

## COUNCIL 28. 2. 2013

### COMMUNITY, RECREATION AND CULTURE COMMITTEE 5 FEBRUARY 2013

**A meeting of the Community, Recreation and Culture Committee  
was held in the Committee Room 1  
on Tuesday 5 February 2013 at 9am**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Yani Johanson (Chairperson)  
Councillors Peter Beck, Helen Broughton, Barry Corbett, Jimmy Chen,  
Jamie Gough, and Glenn Livingstone (Deputy Chairperson).

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Beck, Corbett, Chen and Gough arrived at 10.40am.

An apology for absence was received and accepted from Councillor Carter.

An apology for early departure was received and accepted from Councillor Broughton, who left the meeting at 11.51am and was absent for clauses 4 and 6.

Councillor Broughton arrived at 10.45am and was absent for part of clause 5.

The Chairperson opened the meeting at 9am, and moved that the Committee adjourn its meeting until 10.30am, to allow Councillors to attend an urgent meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Livingstone, and when put to the meeting was declared **carried**.

The meeting reconvened at 10.40am.

The Committee reports that:

#### **PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**

##### **1. HERITAGE INCENTIVE GRANTS PROPOSED AMENDED OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	City Planning Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Brendan Smyth, Heritage, Architecture and Urban Design

#### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to obtain approval from the Council for amendments to the Operational Guidelines of the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) scheme.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The existing HIG Operational Guidelines were created for the pre-earthquake environment. The proposed amendments outlined below (and presented as **Attachment 1**) attempts to align the guidelines to the current circumstances by seeking to arrest loss of and encourage repair to the remaining heritage building stock in Christchurch following the earthquakes of 2010 and 2011. The need for this review was submitted as part of the 2012/13 Strategy and Planning Group (SPG) heritage work programme for consideration and subsequently approved by the Council.

1 Cont'd

3. The City and Banks Peninsula have sustained significant loss of heritage buildings (refer **Attachment 2**) and substantial damage to many of those that remain. Officer experience with many owners has shown that these buildings were rarely insured for full replacement costs, with many only being insured for their indemnity value. Recent changes in the Building Code for the Canterbury region, in particular an increase in the Zone Factor for Seismicity from 0.22 up to 0.3, have resulted in significantly higher seismic compliance costs and the extent of repair work will often trigger the requirement for full compliance with the fire and access provisions of the code. The burden of repair has fallen with owners who have possibly lost tenants and hence rental income on top of the damage and upgrade costs. This situation frequently leads to a funding gap and a serious threat to the repair and retention of the building. One way to bridge this gap is through grant applications to either the Canterbury Earthquake Heritage

Buildings Fund Trust (CEHBF) or to the Council for HIG funding. The changes proposed in this report aim to make the Council's HIG scheme more relevant to the post-earthquake environment and more able to meet the current needs of heritage building owners. As a consequence HIGs could better provide the Council with a means to persuade owners to invest in their buildings with the hoped for outcome that more are retained.

**DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSALS**

4. The principal change proposed to the HIG Operational Guidelines is to remove the graded percentage limitations for the different group listings which range from 30-50 per cent. This would allow the Council to choose to fund up to 50 per cent of the approved work to any listed heritage building based on an assessment of its heritage significance post earthquake. Under the existing HIG guidelines, many building owners are eligible for less than a third of the cost of repairs, upgrades and maintenance to their buildings. The 50 per cent level of support is currently only available to City Plan Group 1 buildings and Protected Buildings in Banks Peninsula that are Category 1 with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga (NZHPT). Banks Peninsula Notable buildings are only eligible for a maximum of 30 per cent and City Plan Group 4 buildings up to 30 per cent. However, given the dramatic reduction to the number of listed items following the earthquakes, the existing listings may not reflect the actual heritage values and significance of those remaining listed buildings. For example, it may be that a dwelling identified in the plan as a Group 4 building is now the only remaining example of its type and could be considered as having greater significance. If the Council is able to fund up to 50 per cent of approved works on all listed buildings, HIG funding would be much more attractive to the owners of heritage buildings in the lower group classifications and make it a more effective tool for preserving these at risk heritage buildings.
5. A second proposed change is that the threshold levels for covenants be raised to reflect construction price inflation over the past decade; to create parity with other grant funding streams; and to reduce Council administration costs. The Statistics New Zealand Civil Construction Index 1999 – 2012 shows cumulative inflation of approximately 65 per cent. Under the current guidelines the threshold for a Limited Conservation Covenant (historically not more than 20 years before expiring) is a grant of \$5,000 to \$49,999, and over \$50,000 in grant funding requires a Full Conservation Covenant (in perpetuity). This proposal is to increase the threshold, with grant funding of \$15,000 to \$149,999 requiring a Limited Conservation Covenant and grants of \$150,000 or more being subject to a compulsory requirement for a Full Conservation Covenant. The proposed figures have been raised relative to the minimum figure in the current HIG policy to reflect construction cost inflation, both over time and resulting from the earthquakes. This will encourage and accelerate small scale grant applications where relatively minor works will secure the repair, maintenance and ultimately retention of the listed item. The requirement for a conservation covenant on the title of a property can act as a deterrent to some applicants due to the fear that it will detract from the value of the site. In addition it brings about the need for covenant consent applications for all future alterations which may be vetoed by the Council. There is also an administrative cost for the Council in managing conservation covenants that could be reduced if relatively minor works were exempted. The requirement for a full covenant will also be brought more into line with other

**1 Cont'd**

grant fund requirements such as the CEHBF which sets its minimum for a covenant at \$150,000.

6. A third proposed change is that the temporary stabilisation of parts of buildings, where it clearly relates to a longer programme for retention, be eligible for HIG grant support. This is particularly relevant where façade retention is the only option to save part of a building. This was not identified in the original guidelines as it was not considered to be best practice conservation; however, in the post earthquake environment it would mean that HIG funding could provide a tool for supporting partial retention of badly damaged listed buildings as part of a phased programme of works.
7. Finally, to ensure high quality design and appropriate detailing with regards to work on heritage buildings, it is proposed that grants can be used for the professional fees for NZ Institute of Architects (NZIA) registered architects, Institute of Professional Engineers (IPENZ) professional structural engineers and NZ Institute of Quantity Surveyors (NZIQS) registered quantity surveyors where the work relates to the approved scope of work. Heritage buildings are frequently highly complex structures with complex architectural and engineering detailing required to ensure repairs and changes are undertaken with minimal damage to the fabric. This change to the guidelines will help to ensure that the appropriate professional skills are employed to undertake the design and monitoring of grant funded works to heritage buildings.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. There are no financial implications from these changes for the Council. The annual HIG fund will remain the same. The only difference will be that greater discretion will be allowed by Council Staff, the Community, Recreation and Culture Committee and when required full Council, to recommend and approve proportionately larger grants to buildings within Groups 2 to 4 and for Banks Peninsula 'Notable' Buildings.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?**

9. Yes. The Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

10. Limited Conservation Covenants would still be required under the Heritage Conservation Policy for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants. However the limits would be raised to take into account significant construction cost inflation in the past ten years and particularly since the earthquakes of 2010 and 2011. The new thresholds for Limited Covenants would be for grants between \$15,000 and \$149,999 and for a Full Covenant the threshold would be for grants above \$150,000.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

11. Yes. Covenants generally are a more comprehensive form of protection of the buildings because they are registered against the property title, ensuring that the Council's investment is protected.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

12. The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcome '*An attractive and well-designed City*' (LTCCP 2009-19, page 50). 'Community Outcome 9. Development' provides for, among other things, ensuring "*our lifestyles and heritage are enhanced by our urban environment*" (page 54). One of the success measures is that "*Our heritage is protected for future generations*" (page 54). "*Progress will be measured using these headline indicators ... number of heritage buildings, sites and objects.*" (page 54). Heritage Incentive Grants

1 Cont'd

contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is the measure under the outcome.

13. Within the 'Activities and Services' section of the LTCCP, is 'City planning and development' which aims to help improve Christchurch's urban environment, among other things. One of the activities included in 'City planning and development' is 'Heritage protection'. *"A city's heritage helps to sustain a sense of community identity, provides links to the past, and helps to attract visitors. The Council is committed to protecting the heritage of our city and works with developers, landowners and other stakeholders to conserve heritage buildings, areas and other items"* (page 187).
14. 'Heritage Protection', requires the Council to *"Research and promote the heritage of Christchurch and Banks Peninsula. Work with developers, landowners and other stakeholders to conserve heritage areas, buildings, and other items. Promote development that is sensitive to the character and heritage of the city and existing communities."* (page 192). The Council provides information, advice and funding for city heritage and heritage conservation, and will be expected to continue to do so, as part of its objective to retain heritage items.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?**

15. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

16. Alignment of the requirement for Heritage Incentive Grants and Conservation Covenants stems from the Heritage Conservation Policy which in turn is relevant to:

Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS)

17. Heritage development projects provide opportunities for increased commercial and residential activity in the City while at the same time enhancing the heritage townscape. The UDS considers heritage as an integral part of Christchurch and an aspect of growth management provided for is through the protection, maintenance and enhancement of heritage.

Christchurch City Plan

18. Heritage redevelopment projects are consistent with the Heritage provisions of the City Plan: Volume 2, Section 4, City Identity, Objective 4.3 Heritage Protection provides for objectives and policies in relation to Heritage protection. It recognises that Christchurch is a cultural and tourist centre, a role mainly dependent on its architectural, historic and scenic attractions. Much of its distinctive character is derived from buildings, natural features, other places and objects which have over time, become an accepted part of the cityscape and valued features of the City's identity. Protection of heritage places includes cultural, architectural, areas of character, intrinsic or amenity value, visual appeal or of special significance to the Tangata Whenua, for spiritual, cultural or historical reasons. This protection may extend to include land around that place or feature to ensure its protection and reasonable enjoyment. A heritage item may include land, sites, areas, buildings, monuments, objects, archaeological sites, sacred sites, landscape or ecological features in public or private ownership.

Banks Peninsula District Plan

19. Heritage protection is consistent with the Cultural Heritage provisions of the Banks Peninsula District Plan. These are detailed in chapter 14, Cultural Heritage, Objective 1, and Policies 1A and 1B, p.74.

The Christchurch Central Recovery Plan

20. The Plan is a critical statutory document. From the time of notification (31 July 2012) of this Recovery Plan, those exercising functions or powers under the Resource Management Act 1991 must not make decisions that are inconsistent with the Recovery Plan. If there is an inconsistency, the Recovery Plan prevails.

1 Cont'd

New Zealand Urban Design Protocol

21. Heritage projects improve the quality and design of the urban environment by protecting the heritage of the city, which is stated in the Protocol as being an attribute of successful towns and cities. The Limited Covenants will contribute towards the implementation of the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol of March 2005 of which the Council is a signatory body.

Heritage Conservation Policy

22. The Heritage Incentive Grants are provided for under section 8 of the Heritage Conservation Policy. As noted above under the LTCCP heading, the Heritage Conservation Policy aligns with the Community Outcome "An attractive and well-designed City" through the indicator "Number of heritage buildings, sites and objects".
23. The Heritage Grants Policy is aligned with the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 1993 for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, which the Council has adopted. The concept of places incorporates landscape, buildings, archaeological sites, sacred places, gardens and other objects. ICOMOS considers that countries have a "general responsibility towards humanity" to safeguard their heritage for present and future generations.

Christchurch Recovery Strategy

24. This Recovery Strategy is the key reference document that guides and coordinates the programmes of work, including Recovery Plans, under the CER Act. Retention and conservation of restorable heritage buildings, places, archaeological sites and places of cultural significance, and restoration of access to heritage collections, will help recreate that distinctive sense of place and identity that has defined the region and contributed to its economic development.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

25. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

26. There is no requirement for community consultation for Heritage Incentive Grants or Covenants.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council amend the Operational Guidelines of the Heritage Incentive Grants (HIGs) scheme as follows:

- (a) Allowing all groups and classifications of listed heritage buildings in both the City Plan and the Banks Peninsula District Plan to be awarded Heritage Incentive Grants of up to 50 per cent of the cost of approved works to heritage fabric.
- (b) Raising the threshold levels for the requirement of a conservation covenants to the levels of between \$15,000 and \$149,999 for a Limited Covenant and for a Full Covenant the threshold would be above \$150,000.
- (c) Allowing the temporary stabilisation of parts of buildings to be eligible for HIG grant support where this work relates to a longer programme for retention.
- (d) Allowing professional fees to be included in a grant when the professionals are registered with the NZIA, IPENZ and the NZIQS.

**COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

During the discussion of the report, the Committee queried whether staff had evaluated the response to heritage recovery post earthquake, and requested that a Committee workshop be held on this matter.

1 Cont'd

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

**2. HERITAGE INCENTIVE GRANTS SIX MONTHLY REPORT**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI: 941-8281
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	City Planning Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Brendan Smyth, Architecture, Heritage and Urban Design

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on the Heritage Incentive Grants and Covenants approved during the period 1 July 2012 to 30 December 2012. Also to advise the Council of any covenants that have been removed under the delegated authority of the General Manager, Strategy and Planning.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Table 1 provides a summary of Heritage Incentive Grants and covenants approved during the period 1 July 2012 to 30 December 2012. The table also shows the Heritage Incentive Grant Fund has a total budget of **\$1,269,183** for the 2012/13 financial year. Three new grants had been approved from the 2012/13 budget by 31 December 2012 and one transfer of funds to the Canterbury Earthquake Heritage Building Fund Trust (CEHBF).

**Table 1: Heritage incentive grants and transfers approved by committee July 2012 to December 2012:**

	<b>2012/13</b>
<b>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</b>	<b>\$763,684</b>
<b>Funds remaining from 2011/12 financial year</b>	<b>\$505,499</b>
<b>Balance of 12/13 funds</b>	<b>\$1,269,183</b>
Approved grant to 284 – 294 Kilmore Street	\$48,924
Approved grant to 236 Tuam (McKenzie & Willis)	\$240,000
Council approved transfer to CEHBF	\$254,690
Approved grant to 72 Chancellor Street	\$3,252
<b>Total Available Funds 2012/13</b>	<b>\$722,317</b>

3. Statements of Heritage Significance, which have been provided as part of the decision making process for each grant application are attached for reference (refer **Attachments 1, 2, 3 and 4**).

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. Heritage Incentive Grants are budgeted for on an annual basis through the Council's Long Term Plan (LTP). The total Heritage Incentive Grant Fund budget via the Annual Plan 2012/13 is \$763,684. The Council on 17 September 2012 confirmed carry forward of the 2011/12 unspent Heritage Incentive Grants monies resulting in the available current sum of \$1,269,183.00.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?**

5. Yes. The Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

2 Cont'd

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6. Limited Conservation Covenants are required under the Heritage Conservation Policy for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of \$5,000 to \$49,999. A Full Conservation Covenant is required for grants of \$50,000 or more. Delegated Authority given to the General Manager of Strategy and Planning for the removal of conservation covenants following the demolition of the building as a result of the earthquakes has been used on two occasions. 278 -282 High Street (Fisher's Building) and 759 Colombo Street were both demolished following the earthquakes and the owner's requested that the covenants, or Heritage Grant Agreement in the case of 278 High Street, be removed from the title or surrendered and this has been undertaken.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

7. Yes. Covenants are a more comprehensive form of protection for the buildings because they are registered against the property title, ensuring that the Council's investment is protected. For all grants approved in the period 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2012, covenants have been required as a condition of grant approval where the value of the grant exceed \$5,000.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

8. The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcome '*An attractive and well-designed City*' (LTCCP 2009-19, page 50). 'Community Outcome 9. Development' provides for, among other things, ensuring "*our lifestyles and heritage are enhanced by our urban environment*" (page 54). One of the success measure is that "*Our heritage is protected for future generations*" (page 54). "*Progress will be measured using these headline indicators ... number of heritage buildings, sites and objects.*" (page 54). Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is the measure under the outcome.
9. Within the 'Activities and Services' section of the LTCCP, is 'City planning and development' which aims to help improve Christchurch's urban environment, among other things. One of the activities included in 'City planning and development' is 'Heritage protection'. "*A city's heritage helps to sustain a sense of community identity, provides links to the past, and helps to attract visitors. The Council is committed to protecting the heritage of our city and works with developers, landowners and other stakeholders to conserve heritage buildings, areas and other items*" (page 187).
10. 'Heritage Protection', requires the Council to "*Research and promote the heritage of Christchurch and Banks Peninsula. Work with developers, landowners and other stakeholders to conserve heritage areas, buildings, and other items. Promote development that is sensitive to the character and heritage of the city and existing communities.*" (page 192). The Council provides information, advice and funding for city heritage and heritage conservation, and will be expected to continue to do so, as part of its objective to retain heritage items.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?**

11. Yes.

**2 Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

12. Alignment of the requirement for Heritage Incentive Grants and Conservation Covenants stems from the Heritage Conservation Policy which in turn is relevant to:
- Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS)
  - Christchurch City Plan and Banks Peninsula District Plan
  - Central City Revitalisation Strategy
  - New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

13. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

14. There is no requirement for community consultation for Heritage Incentive Grants or Covenants.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council receive the report for the period 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2012.

**COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

The Committee queried the current status of the McKenzie and Willis building, and requested that staff provide information by way of a memo to Councillors prior to the Council meeting on 28 February 2013, including reference to the conditions placed on the heritage incentive grant for this building.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

**3. EXPRESSION OF INTEREST FOR TRUSTEES FOR COUNCIL'S EVENTS TRUSTS**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	Lydia Aydon, General Manager Public Affairs, DDI: 941-8982
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Richard Stokes, Marketing and Events Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Richard Stokes, Marketing and Events Unit Manager

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. To seek the Council's approval to call for Expressions of Interest for volunteer Trustees to be appointed to the Garden Events Trust and the World Buskers Festival Trust.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Since establishment of the Garden Events Trust (December 2008) and the World Buskers Festival Trust (July 2010) and the appointment of Trustees by the Council, a number of the volunteer Trustees have resigned, for a variety of reasons. Both Trusts now require appointment of new Trustees to enable their effective operation in support of their respective events - the Ellerslie International Flower Show and the World Buskers Festival. It is proposed that an Expression of Interests process be advertised calling for Expressions of Interest for Trustees. Upon assessment of applications received, a report to the Community, Recreation and Culture Committee would be actioned with recommendations for appointment of Trustees to the respective Trusts.



**3 Cont'd**

**BACKGROUND**

3. The Garden Events Trust was established to mirror the structure in place for operation of the Ellerslie International Flower Show, prior to Council ownership. The Trust works alongside the Ellerslie International Flower Show Management Company for the purpose of sourcing community grants and gaming funding to be distributed to not for profit community groups or organisations to enable them to compete or exhibit at the Show. The Trust is not involved in the organisation or management of the Show.
4. The World Buskers Festival Trust was established in July 2010 following the purchase of the World Buskers Festival by the Council. The Trust is licensed by the Council to use the World Buskers Festival intellectual property, owned by the Council, to operate the festival. A Supply of Services agreement is in place for the Council to provide the event management services to the Trust. This agreement included a three year 'transition' period during which the Council would move up to provide 100 per cent of the event management services for the festival. This period is now complete, with a World Buskers Festival Manager in place within the Council's events staff. The Council also supports the Festival with financial management and marketing.
5. New Trustees are required for both Trusts, with a minimum of two new trustees required for the Garden Events Trust to enable efficient operation of the Trust and three new Trustees required for the World Buskers Festival Trust to meet requirements of the Trust Deed.
6. It is proposed that applications are called for through an Expression of Interest process. Applications would be reviewed against the following factors:
  - Networking and interpersonal skills
  - Connectivity with the event
  - Fit with skills of current Trustees
  - Independence from vested interests
  - Experience in accessing funding.
7. Upon closing of applications, staff will assess applications and make recommendations to the Community, Recreation and Culture Committee for appointment of new Trustees for a three year term and reconfirmation of current Trustees willing to extend their term of appointment.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. Effective operation of the Trusts is required to source community grants and gaming funding to support the charitable objectives of the Ellerslie International Flower Show and World Buskers Festival. Without this funding some content within the festivals would not occur.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?**

9. Yes.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

10. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

11. Events and Festivals Activity Management Plan

**3 Cont'd**

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

12. Christchurch Events Strategy 2007-17.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

13. No public consultation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council approve an Expression of Interest process to be advertised requesting applications for volunteer Trustees positions for the Garden Events Trust and the World Buskers Festival Trust.

**COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

In relation to the Garden Events Trust, the Committee requested that staff provide the Committee with copies of any annual reports or provide a yearly update to the relevant Committee on the previous years events.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

**4. DEMOLITION OF A SMALL TOILET BLOCK BESIDE SUMNER SURF LIFE SAVING CLUB**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Corporate Services Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Lucy Brown, Project Manager

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council resolution for the demolition of a Council owned toilet block beside Sumner Surf Life Saving Club (SSLSC).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The entire footprint of the building is a concrete block "T" shaped structure which contains both the Sumner Surf Life Saving Club (SSLSC) facilities along with the Council owned and maintained toilet. The Sumner Surf Life Saving Club building is "leaning" onto the Council owned toilet block. The building has a red placard and safety fencing has been put in place.
3. Both the SSLSC facilities and the Council owned toilet block have been severely compromised as a result of the recent earthquakes. The toilet block along with the larger proportion of the SSLSC facilities have been closed due to significant structural weakness and the most compromised portion of the surf club facilities have already been demolished. The remainder of the SSLSC facilities along with the Council owned toilet block are proposed to be demolished. It is not cost-effective to repair either building. SSLSC have received a price for demolishing their building and also to demolish the Council toilet block.
4. Staff have requested a separate quotation from the Club's demolition contractor for the demolition of the Council toilet block at the time they were on-site. The quotation is for \$9,980 plus GST for the 'incremental' work to demolish the building. It is clear that engaging the contractor while they are demolishing the adjoining Club building will provide the safest and most cost-effective outcome for the demolition of our building and the clearance of the site.

**4 Cont'd**

5. Staff intend to work in conjunction with the SSLSC under a partnering agreement to design a new facility and reinstate a full public toilet service in Sumner. This is at the concept design stage now and a pre-application meeting with the Council has occurred prior to Christmas.
6. The Council's Insurers have confirmed that they agree that the building is uneconomic to repair. The claim was accepted on 15 January 2013 and the loss adjusting team formally agreed that the demolition can proceed. They also agree that the toilet block total sum insured is \$574,763.00. The loss adjusting team still require a copy of the replacement cost report as the like for like replacement cost has not yet been agreed, which will, if the insurers agree, be the claim settlement amount.
7. The Council's agreement is sought for the demolition of the toilet block.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. The cost of demolition and the removal of the demolition debris will be met by our insurance cover and done using CERA's demolition procedures.
9. We have received a quotation for demolition and site clearance of \$9,980 plus GST and expect to receive an amount up to the insured value of \$574,763.00.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?**

10. As the recommendations are a consequence of the earthquake events, this issue is not addressed in the LTCCP.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

11. Consent is not required for demolition. The building has no heritage value.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

12. Not applicable.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

13. As the recommendations are a consequence of the earthquake events, this issue is not addressed in the LTCCP.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the LTCCP?**

14. Not applicable.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

15. Due to the exigencies of the Earthquake Recovery process, this recommended action is outside of 'normal' strategic process.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

16. Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

17. Due to the level of damage which the building has sustained, and given that the building will be in a dangerous state once the adjoining Club building is demolished, demolition is recommended as the most cost-effective option available to the Council.

**COUNCIL 28. 2. 2013**  
**COMMUNITY, RECREATION AND CULTURE COMMITTEE 5. 2. 2013**

- 12 -

**4 Cont'd**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council agree to the demolition of the small Council owned toilet block which adjoins the Sumner Surf Life Saving Club.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

**PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**5. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

5.1 Lianne Dalziel MP and Charles Chauvel MP addressed the Committee with regard to Christchurch's heritage recovery, and encouraged an ongoing dialogue on the issue.

**6. ARTS UPDATE REPORT**

The Committee considered an update on the current status of arts projects within the Central City.

The Committee **decided** to receive the report.

The meeting concluded at 11.59am.

**CONSIDERED THIS 28TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2013**

**MAYOR**