The Point of Resistance in Local Planning: Reflecting upon the place of community, strategy, and strife in governing Greater Auckland*. Her Masters degree explored the place of citizenship under the changing welfare state in New Zealand. Clare's primary research focus explores the boundaries of theoretical planning drawing on practice and including relational analyses of governance (emphasising communities and community planning). Her research interests include the reinvention of urban politics and governance in cities; community planning; citizen governorship; regional strategies and visioning; urban narratives and stories; culture, heritage, identity, and belonging; social justice; power; and democracy.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AS IF CULTURAL HERITAGE MATTERS

ABSTRACT:

Sustainable heritage development should reflect a contested and layered composite of workaday history and living heritage. Yet, both the narrow approach to heritage practice and the deceptive conflation of history and heritage detract from good community governance. Using a case study, we question whether the fundamental understandings of cultural heritage and well-being extend far enough in practice as articulated through the policies and guidelines of the Auckland City Council. The authors argue a comprehensive approach to cultural heritage that includes context will realize a better living environment. Cultural heritage makes a small but vital contribution as a critical element shaping our identities, belonging, and security in our contemporary urban worlds.

The central question of this paper is whether local government appropriately understands the complex dimensions of history and cultural heritage as a vital part of community planning in New Zealand. Sustainable cultural heritage development, we maintain, should reflect metropolitan Auckland as a palimpsest; a contested and layered composite of workaday history and living heritage. A misleading confusion in local government parlance between "history" and "heritage" impedes this dimension of cultural sustainability. Consequently, this frustrates effective discourse and practice to this end. We claim that there is a significant and urgent gap in understanding of the connections and scope of cultural heritage within "cultural", let-alone "community", well-being in Auckland. This is illustrated in the existing stance taken by local government, and exemplified in the conduct of Auckland City Council (hereafter the City Council). To accomplish the greater well-being we seek, we must address this gap in planning proactively. The focus of this review paper is diagnosis not policy prescription;

thus, this inquiry undertakes a preliminary diagnosis of how we might better safeguard and engage our cultural heritage. We need to refocus the issues: to make informed analysis and stronger policies, toward sharper, more potent instruments of good governance in Auckland.

There are three explicit sections in this developmental review paper. Firstly, we consider the policy framework and implementation by illustrating the City Council's current position of heritage intentions and policies. Secondly, we review this position, arguing that the prevailing interpretation of heritage is one-dimensional and marginalised within the local and regional commitments of the City Council. We use the case study of Panmure, a pilot site for implementation of the City Council's Liveable Communities programme; an intense and controversial transformation into a new urban order. Panmure is a valuable and critical resource for our diagnosis as it represents a site of contested and narrowly-defined heritage. Finally, certain problems for further exploration are put forward. This work is meant to encourage more comprehensive focus on dimensions of culture, and more firmly embed them into our governing practices: both to convey the textures of urbanity and to reconcile policy ambition with much-consulted community contribution.

Caveats and Limitations

The complex and intangible nature of cultural well-being and possible policy or practical repercussions make for a broad and intense paper. In order to achieve the objectives of this paper, we make the following assumptions and exclusions. We do not explore the mandate, responsibility, or role of government in aspiring to provide and promote cultural heritage and well-being in local communities. Further, we assume that the fundamental thinking of the City Council plans for and articulation of, cultural heritage and well-being are found in statutes, plans, and policies. Neither do we analyse these policies for their development, integrity, or weaknesses¹. We accept that there are four pillars – containing economic, social, environmental, and cultural elements – of sustainability², moreover we recognise that they should be approached in an integrated manner. However, in this short review we isolate cultural heritage and well-being as it has been marginalised under existing attitudes and practices. Specifically, in the Panmure case study, we restrict our views and attention to elements of cultural heritage in local government planning.

CULTURAL WELL-BEING AS A PILLAR OF COMMUNITY PLANNING

In this first section we establish the current law, policies, and practices framing cultural heritage planning within New Zealand. The implications of the ongoing political transformations, with especial attention to the unrefined mandate for cultural heritage, are only briefly illustrated in this diagnostic review. Heritage should be asserted as a critical element shaping our identities, belonging, and security in our contemporary urban worlds. Within our city dominions, both the narrow approach to heritage practice and the deceptive contest between history and heritage detract from good community governance. This paper critiques the narrowness of existing attitudes to cultural heritage planning in New Zealand. Explicitly, the planning mentalities toward heritage fail to meaningfully engage the community values within Council standards and guiding principles. These mentalities play a fundamental role in effectively determining and promoting cultural heritage both as a vital part of community well-being in synergistic relation with policy, practice, lifestyles, and as required by law. In this section, we begin canvassing the process of local governance. Then we explore four key legal and policy elements integrating cultural heritage in local and community planning: two key statutes, and two local council policies/plans.

In a broader sense, our struggle with cultural heritage requires an understanding of governance regimes in New Zealand, which feature a lack of a national/regional framework; episodic reforms; statutory imperatives; and ad hoc idiosyncrasies in local practice. Independence and autonomy from central government are strong features of local government in New Zealand; various councils display an individualistic and often-antagonistic nature in the interpretation and practical implementation of policy. Paradoxically, however, councils remain bound by their all-powerful "District Plan" and their existence as creatures of statute. In the last two decades, at least three significant changes have transformed the trajectory of local government and community planning: the national reorganisation (and amalgamation) of Councils; the implementation of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

in 1991 and; amongst other amendments, amendment to the Local Government Act 1974 in 2002. For example, 74 Territorial (city and district) authorities replace 217 former city, borough, and county councils³. The radical reforms of 1989 closely followed those applied to central government in 1984; where the Labour Government set about “... *comprehensively reviewing the role of the state due to changes in thinking arising from new institutional economic and management theories*”⁴ under a Neoliberal rubric. There is a paradoxical shift from hierarchical and centrally-driven service provision to a horizontal and locally-based networking of actors; where governance is based on autonomous, enabling, efficient supervision or facilitation through competitive networks and partnerships.

Significantly, in local government terms, the primacy of economic drivers (of reform and progress) has been revised. Whilst Territorial local authorities (or councils) have certain roles and responsibilities under the Local Government Act, they are primarily responsible to their electors or “communities”, and for their “well-being”. Recent statutory and policy reforms entrench the necessity of culture as part of a quadruple “bottom-line”; as the fourth pillar of sustainable city planning⁵, council policies now reflect the belief that our well-being is strengthened through culture as the latest addition to “sustainable” urban planning agendas. Similarly, updated strategic reforms, reflected in the longer term plans and community agendas, are designed to manage growth “*in such a way as to enhance ... amenity and liveability ... while protecting the significant natural, cultural, and physical resources of the city*”⁶. Together these reforms constitute new communities, shifting responsibilities, and radical changes to governing mentalities of urban planning⁷.

There are at least four components to be considered as key legislation and policies driving contemporary local government: the RMA; the Local Government Act; and, in Auckland City Council context, both the Long Term Council Community Plan: 2004-2014 and the Liveable Communities programmes. Firstly, we consider the RMA. Appearing in the purpose of the RMA cultural well-being includes physical manifestations of cultural heritage⁸ but remains subordinate to the context of environment. This act is designed with a national umbrella framework for local interpretation, and has significant ongoing implications for planning⁹. “*In this Act, “sustainable management” means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety...*”. Overall broad judgement is required with the hierarchy of stated principles being explicitly subordinate to the primary purpose, sustainable management: “Matters of national importance”, “Other Matters”, and “Treaty of Waitangi issues”. Under the RMA, Councils are required to produce District Plans, which are the powerhouse of local government authority and planning practice. They involve the management of land-use, subdivision, and development activities. This includes looking at “... *what things are valued by their communities*” and “*how to protect those values*”¹⁰. The City Council considers that cultural heritage is comprehensively covered in its District Plan and with regard to growth strategy requirements¹¹.

Secondly, we consider the Local Government Act, whose purpose “... *is to provide for democratic and effective local government that recognises the diversity of New Zealand communities*”¹². This act is explicitly community-based and reflects the devolved governance regimes in national affairs. Adjunct statutes exist which explicitly concern cultural heritage, such as the Historic Places Act 1993.

Thirdly, long term council community plans are important in the chain of governance because they represent a revolutionary shift from council-driven planning toward community-led development in New Zealand local government. Community outcomes and the purpose of local government, under the Local Government Act, have a broad approach to cultural well-being, which devolves powers and responsibility for definition and interpretation to the lowest possible level of relations: between councils and communities. The long term council community plan is a ten year plan that must be reproduced every three years; showing “...*what the City Council does and how it will work toward achieving what the community wants. The inaugural plan is entitled “Focus on the Future 2004-2014” where community outcomes [are] identified through consultation with the community*”¹³; consultation was undertaken between 1998 and 2000¹⁴, the bottom up planning approach coexisted with the council-driven growth concepts and strategies.

Fourthly, there is the Liveable Communities programme. “*This growth concept aspires to*

*communities that are safe, walkable, attractive, offer a choice of lifestyle, have mixed-use at their core, have access to a choice of transport, and create a sense of belonging*¹⁵. It “...prepares the way for an action plan, time frame, and funding plan, which aim to maintain and improve the “liveability” of a centre, while mitigating the negative effects of growth”. In partnership with the community, the City Council is responsible for promoting good urban design and liveability using sustainable principles and features (imported¹⁶) intellectual ideas such as new urbanism, smart growth, and transit-oriented design¹⁷. This programme co-originated with regional strategies for growth management. Culture and ‘sense of belonging’ are beset by prevailing and tangible physical land-use measures.

In summary, while these key elements provide council with a mandate and guidance for community-led planning toward community well-being, they are short on particulars in terms of cultural heritage. Despite multiple references in various acts, and directives from both central and local government, none prescribe or clearly delineate cultural heritage and well-being in any practicable or operational terms. The City Council, a demographically-large and powerful statutory stakeholder, both derives and influences the guiding principles enshrined in these statutes and provisions. Nonetheless, it struggles to meaningfully integrate community values into City Council policies and practices.

Working on a working definition...

Cultural well-being is defined by the MCH as the “...*vitality that communities and individuals enjoy through: participation in recreation, creative and cultural activities; and the freedom to retain, interpret and express their arts, history, heritage and traditions*”¹⁸. Developing a working definition of cultural heritage and well-being is critically overdue. Attempts have been made: both the Ministry for Culture and Heritage (MCH) and the Department of Internal Affairs have acknowledged and addressed the critical gap left by the absence of prescription in key legislation and policies. A series of national reports, a toolkit, and resource suggestions¹⁹ provide a (voluntary) starting point for debate within councils; thereby a sense of common ground is initiated. The reports include a literature review, bibliography, and consider “*a possible definition, [and] reports on what cultural well-being means in theory and practice, and discusses how it interacts with other types of well-being. [It also] focuses on the impact for local government*”²⁰. Current local government practices are set within an incomplete yet operational definition.

Local government asserts its position as a key provider and supporter of cultural activities: ranging from libraries, to multi-cultural festivals, to the underwriting of local regional arts organizations. Another governmental conception of “cultural heritage” – devised by the Auckland Regional Council and Manukau City Council – “*recognises the metaphysical or spiritual qualities of locations – and so it includes oral histories, churches, markets, and particular vistas*”²¹. It also “*represents those attributes, tangible and intangible, from the distant and more recent past, that establish a connection to former times, and are intrinsically linked to community identity, sense of place and spirituality*”²².

These conceptions represent powerful framing agencies, intentions, and expectations – all differently articulated by Auckland councils. In the end, despite the best intentions, culture ends up being supplemental to established economic models and development agendas, or approximated using such (unsuitable) frameworks. Given the imperatives for efficiency, accountability, and transparency (under the Local Government Act), the tendency to rule-based technical problem-solving is understandable; reinforced by the district plan and associated policies grafted into practice and place.

This tendency is unsurprisingly problematic, and results in at least three explicit cumulative and self-perpetuating features of cultural assessment. Firstly, there is a heavy reliance on (relative) statistical measurements and frameworks. Secondly, the assertion culture as physical evidence or interface is barely-questioned. Thirdly, it ingrains the marginalisation of heritage as a cultural factor within prevailing economic regimes of governmental and strategic planning.

Firstly, statistics determine the characteristics of communities and their (relative) values including cultural heritage. In the compilation of cultural statistics (by MCH, and Statistics New Zealand) into a “*cultural profile of Auckland*”²³ asserts culture as measurable and of quantifiable dimension; primarily these are derived from economic measures of utility. This is inherently problematic for experiential

and intangible dimensions of culture and cultural heritage.

Secondly, non-indigenous New Zealanders display a marked preference for natural and colonial-built heritage in its pristine form. Two long standing government entities concern mainly natural conservation and historic places, only in 1991 was the MCH established as a stand-alone ministry with a broader sense of culture.

The third feature embeds the former two positions by evolving capital from cultural heritage in the name of entrepreneurial cities and urban renewal. Consider the determined belief in the “...*efficacy of city marketing and place promotion in boosting urban competitiveness*”. In 2000, the City Council stated its aim to be “*First City of the Pacific*” by 2020. The City Council²⁴ also has the “ultimate goal” of making Auckland “*New Zealand’s most liveable city*”. This means “...*protecting the city’s valued natural features and character and heritage areas, focussing on quality, compact urban form and promoting strong communities that growth through business investment*”. Since then urban renewal efforts based on physical urban design and amenity were fast-tracked: heritage and amenity were central cues for marketing and community objectives.

Consequently, in practice, these three features culminate in a narrow one dimensional interpretation of cultural heritage: the physical, mainly the built, representations of culture, which are often stripped of their context and itemised. We argue for a cumulative approach to cultural heritage emphasising both *physical and context*. Next, we examine how history and heritage are misused and deflect our attention from sustainable heritage development and a better living environment.

If History and Heritage Were Viewed Rightly

In local government parlance “heritage” and “history” are conflated and used synonymously. Government and public alike need to extend to a more accurate and related understanding of these two critical elements of terminology related to cultural heritage and urban planning. The contested reality of everyday Auckland reflects the dissonant mutuality of history and heritage; a palimpsest of multiple and overlapping elements of humanity confounds attempts at governing cultural heritage. History, we believe, is the stories told or the chronicles of people, places, and events. Heritage encapsulates the tangible and intangible values that we receive from the past and give meaning to our present.

History, under governmental handling at policy level can be showcased in the document: “*A Place Sought by Many*”²⁵. Here, the Auckland Regional Council tells a community history as chronological – picked up by council, codified, underwriting strategies and lawmaking policy, and produced for public consumption – turned into “winning story” (rather than the best story, or even a better story²⁶). This policy-driven document stands behind the development of liveable community plans and strategies. In this discrete re-presentation of the past, history is itemised as a landmark chronicling of people, places and events, and should not be conflated with heritage. Authors and instigators of such a collection of “facts” can only aspire to represent the broader and genealogical (after Foucault) conceptions of heritage, let alone the values from which communities dynamically receive, retrieve and live out their histories and (cultural) values in continuous and everyday living and engagement.

Heritage is also captured as spectacle and commodifiable consumable usually appealing to “high culture”, events, and the spectacular (whether this is built or experienced). This is seen, for example, in tourism or in heritage policy. This attitude is attractive to entrepreneurial planning agendas as it adds to the “*economy of post-industrial places*”²⁷ promoting urban renewal and order. Paradoxically this renewal calls for a *re-discovery* of heritage while, unless care is taken, irreversible and destructive gentrification of cultural heritage takes place. Corporate sponsorship and joint ventures between local government and non-government entities reinforce the push to commodification and creative industry developments of cultural heritage. This manner fails to acknowledge that cultural heritage is also an everyday, continuous, disrupted, splintered, and mundane affair.

In other words, an emphasis on “*physical manifestations rather than the webs of meaning*”²⁸ denies the relational and symbolic depth in our communities; pervading our governing mentalities in self-fulfilling logic. Building on the ‘science’ of management in New Zealand, we need to co-develop the

art of governance and community, of which heritage provides a crucial insight and starting point.

Although the suburbs of metropolitan centres are the crucible of urban life, Gleeson²⁹ maintains that “... *they are poorly understood and their dynamism is so often not appreciated*”. Only glimpses of which can be found in the community stories, which represent history (or (hi)stories) and their living function deposits complex and often-competing layers as a genealogical archives and living landscapes. The confusing use of terminology inevitably means that cultural heritage remains elusive to council governance, and is prone to (symbolic) violence³⁰ through the predominance and continuation of dysfunctional relationships between the district plan, and poorly-produced council policies, and differentially-organised communities: overwhelmed by amount of information, regulation, statutory deadlines, and even the values of the public. Equally, statistics cannot provide planners with an adequately grounded conceptualisation so as to contribute to the changing spaces and places of heritage/stories of liveability in communities over time³¹. Many people do not see their concerns as being of (or being considered as) high importance; or that their views, which may be complex or nuanced, as sitting easily within the competing and prevailing mandated requirements.

The dynamic and multiple layers of cultural heritage and values are vital to our cultural well-being as we pursue liveable communities through public planning. It is imperative that we record and deliberate our definition and interpretation using illustrative cases and learning opportunities from implementation; one example is presented in the Panmure pilot scheme for Liveable Communities.

ANALYSIS OF POSITION: CRITIQUE AS DIAGNOSIS

Since reflective planning skills are not wrote learnt or acquired though “being told”, it is possible to discover and appropriate vital skills through “*experiential learning, reflective dialogue,³² and reflexive practice³³*”. On this basis, Panmure has much merit as a case study. The paradoxically diminishing cultural heritage emphasis via the Panmure Liveable Community Plan is explored in the following section. From our diagnostic position, we seek to illustrate what attempts were made toward acknowledging, activating, or preserving cultural heritage in Panmure. There are already imperatives to self-assess the position of cultural heritage in public governance. The long term council community plan standards of practice audit (SOP)³⁴ aims to identify “... *opportunities for improvement in [council] processes*”. Our assessment draws on these as a diagnosis in part answer to the question (as regards outcomes): does the City Council understand the needs and aspirations of its district and what it and other stakeholders can achieve? With regard to cultural heritage, we address two SOP audit questions³⁵: How does the City Council interpret and reconcile the community outcomes with its own views on key long-term sustainability and wellbeing issues? What does the City Council see as key long term well-being issues for the district/region? Planning in New Zealand is a pragmatic discipline focusing on statement and action, not just a framework³⁶. The long term council community plan assessment offers a welcome opportunity to review the current position.

Panmure in Context

Panmure, an eastern suburb of Auckland city, within the Auckland region (Figure 1 to 3) is at the forefront of urban regeneration. The style and extent of this change is unprecedented in local government planning and has serious repercussions for protecting cultural heritage in local communities. As a Liveable Community, Panmure was to be a springboard for overcoming significant difficulties through intensification; simultaneously accomplishing better urban living and community well-being. In this single-story garden suburb, a series of planning, consultation, drafting, public comment, and plan-finalisation lead to a significant “Plan change” to the Auckland Isthmus District Plan. The emphasis on “urban” living (rather than suburban lifestyle) evolved from, and was developed at the same time as, a multi-level range of growth management strategies in Greater Auckland, circa 1996-2000. In context, “*Auckland is set to grow by about 37 percent or 142,000 people by 2021³⁷. Panmure is expected to accommodate growth of 2400 people or 1850 homes³⁸. One of ten “Strategic Growth Management Areas*” (Figure 2) in the initial Programme, Panmure sits within the auspices of the larger, newly-monikered “Tamaki Edge”. In this project, urban renewal meets entrepreneurialism and education where State Housing, transit operators, University of Auckland, and private developers are partners in a radical and extensive urban transformation.

Figure 1 and 2: (within the Auckland Region) Auckland City's Proposed Strategic Growth Management Areas³⁹.

Explicitly, the central area of Panmure became a pilot liveable community project (Figure 3a and 3b). The idea was to fix the city from the inside out: the city council taking an entrepreneurial rather than caretaking role. The draft version promoted mixed-use, nodal development, integrated with public transport as a “pragmatic response” to booming population and failing infrastructure city-wide, and evident in Panmure. Part of Panmure’s local heritage stock dates from the state-led development during the 1940s/50s as post war housing for workers; changing demographic compositions since the Second World War period has been the result of “*employment changes, migration changes, and globalisation*”⁴⁰. Notably, the City Council district plan is now explicit that heritage that that which pre-dates 1940. Panmure’s “*revival*” started from a low base: where the neighbourhood was seen as “*dirt-poor and crime-ridden*”. Also commercial stability declined with “*the departure of the traditional stores like “Farmers” and “Hannahs” to nearby malls, and an influx of “\$2 shops” and massage parlours, brought the once-proud main street to its knees*”⁴¹. Urban rejuvenation fixated (Figure 3b) on the urban design (with a sense of pristine physical condition), inclining to a scorched earth policy, for all the niceties of the rhetoric, ideals and consultation. Protection was ultimately reserved for a narrowly articulated range of cultural heritage “features”, “activities”, or “facilities”.

In doing so, the focus was on physical and tangible manifestations whilst paying verbal tribute to wider and more indefinable cultural elements. The physical assessment and council-driven trajectories of cultural heritage and well-being suffer in the translation from vision into grounded reality. Legal requirements mean that Council must carry out an evaluation before publicly notifying a plan change. A Council report states that the long term council community plan holds “*a “community vision” that in 2020 Auckland will have an accessible, people-focussed, and revitalised city centre; liveable communities accommodating growth; attractive urban design and valued built heritage*”⁴². In effect, the policy instruments were designed, refined, and implemented with the sole ambition of radically transforming part of a largely suburban city into a quintessentially urban landscape⁴³; promoting the renaissance as “*the embodiment of individual freedom*”⁴⁴ in which we “*love to live, work and play*”⁴⁵.

Panmure holds much of its “heritage” in the syntax and spaces of the community and its interactive places (Figures 4 to 8): kids playing in state house driveways, gardens in sections, and nearby signature features (such as the Lagoon). This contrasts with other “character” areas of Auckland (like Howick, Remuera, or Parnell) where elegant examples of natural and built heritage are evident; though even there, despite a tangible link between heritage and money, development and financial feasibility often override cultural heritage conservation.

Figure 2a and b: Panmure “Liveable Community” area, with a redesign of Queens Rd shown in cross section⁴⁶.

“*Political apathy, bicultural complexities, inadequate resources, and a hotchpotch of methodological approaches have bedevilled the management of cultural heritage*” generally⁴⁷. The layers of spatio-legal rationality embedded in policy sought to encompass the wealth of people and cultures in Auckland city. Yet it crushed deep layers and perceptions of our sense of belonging and community that are represented in the “*...ideal of the familial Arcadia...*” and seen in the resultant morphological impacts on low density, single allotments⁴⁸, which can be witnessed across the city.

Nonetheless, the powerful boxing of the strategic imagination, clearly played out in the Panmure example, reinforced a one-dimensional physicality reinforced by rules and design codes framed by statistical collations and projections; aspirations to ensure pristine natural and built environments; and ideologically city transformations driven by Neoliberal hegemonies. These three governing mentalities persist even in recent documentation, subsequent to much revision and public consultation.

Figure 4-8: View of the main highway coming into Panmure toward Queens Road Roundabout (with the Panmure sign); partial view of Queens Rd; housing style and neighbourhood feeling (just behind Queens Rd)

Statistical and principle-based utilitarianism seemed to orchestrate the City Council plans and programmes confounding attempts to comprehensively address cultural heritage and well-being. The progression of plans appeared to gradually marginalise any meaningful focus on the spirit and community of Panmure as a community-led and sustainable cultural heritage development. Glossier and narrowly specified agendas (across a spectrum of elements from walking to community facilities to urban character) struggle to reflect the contested and layered composite of workaday history and living heritage that is Panmure. In the draft Plan, pictorial representations (Figure 3b) revealed community, heritage, activity, and people were subsidiary consequences of “good” urban design; the development of critical infrastructure; and the reshaping of public perception toward consensus and submission (and not of the District Plan kind!). This re-conception of Panmure was not widely accepted when the first council plan was presented at the local library. A central problem was that the whole process looked to be more informative and educative than participatory. Despite “consultation” throughout the process, at the draft presentation in the Mt Wellington Library, there was the perception that the whole project was a “*done deal*”⁴⁹.

Panmure’s cultural heritage and well-being can be seen to be removed from primary consideration in the near-final draft of the City Council’s re-design: from a broad interpretation in initial planning stages, ultimately, physical cultural heritage elements prevailed; even then, this was subsumed by overall intentions and interconnections with other plans. By recent times – after two local-body elections and internal restructuring that included employing more social planners and commissioning an artist to deliver a pictorial representation of a sense of place for Panmure – the emphasis is still clearly focussed on urban design codes and transportation and layered regional policies from regional strategies to “Tamaki Edge” to other targeted areas of change. None emphasise cultural heritage.

Interestingly, initial consultation documents held by the City Council clearly indicate elements of a broader awareness of intangible values of cultural heritage and well-being: including perceptions from a Maori focus group that developed less physical attributes of culture – such as attractiveness (native planting, visibly Maori language on signs) and sense of belonging (relationships, knowledge of local history, Maori tikanga)⁵⁰. This has not translated well into any of Panmure’s liveable communities programmes. In “*order of importance*”, an early Council report places “*develop[ing] a sense of place and strengthen[ing] community identity with Panmure*” first on a list of nine key elements to the Plan⁵¹; in ninth place is the need to “*protect the views and walkways on Mount Wellington and around the Basin*”. Somehow, in the planning process, the broader construct of cultural heritage became marginalised and narrowed within urban living agendas. Equally, the Council’s strategic direction (in 1999-2000 workshops) places “*celebrating and recognising diverse peoples and culture*” in third place (after “*effective transport*”, and “*effective leadership for the city and region*”)⁵².

“*Political language is designed to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind*” (attributed to George Orwell). Cultural heritage interpretations give weight and solidity to tangible and omit the value to context and intangibility with the choice of blunt planning instrumentation and mentalities. We argue, following Thompson-Fawcett⁵³, that Panmure represents “... *yet another demonstration of mistaken expectations being placed on urban design*”. This plan represented a radical rezoning based on physical aspects and “tenacious” New Urbanist tendencies⁵⁴. Simply put, cultural heritage and well-being got lost in the unwieldy solidity of regulation and evidence – a “... *long train of records, surveys, proposals, statistics and glossy brochures about managing growth*” on a variety of principles, elements, terminology, coalitions, and intentions: where “... *the average citizen could not be expected to understand the vast amount of literature and information that has been produced in recent years on the growth strategies prepared for Auckland City and the region as a whole*”. Arguably, the nature and deference to culture(s) in public policy and planning practice constitute telling narratives that contest history and heritage in our local communities. In planning for cultural heritage and well-being, “the ability to anticipate and respond sensitively and creatively to complex differences of standpoint, background, race, gender, cultural, and political history” is a difficult and critical task.

PROBLEMS FOR EXPLORATION

Panmure has provided a learning ground, one where lessons have only been partly learnt. We accept the efforts and achievements of the City Council demonstrated in (subsequent) applications of the

liveable community programme. Layers of identity and built environment over time are critically important. While superficially recognised in meta-policies and mandates, the operational aspects are unsatisfactory. We need to consider what layers we are adding to history and heritage. Educated reflection and response is needed to change how local government planners see heritage as a key part of urban planning, and more importantly as a dynamic economic and social systems and international contexts. The implications for the activation and implementation of such thinking through existing or revised policy instruments are immense, and only briefly considered here.

In this way, we have identified some areas for exploration; some have been briefly addressed here. Other issues for attention include the call for further research and attention into expanding the current position of cultural heritage in the Council's planning and communities with regard to, for example: the conflation of history and heritage; the continued privileging of art over culture, acknowledging the necessary dissonance of culture and cultural heritage through the uncomfortable coexistence of values from instrumental profit/utility, to ecological effects, and many possible layers of interpretation, for example. We might also return to some of the caveats addressed at the beginning of this paper.

At this point, rather than attempt yet another "*rush to theoretical order ... we prefer to read the textures of urbanity through the rhythms, interstices, and remaindered spaces and times of the "everyday" urban experience itself*". The Council failed spectacularly to do this in Panmure with unsurprising and ongoing consequences. The kind of thinking proposed by the communitarian and New Urbanist thinkers backing the liveable community programme reduces the idea of community, and mainstreams its cultural heritage, to the known, solid, and the local. We would extend this thinking "celebrating connectedness in a wide variety of often-distanciated identities and common causes"⁵⁵; found in the unbounded and "hybrid places" and spaces of the cosmopolis "... occupied by overlapping and fragmented identities and social groups and consumed economically by multiple markets"⁵⁶. We need to remember that "...nothing comes without its world", making the knowledge of that world crucial to meaningful planning.

It is necessary to expose and explore the different rationalities and their associated assumptions through "tales from the field"; exposing the incongruence of the persistence of the rational paradigm⁵⁷. This comes from a sense of lack, according to Latham⁵⁸: a lack "of centred-ness, of authenticity, of history ... [which] has in many subtle but important ways informed the development of planning theory and practice in New Zealand". In Panmure some attention has been paid to this lack with the creation of wonderful pictorial representation capturing and reflecting Panmure's culture, heritage and well-being. Yet, even this remedy does not go far enough. Planning is a practical and performative, therefore ultimately actions are required; meaning that broader attempts at understanding cultural heritage in context can get lost in their intangible representations. Striking the balance is the art of governance we must strive to constantly negotiate and engage. Even from these simple lessons, subsequent areas of change, such as neighbouring Glen Innes, Avondale, and Newmarket have benefited from these lessons. Much more work remains to be done in this arena.

In conclusion, cultural heritage remains a problematic dimension of planning practice and implementation. We assert that the fundamental understandings of cultural heritage and well-being in the policies and guidelines of the City Council do not extend far enough to achieve their stated ends. We do not prescribe better alternatives but merely diagnose existing attitudes to cultural heritage planning in New Zealand. In particular, the three governmentalities: statistical and Neoliberal framing of built and natural heritage is detrimental to meaningful planning in Auckland. Future areas of research could engage with the caveats and limitations mentioned earlier. Strands of inquiry into localised communities would be a welcome start toward a more comprehensive approach and a better understanding the context *and* the physical elements of the community's cultural heritage values. The authors argue a comprehensive approach to cultural heritage that includes context will realize a better living environment. We must plan with the recognition that cultural heritage makes a small but vital contribution in shaping our identities, belonging, and security in our contemporary urban worlds.

¹ T Austin and C Whitehead, 'Auckland: Cappuccino city?' *Urban Policy & Research (UPR)*, 16:3, 1998; Tom

Fookes, 'Auckland's Regional Growth Policy: Developments during the last two decades', *UPR*, 13:4, 1995

² Hawkes, 'The fourth pillar of sustainability: culture's essential role in public planning'

³ UN ESCAP 'Country Paper: New Zealand' accessed at <http://www.unescap.org/huset/lgstudy/country/newzealand/nz.html> on 30 August, 2005

⁴ UN ESCAP 'Country Paper: New Zealand'

⁵ Jon Hawkes, 'The fourth pillar of sustainability: culture's essential role in public planning', Common Ground Publishing Pty in association with Cultural Development Network (Vic.): Melbourne, 2001

⁶ Auckland City Council, 'Section 32 Report: Plan Change 059, Isthmus District Plan: Pilkington Road - Jellicoe Road Area, Panmure, Residential 8 Rezoning', Auckland, 2004, p.2

⁷ see also Harvey Perkins and David Thorns, 'A decade on: reflections on the Resource Management Act and the practice of urban planning in New Zealand', *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 28:2001

⁸ Resource Management Act 1991, Part 2, section 2, emphasis added

⁹ B Gleeson, 'Reforming Planning Legislation: A New Zealand Perspective', *UPR*, 12:2, 1994; K Grundy, 'Re - Examining the Role of Statutory Planning in New Zealand', *UPR*, 13:4, 1995

¹⁰ Ministry for the Environment, 'The Importance of Plans', accessed at <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/rma/everyday-overview-jun04/html/page4.html> on 27 August, 2005

¹¹ Auckland Regional Council and Auckland City Council, 'Central Sector Agreement' 2004, Schedule 4, p28 http://www.arc.govt.nz/arc/library/t30582_2.pdf

¹² LGA02, Part 2 s10(b)

¹³ Auckland City Council, 'Focus on the Future 2004-2014', Auckland, 2004, p.1

¹⁴ Auckland City Council, 'Focus on the Future', p4

¹⁵ Auckland City Council, 'Panmure's Future: The Panmure Liveable Community Plan', Auckland, 2002, p. 25

¹⁶ see for example, Richard Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How it's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*, Basic Books: New York, 2002; A Duany and E Plater-Zyberk, 'The neighbourhood, the district and the quarter', in P Katz (ed) *The New Urbanism*, McGraw-Hill: New York, 1992

¹⁷ Cr. Bruce Hucker, pers. comm.

¹⁸ MCH Report 1

¹⁹ Ministry of Cultural Heritage, 'Cultural Well-being - What is it?' <http://www.mch.govt.nz/cwb/index.html>; MCH 'Literature review: Cultural Well-Being and Local Government', June 2005 [composed of three reports: Report 1: Definitions and contexts of cultural well-being; Report 2: Resources for developing cultural strategies and measuring cultural well-being; Report 3: Bibliography].

²⁰ MCH Report 1

²¹ A Coffin, 'The Role of Auckland Regional Council in Heritage', Draft report, ARC: Auckland, 2005; see also Auckland Regional Council (ARC), 'What is Cultural Heritage?', ARC: Auckland, 2005a; ARC, 'The Cultural Heritage Inventory. An Information Base for Cultural Heritage Management'; ARC: Auckland, 2005b; ARC, 'Guidelines: Assessing Historic Heritage Significance'; ARC: Auckland, 2005c

²² MCH Report 2

²³ MCH and Statistics New Zealand, 'A Cultural Profile of Auckland'

²⁴ Auckland City Council, 'Creating NZ's most liveable city', p.1

²⁵ Auckland Regional Growth Forum, *A place sought by many: a brief history of regional planning for Auckland's growth*, Auckland Regional Growth Forum: Auckland, NZ, 1997

²⁶ See, for example, Graham Bush and Auckland Regional Authority, 'Auckland now! Auckland 2000!: evolving strategies for the region', Auckland, 1988; Graham Bush, 'Decently and in order; the government of the city of Auckland 1840-1971: The centennial history of the Auckland City Council', Collins: Auckland, 1971

²⁷ Robyn Dowling, 'Planning for Culture in Urban Australia', *Australian Geographical Studies*, 35:1, 1997, p.25

²⁸ Dowling, 'Planning for Culture in Urban Australia', p.29

²⁹ Brendan Gleeson, 'Australia's suburbs: aspiration and exclusion', *UPR*, 20, 2002, p229

³⁰ Michael Gunder, Clare Mouat, 'Symbolic Violence and Victimisation in Planning Processes: A Reconnoitre of the New Zealand Resource Management Act', *Planning Theory* 1:2, 2002

³¹ Such as seen in the case of Massey used in K Witten, T McCreanora and R Kearns, 'The Place of Neighbourhood in Social Cohesion: Insights from Massey, West Auckland', *UPR*, 21:4, 2003; and in Sandringham in Wardlow Friesen, L Murphy and R Kearns, 'Spiced-Up Sandringham: Indian Transnationalism and New Suburban Spaces in Auckland, New Zealand', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31:2, 2005

³² Patricia A Wilson, 'Building Social Capital', *Urban Studies*, 34:5-6, 1997

³³ Joe Howe and Colin Langdon, 'Towards a Reflexive Planning Theory', *Planning Theory*, 1:3, 2002

³⁴ under s84(4) of the Act

³⁵ LTCCP SOP Audit Q2.3 and Q2.3.1 respectively accessed on August 18, 2005, http://www.oag.govt.nz/HomePageFolders/LTCCP/docs/LTCCP_Self%20assessment.pdf; note that 'From 2006, the Auditor-General has a new statutory duty to issue opinions on local authorities' LTCCPs under sections 84(4) and 94 of the Local Government Act 2002', <http://www.oag.govt.nz/HomePageFolders/LTCCP/LTCCP.htm>

³⁶ Yvonne Rydin, 'Conflict, Consensus, and Rationality in Environmental Planning: An Institutional Discourse Approach', Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2003

-
- ³⁷ Auckland City Council, 'Creating NZ's most liveable city', *actionauckland: news about projects from the Urban Living Initiative*, 13, 2005, p.1; Auckland City Council, Section 32 Report: Plan Change 059, p.2
- ³⁸ Auckland City Council, Panmure's Future, p.3
- ³⁹ Auckland Regional Council, 'Information about the Auckland Region' 2000, <http://arc.govt.nz/about/general/region.html> Accessed: 26 June 2000; Auckland City Council, 'Growing Our City through Liveable Communities: 2050', Auckland, August 1999, 8
- ⁴⁰ Burnetta Van Stipriaan and Hill Young Cooper, 'Panmure Community Workshop 2: Workshop held on the 11 April 2001 at the Panmure Community Centre', Hill Young Cooper: Auckland, 2001
- ⁴¹ Bernard Orsman, Five projects set to revitalise Auckland's 'Tamaki Edge', New Zealand Herald Online: 05.04.2003, 2003: accessed at <http://www.nzherald.co.nz/storyprint.cfm?storyID=3350888>
- ⁴² Auckland City Council, Section 32 Report: Plan Change 059, p.1-2, emphasis added
- ⁴³ Latham, 'Urban Renewal, Heritage Planning', p. 285; Cr Bruce Hucker, pers. comm
- ⁴⁴ Latham, 'Urban Renewal, Heritage Planning', p. 285
- ⁴⁵ Auckland City Council slogan,
- ⁴⁶ Auckland City Council 'Growth Management Strategy: Area Profile – Panmure', <http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/council/documents/growthstrategy/panmure.asp>, Auckland, 2003, Accessed 2 December 2005; Auckland City Council, 'Proposed Liveable Community Plan - Panmure', Report to Council from the Manager Environmental Planning. Auckland, 259-67pp. (17 July 2000)
- ⁴⁷ Sara Donaghey, 'What is Aught, but as 'tis Values? An analysis of strategies for the assessment of cultural heritage significance in New Zealand', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 7:4, 2001, p.366
- ⁴⁸ Alan Latham, 'Urban Renewal, Heritage Planning and the Remaking of an Inner-city Suburb: A Case Study of Heritage Planning in Auckland, New Zealand', *Planning Practice and Research*, 15:4, 2000, p. 285
- ⁴⁹ Bernard Orsman, 'High-rise horrors instead of houses', The New Zealand Herald Online: 29 November, 2000: accessed at <http://www.nzherald.co.nz/storyprint.cfm?storyID=162372>
- ⁵⁰ Auckland City Council, 'Report to Project Team Focus Group with Maori Residents of Panmure, Auckland, 1999. Tikanga is defined in the RMA as 'Maori customary values and practices'.
- ⁵¹ Auckland City Council 'Report to Council: Proposed Liveable Community Plan – Panmure', 17 July, 2000
- ⁵² Auckland City Council, 'Panmure Workshop Presentation', 26 March, 2001, slide 10
- ⁵³ M Thompson-Fawcett, 'Engaging with a Tenacious New Urbanism', *PT&Practice*, 4:2, 2003, p.212
- ⁵⁴ Thompson-Fawcett, 'Engaging with a Tenacious New Urbanism',
- ⁵⁵ Simon Parker, 'Communities in Common', *City*, 9:1, 2005, p.147-148
- ⁵⁶ Brian Graham, 'Heritage as Knowledge: Capital or Culture?' *Urban Studies*, 39:5-6, 2002, p.1016
- ⁵⁷ Howie Baum, 'Why the Rational Paradigm Persists', *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 15:2, 1996
- ⁵⁸ Latham, 'Urban Renewal, Heritage Planning', p.285

Presented at the 8th Australasian Urban Planning History Conference, February 2006, Wellington NZ