



COMMUNITY COMMITTEE  
10 JUNE 2014

A meeting of the Community Committee  
was held in the No. 1 Committee Room  
on 10 June 2014 at 9am.

- PRESENT:** Councillor Yani Johanson (Chairperson),  
Councillors Ali Jones (Deputy Chairperson), Jimmy Chen, Phil Clearwater, Tim Scandrett,  
Andrew Turner
- APOLOGIES:** Councillor Jamie Gough for absence  
Councillor Jimmy Chen for lateness (arrived at 9.43am)

The Committee reports that:

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

**1. FACILITIES REBUILD PLAN: BISHOPDALE COMMUNITY CENTRE AND LIBRARY REBUILD – OPTION RECOMMENDATION**

This report was considered by the Council on 12 June by way of a staff report containing recommendations of both the Committee and the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board.:

**2. FACILITIES REBUILD PLAN: NORTH BEACH COMMUNITY CRECHE**

		Contact	Contact Details
<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services		
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Places and Spaces Manager		
<b>Author:</b>	Facilities Rebuild Programme Manager	Y	Matt Cummins 941 8236

**1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To seek Council approval to sell part of the North Beach Community Creche building to the Spencerville Residents Association and to demolish the balance of the building, leaving a clear site.
- 1.2 The above recommendation was presented to the Council on 24 April 2014 and the following paragraph was resolved:

*“The Mayor moved by way of amendment that the report be referred back to the Community Committee and further information be provided about the insurance and possible uses of the site.”*

**2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 Refer Figure.1 The building located at 24 Rookwood Avenue, North New Brighton has remained closed following the Earthquake events from 2010-11.
- 2.2 The former tenant, the North Beach Community Crèche, has permanently relocated to North New Brighton School.
- 2.3 The building is insured for \$280,604 and repair costs have been estimated at \$213,139.28. The estimated value would be claimable under insurance should the building be repaired.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**  
**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**2 Cont'd**

- 2.4 Should Council choose not to repair the building, it is still entitled to the full estimated value of the repairs. This has been confirmed by the Loss Adjustors representing Council's insurer. Staff previously reported that an amount of \$82,937 was able to be claimed but has since received updated advice from its external claims advisers. Refer paragraph 5.3.
- 2.5 The Detailed Engineering Evaluation (DEE) identified a New Building Standard (NBS) of 40%, however a collapse mechanism was identified within the building and the tenants were required to vacate the premises.
- 2.6 Based on previous demolition projects, the estimated costs to demolish the balance of the improvements on the site will be between \$20,000 and \$30,000.
- 2.7 An opportunity has been presented to enable part of this building to be reused as a new community centre in the Spencerville area.
- 2.8 The Spencerville Residents Association would manage the relocation and re-establishment process.
- 2.9 Council's Property Team estimate that the land, zoned TC3, at 24 Rookwood Avenue, if sold on the general market, would be worth in the region of \$100,000 including GST, depending on market conditions at the time.

Figure 1 – North Beach Community Crèche.



**3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Prior to the Canterbury Earthquakes the North Beach Community Crèche leased the Council owned site at 24 Rookwood Avenue, North New Brighton.
- 3.2 The site is zoned Living 1, contains an area of 577 square metres, known as 24 Rookwood Avenue and is legally described as Lot 3, Deposited Plan 6151.
- 3.3 The land is Green Zoned with a TC3, blue land category which will require geotechnical engineering advice for foundation design should any future development be proposed for the site.

## COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014

### Community Committee 10. 6. 2014

#### 2 Cont'd

- 3.4 This report deals with the sale of the building only and any future use of the site will be the subject of a further report following Council's future use processes.
- 3.5 As a result of the earthquakes the Crèche was required to vacate the premises. The annual rental was \$27,200. The annual rental was granted from Christchurch City Council through the Strengthening Communities grants fund. The lease was formally terminated in September 2013.
- 3.6 Through a formal retrieval process the Crèche has removed its various items.
- 3.7 The building sits on concrete piles and the construction is such that it can readily be relocated to an alternative site.
- 3.8 The Spencerville Residents Association will:
  - 3.8.1 Purchase part of the building from the Christchurch City Council for \$1.
  - 3.8.2 The Spencerville Residents Association will be responsible for:
    - 3.8.2.1 Removal of the part of the building they require.
    - 3.8.2.2 Capping of water, waste, storm water services at the boundary.
    - 3.8.2.3 Leave their portion of the site level, clear of hazards and safe.
    - 3.8.2.4 Any building and resource consents they require to relocate the building to the alternative site.
- 3.9 The Christchurch City Council will:
  - 3.9.1 Once the above is completed, undertake the demolition of the balance of the building.
  - 3.9.2 The entire site will be cleared of improvements, levelled and grassed.
  - 3.9.3 Council staff will return to council with options for the next steps

#### 4. COMMENT

- 4.1 The North Beach Community Crèche relocated to an alternative site following confirmation from engineers that the building should no longer be occupied due to a collapse mechanism being identified in the roof diaphragm.
- 4.2 The building is of timber frame construction with exposed timber roof trusses and lightweight profiled metal sheeting roof finishes. The roof cannot be fully relied upon as a diaphragm to distribute the horizontal loads to the walls. Each wall therefore resists lateral loads based on the tributary loaded width of the wall. (Paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 are sourced from the DEE assessment).
- 4.3 In addition, differential settlement has caused the floor to be out of level throughout the building. The floor in the North West corner of the extension has settled by approximately 100mm. The foundations have also been damaged in the seismic events.

Staff presented this information to the Community Board on 3 March 2014. The Board Supported:

- 4.3.1 To sell part of the former Crèche building to the Spencerville Residents Association.
- 4.3.2 Accept the indemnity insurance amount, and
- 4.3.3 Demolish the balance of the building and improvements.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**  
**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**2 Cont'd**

**5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The building is insured for a total sum of \$280,604. The cost estimate to complete repairs is \$213,139.28. This has been agreed with Loss Adjustors.
- 5.2 If Council chooses not to carry out repairs it is still entitled to the full value of the repairs which is estimated at \$213,139.28 + GST.
- 5.3 Staff previously informed the Council that should it not wish to proceed with repairs, it would be able to claim a reduced indemnity amount of the repair value. This figure was \$82,937. AON New Zealand Ltd (Council's brokers and advisers) were asked to review this claim and have confirmed the following:
- Normally the indemnity sum insured of \$82,937 would be the claim limit as this is less than the repair estimate.
  - Loss Adjustors, on behalf of insurers, have obtained a 'pre-loss market valuation' for the sum of \$225,000 including GST. This is less than the replacement sum insured of \$280,604.
  - Whilst this does not necessarily replace the current indemnity sum insured it does, for cash settlement purposes, allow Council to claim the full repair costs plus the minor expenditure incurred as they are less than the \$225,000 valuation.
- 5.4 On this basis, Council will be claiming from insurers the full value of repairs plus other costs associated with the claim (engineering / reports etc).
- 5.5 The estimated cost to demolish the balance of the improvements on the site is between \$20,000 and \$30,000. These costs would need to be funded from the indemnity value received.
- 5.6 The sale of part of the building and demolition of the remainder means that this asset would have to be written out of Council's asset register. The building has a current book value of \$74,722.50 which means a loss of disposal of this amount would be charged to operating budgets.
- 5.7 Council's Property Team estimate that the land at 24 Rookwood Avenue, if sold on the general market, would be worth in the region of \$100,000 including GST, depending on market conditions at the time.

**6. STAFF AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that to the Council that it:

- 6.1 Agree to sell part of the former Crèche building to the Spencerville Residents Association for \$1 (one dollar).
- 6.2 Agree to demolish the balance of the building and improvements, level and grass the site pending further discussion on a future strategy.
- 6.3 Pursue an insurance claim for the full value of repairs (refer paragraph 5.2) plus associated project and engineering costs.

3. FACILITIES REBUILD PLAN: REPAIR OF THE OPAWA / ST MARTINS TOY LIBRARY

		Contact	Contact Details
<b>Executive Leadership Team Member responsible:</b>	Transitional Manager, Facilities and Infrastructure Rebuild		
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Facilities Rebuild Portfolio Manager		
<b>Author:</b>	Matt Cummins, Facilities Rebuild Programme Manager	Y	941 8236

1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Council for the repair and strengthening of the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library located at 65 Sandwich Road, Beckenham, Christchurch. Refer Figure 1 (**Attachment 1**).

1.1.1 On 3 October 2013, it was resolved that the Council approve the demolition of the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library building.

1.1.2 Subsequently, on 12 December 2013, it was resolved that the Council put a stay on the demolition and revoke its previous resolution from 3 October. This followed a Notice of Motion put forward by the Spreydon Heathcote Community Board.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 Refer to Figure 2 (**Attachment 2**).

2.1.1 The 154m<sup>2</sup> building is a single storey, unreinforced, load bearing brick structure, believed to be 83 years old. The building is closed and has a red placard. Both safety fencing and temporary propping have been put in place to secure the building.

2.1.2 The Opawa / St Martins Toy Library received moderate damage as a result of the earthquakes. This damage was assessed by City Care Ltd and a repair calculated at \$26,010. The Loss Adjustment Team (LAT) confirmed their support for this by way of a Statement of Position (SOP). The work was subsequently undertaken and completed in December 2011.

2.1.3 The building has been assessed by engineering consultants. Due to the type of construction there is no easy way to strengthen the load bearing brick walls and very few methods available to strengthen the building to 34, 67 or 100% of the new building standard. In short, the cavity brick walls must be deconstructed and rebuilt.

2.1.4 The cost estimate to strengthen the building to 34%, 67% or 100% of the new building standard is \$365,000 + GST. This has been prepared by an independent quantity surveyor. **Refer Attachment 3.**

2.1.5 The estimated cost to rebuild a like for like facility at Sandwich Road is \$500,000.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Toy Library was constructed in 1931 as the local Beckenham Library. It houses a service run by volunteers providing the community with a range of toys, puzzles and games for the benefit of children in the community.

3.2 The Toy Library was operating pre-earthquake for eleven hours per week – two evenings for two and a half hours and one day for six hours. The Toy Library operation requires a large amount of storage and shelving. Due to the nature of their operation, it is difficult for the area to be used by other organisations when not open as a Toy Library.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**

**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**3 Cont'd**

- 3.3 Following a Detailed Engineering Evaluation (DEE – 8% New Building Standard)), the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library building was closed. The service was temporarily located in a squash court at the Hereford Street YMCA. The low strength assessed is the result of the unreinforced brick walls as opposed to earthquake damage.
- 3.4 The Toy Library building received mainly cosmetic damage in the Canterbury earthquakes. These repairs have been completed, however the building is still only 8% of the new building code and requires significant strengthening before it is safe to re-open and occupy.
- 3.5 The building is insured for \$344,707. As stated in paragraph 3.1.4, the damage that occurred to this building was mainly cosmetic in nature with limited structural cracking. City Care scoped the damage at \$26,010. Loss Adjustors confirmed their support of the scope of work on 21 March 2011 and the repairs were completed in December 2011, prior to CERA's requirement for DEE assessments and the establishment of the Facilities Rebuild Programme. It is believed that there is no additional insurance money claimable towards the strengthening of this facility, above that which has already been claimed.
- 3.6 Council appointed engineers carried out a Detailed Engineering Evaluation (DEE) which identified large parts of the building comprise of unreinforced brick masonry which creates a potential brittle collapse risk.
- 3.7 The appointed engineers commented that the cavity brick wall system is considered to have a low capacity for lateral resistance and that brittle failure is likely. Consequently it was calculated as being 8% of the new building standard and the building was closed. Council's occupancy approach has been revised but due to the collapse risk, it must remain closed until strengthening has been completed.
- 3.8 The strengthening options have been assessed but due to the nature of the building, there are few methods that would work successfully. In summary, the cavity brick walls need to be removed and rebuilt from ground level upwards.
- 3.9 External Quantity Surveyors have provided a cost estimate to strengthen the Toy Library. The estimate is \$365,000 + GST and is based on the following methodology: (**Refer Attachment 3**) :
- Removal of all lath and plaster internal linings
  - Removal of external, unreinforced double brick walls
  - Propping of the roof (in stages)
  - Crack injection to ring foundation
  - New connections of roof to structural beams
  - Minor repairs to roof
  - Rebuild external walls with reclaimed brick (over timber stud wall)
  - Allowance to re-instate windows
  - New gib board on internal walls / insulation / plaster / paint etc
  - Re-wiring of building, new fire alarm and an accessible ramp
- 3.10 Note, this price is based on replacing unreinforced brick walls with reclaimed brick (like for like). A timber framed wall with timber external cladding (ie, weatherboard) would be slightly cheaper. **Refer Attachment 3**.
- 3.11 Should Council wish to strengthen this building, funding could be sought from the Building Infrastructure and Improvement Allowance.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**  
**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**3 Cont'd**

**4. COMMENT**

4.1 Asset Maintenance

4.1.1 The following numbers have been obtained from Council's Asset Management Team

- City Care earthquake repair works in August 2011 - \$30,162
- City Care re-roofed and installed new spouting in August 2011 - \$58,000

Future maintenance:

- Strengthening building - \$365,000 (estimate)
- Maintenance anticipated over next ten years is estimated to cost approximately \$20,500 per annum.

4.1.2 The Community Support Unit notes that the previous occupant, the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library group currently has alternative temporary accommodation. The group has indicated that it wishes to return to this building, should it be strengthened and re-opened.

4.1.3 Staff met with the Ministry of Education in April 2014 who advised that they are interested in purchasing the site, should it become available, for incorporation into Beckenham School. There is no interest in purchasing the actual building. If this option was supported by Council then the funds from the sale could be put towards a new community facility in the Spreydon Heathcote ward or returned to Council.

4.1.4 At this stage, no other suitable groups have been identified that require this facility or site. Further discussions were held with the Spreydon Heathcote Community Board on 23 May 2014 with the clear preference being to retain the building if at all possible, but not at the expense of a new Community Facility being built in the Spreydon Heathcote Ward (refer paragraph 4.1.5 and 4.1.6). If Council decided to proceed with demolishing the Toy Library, the Community Board would like to see the architectural stone frontage retained in some way. Refer photograph in Figure 2.

4.1.5 Community Committee and Council agreement for a sister project in the Spreydon Heathcote ward is also being sought – the rebuild of a community facility on the site of the old St Martins Voluntary Library site (corner Wades / Wilson roads).

4.1.6 If approved, this new community facility could house the displaced Toy Library Group and St Martins Voluntary Library as well as providing bookable meeting spaces for the community. It is expected that the Community Committee will discuss this report on 10 June 2014.

4.2 Refer paragraph 1.1.1 and 1.1.2

4.2.1 On 3 October 2013 it was resolved that Council approve the demolition of the St Opawa / Martins Toy Library building. Due to the estimated strengthening costs and ongoing maintenance costs, the building was considered uneconomic to repair.

4.2.2 On 12 December 2013 it was resolved that the Council halt the demolition of the building due to questions over the level of work required to open the building and interest in historic architectural features. The building currently remains closed whilst a decision is made on how to proceed.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**  
**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**3 Cont'd**

**5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 To summarise from the above, the cost to strengthen the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library is estimated to be \$365,000 + GST, based on rebuilding external walls in brick. Should a light-weight exterior cladding be chosen, the estimate can be reduced by approximately \$20,000 - \$30,000.
- 5.2 If Council chooses to remove the building, the cost to demolish the facility is expected to be in the region of \$25,000 to \$35,000. This cost would be met by the Community Facilities Renewals and Replacements budget.
- 5.3 The rateable land value of the site at 65 Sandwich Road is \$165,000 with the capital value being \$240,000. Should the land be sold, the provisions of the Public Works Act will need to be followed as the title of the site is purposed for a library activity. Depending on what the proposed buyer wishes to use the site for, there is likely to be some restriction or more work involved to amend this use.

**6. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee recommend that the Council:

- 6.1 Agree to the strengthening and repair of the St Martins / Opawa Toy Library.
- 6.2 Allocate \$365,000 from the Building Infrastructure and Improvement Allowance to this project.

**7. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

The Committee Recommends to the Council:

- 7.1 That the Building be retained in principle due to its heritage significance.
- 7.2 That the financial aspects of this report be considered as part of the Annual Plan.

**4. FACILITIES REBUILD PLAN: OPTIONS FOR THE REBUILD OF A COMMUNITY FACILITY IN THE SPREYDON - HEATHCOTE WARD**

		Contact	Contact Details
<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services		
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Facilities Rebuild Portfolio Manager		
<b>Author:</b>	Matt Cummins, Programme Manager	Y	941 8236

**1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to recommend that the Council:

- 1.1 Agree to the building of a Community facility in the Spreydon – Heathcote ward on the site of the former Voluntary Library at 122 Wilsons Road to accommodate the St Martins / Opawa Voluntary Library, the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library and community space. Stage one includes: planning, conceptual design, scheduling, cost estimating and community consultation.



**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**  
**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**4 Cont'd**

- 1.2 Requests staff reports back their findings at the conclusion of stage one.
- 1.3 Agrees that Council officers provide regular progress updates to the Spreydon – Heathcote Community Board.
- 1.4 Agrees that the remaining insurance proceeds from the existing voluntary library building are allocated to the proposed new facility at 122 Wilsons Road (paragraph 3.3.1 - option one).

**2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 On 2 December 2013 it was resolved that the Council:
  - 2.1.1 Agree to the demolition of the remainder of the St Martins/ Opawa Voluntary Library.
  - 2.1.2 Agree in principle to ring-fence the insurance proceeds for a future community facility that includes space for a voluntary library.

In addition:

  - 2.1.3 On the 7 October 2013 it was resolved that the Council approve the demolition of the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library building.
  - 2.1.4 On the 12 December 2013 it was resolved that the Council put a stay on the demolition of the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library building.
- 2.2 Damage has occurred to both the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library building located at 65 Sandwich Road, and the Opawa / St Martins Voluntary Library, located at 122 Wilsons Road, following the series of Canterbury earthquakes.
- 2.3 The Opawa / St Martins Voluntary Library at 122 Wilsons Road is considered a total constructive loss via the insurers Statement of Position dated 6<sup>th</sup> June 2013 and demolition has partially occurred with the remainder due for demolition. This building is insured for \$610,236.
- 2.4 The Toy Library building at 65 Sandwich Road received mainly cosmetic damage. These repairs were completed prior to CERA requiring Detailed Engineering Evaluations (DEE's), however once the DEE was received the building was assessed at 8% of the new building standard and requires significant strengthening before it is safe to re-open and occupy. It has been estimated to cost \$365,000 + GST to strengthen the building. Due to the strengthening methodology, the cost to bring the building to 34%, 67% or 100% of the new building standard is the same.
- 2.5 It is proposed that a new, combined community facility be built on the former voluntary library site at 122 Wilsons Road which would incorporate the voluntary library service, and potentially the toy library service, depending on Council's decision around the future of the facility at 65 Sandwich Road. The new facility will also provide space for community groups to book on a casual basis.
- 2.6 However, if the Toy Library remains at 65 Sandwich Road then the new community facility will have increased bookable space.
- 2.7 Five options have been considered for the proposed community facility. These are detailed in paragraph 3.3.

## COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014

### Community Committee 10. 6. 2014

#### 4 Cont'd

- 2.8 Council officers estimate the floor area of a new facility could be between 200 and 250 square metres (slightly smaller than the previous voluntary library) at an approximate cost of \$3,600 per square metre, providing an indicative build price of \$900,000 (at the upper end). This has been calculated by an independent quantity surveyor (QS).
- 2.9 This estimate is at a high level only and would be refined if approval was given to investigate further. It is unknown at this stage what level of onsite car parking will be required and how this affects the size of the new facility.
- 2.10 The Opawa / St Martins Toy Library building is insured for \$344,707. The damage that occurred to this building was cosmetic in nature, totalling \$30,162. Council's insurers confirmed their support of the scope of works on the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011 and the repairs were completed in December 2011. Therefore, there is no additional insurance money in relation to this building claimable towards the construction of a new community facility.
- 2.11 It is expected that the insurance proceeds from the demolished Opawa / St Martins Voluntary Library would be allocated to the new project - \$610,236.
- 2.12 The Council's 2013 – 16 Three Year Plan included \$500,000 for the provision of a re-locatable metropolitan facility at Beckenham or other agreed site, for community groups, to be funded through borrowing.
- 2.13 Staff presented this proposal to the Spreydon Heathcote Community Board on 6<sup>th</sup> May, and the recommendations were well-supported by all present. If approved to proceed staff will report back to the Board, Community Committee and Council once concept plans, cost estimates and a consultation summary have been completed.

#### 3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 As outlined in paragraph 2.2, earthquake damage has occurred to two separate Council owned facilities in the Spreydon – Heathcote Ward. An opportunity has arisen to combine the separate facilities into one multi-use community facility as well as incorporating additional meeting space. It is proposed that the services of the below groups are incorporated into the new facility.
  - 3.1.1 The Opawa / St Martins Voluntary Library group is a community organisation providing a service external to, but compatible with, the Council libraries and information network; this service is run by volunteers. This group occupied a 265 square metre building located at 122 Wilsons Road. This building experienced significant damage in the earthquakes and was partially demolished under a CERA Section 38 notice in July 2011. Approximately 80 square meters of the building remains, but it is closed due to the extent of damage and is approved to be demolished with this work likely to occur during winter 2014. Currently, The Voluntary Library community group were temporarily located at the St Martins New World Supermarket but are now dormant awaiting a permanent accommodation.
  - 3.1.2 The Opawa / St Martins Toy Library was constructed in 1931 and houses a service run by volunteers providing the community with a range of toys, puzzles and games for the benefit of the children within the community. The 154 square metre building experienced earthquake damage, mainly cosmetic in nature.
  - 3.1.3 Following a detailed engineering assessment, the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library building was closed as it was assessed as being 8% of the new building standard and the service is currently located in a squash court at the Hereford street YMCA, their sixth temporary location. The low strength assessed is the result of the unreinforced brick that the building has been constructed from as opposed to earthquake damage.

## COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014

### Community Committee 10. 6. 2014

#### 4 Cont'd

- 3.1.4 Engineers have advised that the Toy Library has a potential brittle collapse risk, and although Council's occupancy approach has been revised, this building must remain closed due to its risk of collapse. A separate report has been prepared and it is expected that this will be heard by the Community Committee on 10 June 2014.
- 3.1.5 On 7 of October 2013 it was resolved that Council approve the demolition of the St Opawa / Martins Toy Library building. Due to the estimated strengthening costs and ongoing maintenance costs the building was considered uneconomic to repair. On 12 of December 2013 it was resolved by the Council to put a stay on the demolition of the building due to questions over the level of work required to open the building and interest in historic architectural features. The building currently remains closed while a decision is made on how to proceed. It is estimated to cost \$25,000 - \$35,000 to demolish the building.
- 3.2 Due to the low operational hours of both the Toy Library and Voluntary Library, and the low and sporadic operational needs of the community, each group does not require its own individual building and it is proposed that the services of each of the groups are combined to create one multi purpose facility.
  - 3.2.1 The Voluntary Library is open Monday to Friday 2 - 4.30pm; Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday 10-12 noon. A purpose designed space will be required to accommodate some books, a small desk for issuing as well as some space for tables and chairs and storage. This space could be configured in a lockable area.
  - 3.2.2 The Toy Library was operating pre earthquake for 11 hours per week; 2 evenings for 2½ hours and 1 day for 6 hours. The Toy Library operation requires a large amount of storage shelving. Due to the nature of their operation it is difficult for the area to be used by other organisations when not open as a toy library.
  - 3.2.3 The community groups require multi-use facilities that can be used for light recreational activities or meetings both small and medium sized in nature for up to approximately 50 people. Examples of usage include yoga, pilates, ante-natal classes, community meetings and a range of other community focused events.
- 3.3 Different options have been investigated for the proposed new community facility. See options below:
  - 3.3.1 **Option 1 Rebuild at 122 Wilsons Road (former Voluntary Library site):**

The building that previously occupied the site was significantly damaged in the earthquakes and will be demolished. This gives Council a clear site for redevelopment. Staff have been working with Council planners to better understand the requirements of the site. The 668 square metre corner site allows for a building of up to 250m<sup>2</sup> square metres in size (approximately), depending on consent requirements for car parking onsite. The Land has been classified as green zone, technical category 2 (TC2). This is the preferred site for the construction of the proposed community centre.

4 Cont'd

- 3.3.2 **Option 2 Rebuild at 65 Sandwich Road (Toy Library site):**  
Quantity surveyors have estimated that it will cost \$500,000 + GST to rebuild a like for like facility on this site (154 square metres). Although the building is not listed with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, or listed as historic on the Christchurch City Plan, the building does have points of historic interest. On the 7<sup>th</sup> October 2013 it was resolved that Council approve the demolition of the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library building as it was considered uneconomical to repair. On the 12<sup>th</sup> of December 2013 it was resolved that the Council put a stay on the demolition of the building due to questions over the level of work required to open the building and interest in historic architectural features. The building currently remains closed while a decision is made on how to proceed. It is estimated to cost \$25,000 - \$35,000 to demolish the building. The Land has been classified as green zone, technical category 3 (TC3).
- 3.3.3 **Option 3 Repair of 65 Sandwich Road:**  
Council appointed engineers carried out a detailed engineering evaluation (DEE) assessment dated 24<sup>th</sup> January 2013 which identified that large parts of the building comprise of unreinforced brick masonry, which provides a potential brittle collapse risk. The appointed engineers also identified that the cavity brick wall system is considered to have a low capacity for lateral resistance and brittle failure is likely. Consequently, it was calculated as being 8% of the new building standard and the building was closed. Council's occupancy approach has been revised, but as the building is considered to provide a brittle collapse risk it must remain closed unless/until it is strengthened. The strengthening options for the building have been assessed by engineers, however due to the type of construction, there are very few engineering methods to strengthen the building. The estimated cost to strengthen the building to 34 per cent, 67 per cent or 100 per cent is the same - \$365,000 + GST. Council's Asset Management Team have advised that for a building of this age, the maintenance anticipated over the next 10 years averages about \$20,500 per annum.
- 3.3.4 **Option 4 Demolition and / or sale of the site at 65 Sandwich Road:**  
Staff met with The Ministry of Education in April 2014, who advised that they are interested in purchasing this site to incorporate into Beckenham School. If this option is supported by Council then the funds from the sale could be allocated to the proposed new building, or another development within the Spreydon - Heathcote ward. At this stage, no other suitable groups have been identified that require this facility or site. Further discussions on this option are required with the Community Board. Demolition of the building is estimated to cost between \$25,000 and \$35,000.
- 3.3.5 **Option 5 Rebuild in car park of the Council Distribution Centre at 54 Colombo Street:**  
The Distribution Centre is a Council owned, single storey warehouse with a large car parking area. The building has been used as a storage facility and a place to distribute Council newspapers, flyers etc from. The site has a number of constraints in regards to land condition. The neighbouring South Library has had a geotechnical report conducted which has highlighted key issues around flood plain levels and liquefiable layer at 6.5 meters deep. Information also suggests that there is an old land fill onsite which would require environmental monitoring, and remediation, through any land works on site. There are also significant water and waste systems underground limiting the amount of available building space.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**

**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**4 Cont'd**

**3.3.6 Option 6 Conversion of the Council Distribution Centre at 54 Colombo Street:**  
 The Council owned Distribution Centre located at 54 Colombo Street is 17.9 meters wide and 36.9 meters long, with a ceiling height differing between 5.8 meters and 8.16 meters. This option has been discarded as this building is considered too large to accommodate the Voluntary Library group and Toy Library Group. In addition to this the Voluntary Library is not best situated adjacent to the much larger, sophisticated and well equipped South Library. This option was originally considered when twelve offices were required for the use of Non-Government Organisations in addition to the space required by the Toy Library and Voluntary Library. These needs have since been met elsewhere and the proposed Spreydon Heathcote Community Facility no longer needs to accommodate the Non-Government Organisations. The new Community House building project is an 1,800m<sup>2</sup> facility within the former Star Newspaper building on Cashel Street. Council would need to be cognisant of the plans and tenants anticipating to occupy Community house as we do not wish to 'compete' for tenants. Once Community House is open, the need for satellite offices will be less and there are bookable spaces within the Christchurch South library to meet this smaller need.

**3.4 Comparison of costs and options**

	OPTION	COST OF DEMOLITION	COST TO REPAIR/BUILD
<b>Option One</b>	Rebuild a new community facility at 122 Wilsons road (includes facilities for toy library, voluntary library and hireable meeting space).	\$10,000	* \$900,000
<b>Option Two</b>	Rebuild Toy Library at 65 Sandwich Road "Like for like" (does not allow the Voluntary Library or bookable meeting space)	\$25,000-\$35,000	** \$500,000
<b>Option Three</b>	Repair Toy Library at 65 Sandwich Road (space for toy library only).	NA	** \$365,000 + ongoing maintenance (Refer paragraph 2.4)
<b>Option Four</b>	Demolish Toy Library and sell site	\$25,000-\$35,000	Estimate \$100,000 value of land (no building).
<b>Option Five</b>	Rebuild multi purpose Community Facility in car park of the Council Distribution Centre	NA	No consideration given due to site conditions
<b>Option Six</b>	Conversion of the Council Distribution Centre to a multi purpose Community Facility	NA	No consideration given due to appropriateness of the option.

\* Staff estimates based on the buildings anticipated site coverage multiplied by \$3600 per square metre.

\*\* Based on Quantity Surveyor estimate.

**4 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

**VOLUNTARY LIBRARY**

- 4.1 The voluntary library building located at 122 Wilsons Road building is insured for \$610,236.
- 4.2 Council insurers agreed that the Voluntary Library was a constructive loss via Statement of Position on 6<sup>th</sup> June 2013.
- 4.3 Currently \$51,475 worth of costs have been incurred on the Voluntary Library Building. Included within the incurred costs is the CERA section 38 partial demolition, site fencing and professional fees.
- 4.4 It is expected to cost an additional \$10,000 to demolish the remainder of the St Martins / Opawa Voluntary Library building.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**

**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**4 Cont'd**

**TOY LIBRARY**

- 4.5 The earthquake damage that occurred to the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library at 65 Sandwich Road was cosmetic in nature. The damage was captured by City Care Ltd at \$30,162. The Council's insurers confirmed their support of this scope of works and the work was completed December 2011. Therefore, there are no insurance funds from this building to contribute to either the strengthening of this building or the construction of a new community centre.
- 4.6 The estimated cost to demolish the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library is between \$25,000 and \$35,000. This cost will not be covered by insurance as the demolition is not as a result of earthquake damage.

**Rebuild**

- 4.7 The Council's 2013 – 16 Three Year Plan included \$500,000 for the provision of a relocatable Metropolitan facility at Beckenham or other agreed site, for community groups to be funded through borrowing.

**Table 1 – Funding a New Community Facility in the Spreydon Heathcote Ward**

	Rebuild of a Community Centre in the Spreydon – Heathcote ward
Total Sum Insured (Voluntary Library)	\$610,236
Estimated demolition cost (Voluntary Library)	\$15,000
Estimated costs incurred to date (Voluntary Library)	\$51,475
<b>Potential surplus available for Rebuild</b>	<b>\$543,761</b>
<b>2013-16 Three Year Plan contribution</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,043,761</b>
Estimated cost to build a new community facility (up to 250m2) housing the Voluntary Library, Toy Library and Community Space at 122 Wilsons Road	\$900,000
<b>Surplus</b>	<b>\$143,761</b>

Note: The above table does not include the potential strengthening of the Toy Library which is estimated to cost in the vicinity of \$365,000.00.

- 4.8 Refer to Table 1. At an approximate cost of \$3,600 per square metre, a replacement facility of up to 250 square metre community facility located on the 122 Wilsons Road site is estimated to cost \$900,000.
- 4.9 \$500,000 from the Three Year Plan Capital Endowment Fund is available for immediate use, if required, for the provision of a relocatable metropolitan facility at Beckenham or other agreed site, for community groups. Staff request Councillors allow these funds be used to enable the building of the new facility, combined with insurance proceeds, on the former St Martins Voluntary Library site at 122 Wilson's Road.
- 4.10 If the Toy Library building is demolished and land sold, or the building and site sold as one then the additional funds could be used towards offsetting the 2013 – 16 Three Year Plan contribution towards the proposed new Facility. Council's Property Team estimate that the land could be worth in the region of \$100,000 if sold.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**  
**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**4 Cont'd**

**5. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Community Committee recommends that the Council:

- 5.1 Agree to the building of a facility in the Spreydon – Heathcote ward on the site of the former Voluntary Library at 122 Wilsons Road to accommodate the Opawa / St Martins Voluntary Library, the Opawa / St Martins Toy Library and community space. Stage one includes: planning, conceptual design, scheduling, cost estimating and community consultation.
- 5.2 Requests staff report back their findings at the conclusion of stage one.
- 5.3 Agrees that Council officers provide regular progress updates to the Spreydon – Heathcote Community Board.
- 5.4 Agrees that the remaining insurance proceeds from the existing voluntary library building are used in the building of the proposed new facility at 122 Wilsons Road (paragraph 3.3.1 - option one), together with funding available from the 2013 – 16 Three Year Plan as detailed in section 4.7 of this report.

**6. BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

The Board considered a staff presentation on the rebuild of a community facility in the Spreydon/Heathcote ward:

The Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board **resolved**:

- 6.1 That the staff recommendation be adopted.
- 6.2 To request a workshop with staff on the building and land at 65 Sandwich Road in the next 3 months.

**7. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee Recommends to the Council that the staff recommendation be supported in principle subject to funding being approved in the Annual Plan.

**5. FACILITIES REBUILD PLAN: DEMOLITION AND REPLACEMENT OF THE WOOLSTON MEMORIAL TO FALLEN SOLDIERS PAVILION**

		Contact	Contact Details
<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services		
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Facilities Rebuild Portfolio Manager		
<b>Author:</b>	Matt Cummins, Programme Manager	Y	941 8236

**1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek a Council resolution to demolish the Woolston Memorial to Fallen Soldiers Pavilion located at 502 Ferry Road and proceed with the investigation and conceptual design of a replacement facility.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**  
**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**5 Cont'd**

**2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 The Woolston Memorial to Fallen Soldiers Pavilion is a well used sports pavilion and an important historical facility. Although the pavilion is not listed in the Christchurch City Plan, it has historic interest as a World War One utilitarian war memorial.
- 2.2 Refer to attachments Two and Three. The Council-owned pavilion was severely damaged as a result of the recent earthquakes and aftershocks. Quantity Surveyors and Engineers have advised staff that the building is irreparable in its current state.
- 2.4 Council's insurer has confirmed that the building is a total economic loss and this is supported by a Statement of Position, entitling the Council to the total sum insured value of \$93,279.
- 2.5 Staff recommend demolition of the dangerous building, which is estimated to cost \$25,650. The requirement to demolish the pavilion is due to earthquake damage and therefore the cost of demolition can be met by insurance proceeds.
- 2.6 It is proposed that the Pavilion be replaced on the same site. Early estimates suggest the cost to demolish and rebuild could be in the region of \$400,000. This would replace the facility and return a critical sports pavilion that would support the senior sports grounds at Woolston Park and Southern Christchurch.
- 2.7 2015 marks the World War One centenary when New Zealand first joined the conflict with the landing at Gallipoli. Refer paragraph 3.6.
- 2.8 If approved, it is expected that the \$93,279 insurance proceeds from the damaged Woolston Memorial to Fallen Soldiers Pavilion be allocated to the rebuilding of a new pavilion facility. It is also proposed that \$100,000 of Greenspace capital funds are sourced from the Neighbourhood Parks Buildings renewals to align with EQ repairs budget, with the remaining \$206,721 sourced from the Building / Infrastructure Improvement Borrowing Allowance.
- 2.9 A funding grant will be applied for from the Lottery Grants Board under the Lottery World War One Commemorations, Environment and Heritage criteria. The application to the Lottery Grant Board, if approved, will reduce the amount sought from the Building / Infrastructure Improvement Borrowing Allowance.
- 2.10 Staff will report back to the Hagley – Ferrymead Community Board, Community Committee and Council once concept plans, cost estimates, and a consultation summary are completed.

**3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Refer to **Attachment 1**. The Woolston Memorial to Fallen Soldiers Pavilion is located in Woolston Park at 502 Ferry Road. The building is a single storey pavilion and is constructed from double skin, unreinforced brick. The pavilion services two cricket wickets and one senior rugby league field. Due to a shortage of senior sports grounds in this area, the ground and changing facilities are an important facility.
- 3.2 Refer to **Attachments 2 and 3**. The Council owned Pavilion was severely damaged as a result of the recent earthquakes and aftershocks. Damage includes collapsed walls and windows (**refer Attachment 2**), settlement of the foundation, significant cracking to the foundation, damage to the roof due to collapsed walls and foundation settlement, damage to the remaining bricks and mortar, significant damage to internal linings as a result of the earthquakes, being exposed to the weather and squatters.



## COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014

### Community Committee 10. 6. 2014

#### 5 Cont'd

- 3.3 The building was given a red placard and perimeter fencing has been placed, however due to the visible extent of the damage no detailed engineering assessment (DEE), damage assessment or strengthening report was completed for this building.
- 3.4 The Council's insurers confirmed that the building is an economic loss via a Statement of Position on the 2 October 2013. The building's total sum insured is \$93,279.
- 3.5 A Council appointed Engineer and Quantity Surveyor met on site with staff on 5 December 2013 where it was confirmed by both the Engineer and Quantity Surveyor that the building was irreparable.
- 3.6 The Woolston Memorial to Fallen Soldiers is not listed in the Christchurch City Plan. However the pavilion has historic interest as a World War One utilitarian war memorial. The Woolston Memorial to Fallen Soldiers is believed to be of the few, if only utilitarian World War One memorials in New Zealand, as it was not until World War Two that memorials of this nature were commonly built. Council staff have been liaising with the Historic Places Trust (HPT) and Returned Services Association (RSA) in regards to the current status of the building and future plans / expectations for the site.
- 3.7 These external groups have commented that they would like to see the memorial replaced. Internal Council groups have advised the project team that a replacement facility would need to be of a similar size and their wish is to replicate the original layout and use of materials, as well as retaining the original timber frontage and incorporating it into the new pavilion.
- 3.8 A Council appointed quantity surveyor has estimated it to cost \$385,300 to demolish and replace the pavilion 'like for like' on the existing site. However, Council staff believe \$400,000 is a more accurate estimate, to allow for professional fees and the fit out of the building. The quantity surveyor's estimate allows for removing and reinstating heritage timbers from the front facade and columns of the building to satisfy the HPT, RSA and Council's heritage team. This is the preferred replacement option.
- 3.9 Based on the 75 square meter floor area of the pavilion, it is estimated to cost \$25,650 to demolish the pavilion and carefully remove the historic timbers for reinstatement. This cost has been allowed for in the Quantity Surveyor's estimate.
- 3.10 2015 marks the Anzac Centenary, commemorating 100 years since our nation's involvement in the First World War. Therefore, it is proposed that this memorial pavilion is reinstated to align with the centenary commemorations.

#### 4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 A Council appointed Quantity Surveyor has estimated it to cost \$385,300 to demolish and replace the pavilion 'like for like' on the existing site. However, Council staff believe \$400,000 is a more accurate estimate, to allow for professional fees and the fit out of the building.
- 4.2 Council's insurers confirmed that the building is an economic loss via a Statement of Position on the 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2013. The building's total sum insured is \$93,279. Staff propose using the insurance funds of \$93,279 towards the rebuild of the new pavilion.
- 4.3 The additional funding required for this project is estimated to be \$306,721. Staff propose that \$100,000 of the additional funding required is sourced from the Neighbourhood Parks Buildings renewals to align with EQ repairs budget with the remaining \$206,721 sourced from the Building / Infrastructure Improvement Allowance.

COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014

Community Committee 10. 6. 2014

5 Cont'd

**Table 1 – Funding the demolition and rebuild of a new pavilion at Woolston Park**

Insurance Funds Available (total constructive loss)	\$93,279
Neighbourhood Parks Buildings renewals to align with EQ repairs	\$100,000
<b>Available budget</b>	<b>\$193,279</b>
Estimated cost to demolish and rebuild Pavilion	\$400,000
<b>Funding shortfall</b> (requested from Building and Infrastructure Improvement Borrowing Allowance)	<b>\$206,721</b>

- 4.4 A funding grant is going to be applied for from the Lottery Grants Board under the Lottery World War One Commemorations, Environment and Heritage criteria; however this does not open until August 2014 and the outcome will not be advised until November 2014.
- 4.5 The estimated cost to Council for replacing this building is the maximum figure sought. Should the application to the Lottery Grant Board be successful, it will reduce, if not revoke the amount sought from the Building / Infrastructure Improvement Borrowing Allowance.
- 4.6 It is estimated to cost \$25,650 to demolish the pavilion and carefully remove the historic timbers. This cost has been allowed for in the quantity surveyors estimate. The damage to the pavilion is earthquake related; therefore the demolition can be covered by insurance.

**5. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee recommend to the Council that it:

- 5.1 Agree to the demolition of the Woolston Memorial to Fallen Soldiers
- 5.2 Agree to the building of a new pavilion facility on the same site.
- 5.3 Request staff report back to the Community Board and the Council with completed conceptual design, scheduling, cost estimation and community consultation.
- 5.4 Agree that Council officers provide regular updates to the Hagley - Ferrymead Community Board.
- 5.5 Agree that the remaining insurance proceeds from the existing pavilion are used in the building of the proposed new facility, together with the additional funding sourced from the Neighbourhood Parks Buildings renewals to align with EQ repairs budget.
- 5.5 Allocate \$206,721 from the Building and Infrastructure Improvement Borrowing Allowance towards this project.

**6. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee Recommends to the Council that:

- 6.1 It agree to the demolition of the Woolston Memorial to Fallen Soldiers, noting the retention and reinstatement of the original timber frontage.
- 6.2 It agree to the building of a new pavilion facility on the same site by no later than 30 March 2015 noting the ANZAC centenary commemorations.
- 6.3 The staff recommendation be supported in principle subject to funding being approved in the Annual Plan.

## COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014

### Community Committee 10. 6. 2014

#### 6. HISTORIC PLACES FUND

		Contact	Contact Details
<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	Chief Planning Officer Strategy & Planning	Y	PA Diane Campbell, 941 8281
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Natural Environment and Heritage Unit Manager	Y	PA Michelle Oosthuizen, 941 8812
<b>Author:</b>	Brendan Smyth Heritage Architecture and Urban Design	Y	941 8934

#### 1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek a resolution from Council for approval to retain the Historic Places Fund as a tool for the protection and preservation of heritage places in Christchurch and endorsement of a set of principles for the development of detailed policy and guidelines.
- 1.2 The origin of this report is a request by the Finance Committee on 4 February, 2014 specifically requiring additional information and further explanation of the Heritage Protection Level of Service (LOS) 1.4.5 concerning the Historic Places Fund.

#### 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 The specific LOS is contained in the 2013-16 Activity Management Plan, Activity 1.4 Heritage Protection, 1.4.5 states that "*The policy for Council purchase of heritage properties through the Historic Places Fund [HPF] is reviewed*". Heritage officers created a draft policy in July 2009 which was not formalised by Council.
- 2.2 The fund was established for Council to purchase listed heritage buildings – the objective was simply to save the buildings from imminent demolition. The fund was used on four occasions. The current balance of the HPF is **\$2,525,217** plus an outstanding loan of \$412,500 – should the loan be returned the balance will be **\$2, 937,717**.
- 2.3 The Heritage Review undertaken within Council in 2009-10 considered options for preventing the loss of heritage buildings, places and objects (heritage places). It was recommended that Council use a wide range of tools to facilitate heritage retention, preservation, and to promote ongoing economically viable uses and heritage enhancement across the city.
- 2.4 If the current Heritage Places Fund is retained, the key guiding principles support property purchase, whether short or long term, as an option to save heritage places at risk, The cost would need to be considered and ranked against other financial needs within the Council on a case by case basis.
- 2.5 The principles establish the points of difference the HPF provides when compared to other funding mechanisms. The HPF would support the conservation of cultural heritage through a range of options including purchase, loans and grants for both listed and non-listed heritage places. It is recommended that officers report back to Council with detailed policy and operational guidelines based on the agreed principles.

6 Cont'd

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The LOS contained in the 2013-16 Activity Management Plan, Activity 1.4 Heritage Protection, Non-LTP Performance Standard Heritage Recovery Policy. Activity 1.4.5 states that *"The policy for Council purchase of heritage properties through the Historic Places Fund is reviewed"*. The benchmark is the *"Expectation that Council funding decision making is guided by policy"*. The rationale requires that *"Clear policy direction is necessary to guide decision making / prioritisation for Council purchase of listed heritage. The Historic Places Fund is currently used in situations where Council purchases and on-sells heritage properties, with covenants and other appropriate protection mechanisms in place"*.

3.2 No formal (adopted) Council policy exists to be reviewed. A draft policy was developed circa 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2009, following research that culminated in two Heritage Review presentations to Council on 20<sup>th</sup> April and 30<sup>th</sup> August 2010. The intention following the presentations was to draft a report to the Regulatory and Planning Committee and then to consider initiatives via the 2012-22 LTCCP (Long Term Council Community Plan) process leading to implementation. The report was not finalised prior to the September 2010 earthquake.

*The Creation and history of the Historic Places Fund (HPF)*

3.3 The HPF scheme has a fragmented history. A fund was approved for Council to purchase particular buildings at various times between 1996 and 2008. The objective was simply to save listed heritage buildings from imminent demolition by the existing owner. If a building was purchased it was considered desirable to on-sell with a heritage covenant attached to the Certificate of Title, with the proceeds paid back into the fund. It was recognised that these proceeds could be less than the amount paid out, which would represent the cost to the community of protection of the buildings. Council may also provide additional funds to restore the building prior to on-selling and/or lease the building.

3.4 Finance records show the fund received \$300,000 in 1997/98, accumulating on an earlier fund (set up in the late 1970s) of \$208,000. Finance records show that Council approved \$300,000 per annum to be put into the fund, from 1998 until 2006, to build up and maintain the balance at about one million dollars. Money budgeted via the annual plan each year was transferred to the fund. The fund is receiving interest and therefore continues to grow.

3.5 Council used the HPF on four occasions between 1996 and 2010. The buildings purchased were:

- the Government Building, Worcester St/Cathedral Square (1991)
- Coachman Inn, 144 Gloucester St, (1996/7)
- the former Sydenham Methodist Church, 343 Colombo St (2001)
- Grubb Cottage, 62 London St, Lyttelton (2008).

All the buildings were scheduled and protected by the City or the Banks Peninsula district plans. Following the earthquake sequences only the Government Building and Grubb Cottage remain intact. It appears that purchase using the HPF was also considered for the Excelsior Hotel, 120 Manchester Street and the former Civic Offices, 192-194 Manchester Street. These purchases were not completed.

## COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014

### Community Committee 10. 6. 2014

#### 6 Cont'd

- 3.6 Council resolved on 22 March 2001 to make an interest free loan of \$412,500 from the HPF to the Sydenham Heritage Trust Incorporated to purchase the former Sydenham Methodist Church for \$464,062.50. Ongoing management and maintenance were the responsibility of the Trust. The Trust raised in excess of \$600,000 for conservation works and the building of a new utility block. Prior to the earthquakes the Church was used as a community centre for functions and events. The purchase attracted private funding, community participation and a sense of community ownership. On 12 September 2013 Council resolved to defer calling in the loan.
- 3.7 Grubb Cottage was purchased by Council in 2006 for \$260,000. The initial intention was to save the building from demolition, covenant and on-sell to the Lyttelton Information Centre Trust. However, the Conservation Plan, prepared for Council as part of the covenant, identified the Cottage as having far greater heritage significance than had been previously believed. It was deemed the most significant colonial dwelling in Lyttelton with considerable original heritage fabric. This severely limited options for its use and adaptation or upgrade. Consequently in May 2008 Council resolved to retain ownership of Grubb Cottage, replenish the HPF the \$260,000 purchase price from its operating budget and commit further funding to the conservation of the building. Grubb Cottage is now managed by a Trust, conserved as a record of built archaeology unique in Canterbury, and contributes to Council's heritage education and advocacy programme. It is a community asset and tourist attraction in Lyttelton.
- 3.8 Council helped purchase the Government Building in Cathedral Square for \$735,000 and on-sold it as part of a package deal that included \$3.25 million toward structural strengthening. The Coachman Inn was purchased circa 1996/97 for \$800,000 and sold in 2001 for \$400,000. Both the Coachman Inn and the Former Sydenham Methodist Church succumbed to the earthquakes.

#### 4. COMMENT

- 4.1 The Heritage Review recognised the public benefit of heritage retention and the high cost of maintenance, upgrade and conservation. It identified grant funding as one direct and effective means of encouraging heritage retention, and looked at other 'tool kit' options for non-regulatory means of retaining and encouraging the ongoing economically viable use of heritage buildings. Long-term Council ownership was considered as one such tool. It was recognised that there were occasions where this was the only or the best means of protecting heritage. Council ownership also ensured public access. The Review also recognised that short-term ownership by Council (for months or even years) may occasionally be necessary to secure a building under threat of demolition.
- 4.2 The Heritage Review acknowledged that the HPF required policy and operational guidelines to ensure the fund was utilised effectively and accountably. The Review was undertaken prior to the September 2010 earthquake. However, the substantive issue – the risk of the loss of heritage and the potential for demolition – has not changed. Whilst the HPF remains a potentially effective mechanism for the protection of heritage, guidance around its use needs to recognise the changed environment of post earthquake Christchurch and the resulting loss of heritage across the entire city.

#### *HPF Principles*

- 4.3 The current listings in the City and Banks Peninsula Plans do not adequately represent the cultural heritage value of the districts. The District Plan Review proposes that listed heritage places are determined on a thematic approach. Gaps in the current listings would be identified and new listings are proposed. The following HPF principles are proposed to complement other heritage grants and to provide flexibility to respond to heritage places under threat. The points of difference are that cultural heritage value of significance to the community is conserved through a range of mechanisms including various forms of purchase, loans and grants for both listed and non-listed heritage places.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**

**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**6 Cont'd**

HPF Funding is provided to:

1. Both listed and non listed heritage places of significance to the community
2. Heritage places subject to threat of demolition or deterioration by neglect
3. Community groups (trusts) or private owners who can not access other funding sources

*Need for Policy and Operational Guidelines*

- 4.4 The fund must be subject to clear policy and operational guidelines which are to be established and approved by Council. The guidelines will define an at risk building along with parameters within which purchases are made. The guidelines will essentially give effect to the operational principles, identify and manage any associated risks for Council as far practicably possible. Potential purchase options include:

1. Outright purchase and on-sale
2. Outright purchase and lease
3. Public-Private Partnership (match dollar for dollar private investment through a grant)
4. Council provides a loan or grant to a Trust or an Incorporated Society.

The fund would be made available to both listed and non listed heritage. Currently non listed heritage buildings may qualify for future listing and therefore should not be discounted as potential fund recipients.

- 4.5 The need for the HPF as a separate mechanism for the conservation of a heritage building can be justified in part through the limitations of the other available tools that Council has at its disposal to achieve this aim:

4.5.1 The Heritage Incentive Grant Scheme (HIG) is funded at \$763,000 per annum. It is a successful scheme in terms of supporting owners of heritage buildings who are committed to maintenance and upkeep. It provides financial assistance up to a maximum of fifty percent of the total cost of heritage related works. Council owned assets and non-listed heritage buildings are not eligible for HIG funding.

4.5.2 The Council's Central City Landmark Heritage Grants scheme was established to assist in the recovery and rebuild of heritage buildings. It provides \$1.7 million per annum for the next two financial years (increasing to \$2 million for 2016/17 and 2017/18) for the retention of landmark buildings within the four avenues. There is no allowance in this funding to support landmark heritage outside of the central city or smaller scale heritage buildings that are of significance to the local community. Council owned assets are not eligible for Landmark funding.

4.5.3 Canterbury Earthquake Heritage Building Fund Trust (CEHBF) grants are available for all heritage buildings across the district. Council owned assets are not eligible for CEHBF Trust funding. It should be noted that this funding source is likely to be fully allocated within the next 12 months.

- 4.6 Operation of the HPF is also supported by the following:

- The fund has successfully prevented the immediate demolition of listed heritage buildings at a time of low or no demand for such properties
- Community Outcomes for culture and heritage as well as community involvement can be achieved
- The risk of loss of further listed heritage remains heightened following the earthquakes
- Complements Heritage Incentive Grants (HIG) and Central City Landmarks Heritage Fund (CCLHG)

## COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014

### Community Committee 10. 6. 2014

#### 6 Cont'd

- 4.7 Retention of the HPF and policy to broaden it's application offers Council the opportunity to support the re-engagement of the people of Christchurch with their heritage, and to empower communities to take ownership of and responsibility for the heritage places which are significant to them. Use of the fund supports the Community Outcomes of Liveable City, Strong Communities and Good Governance
- 4.8 Example of a Potential Use of HPF  
A threatened heritage building of significance to the local community is the former home of William Sutton the famous Canterbury landscape artist at 20 Templar Street. William Sutton commissioned the design and lived there from 1963 until his death in 2000. This building is currently within the Residential Red Zone. Subject to further evaluation, short term Council ownership through purchase using the fund and then on-sale to a Trust could provide a mechanism to preserve the dwelling. The community is then provided time and opportunity to find a viable and sustainable use for the building.

#### 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Each decision on property purchase would need to consider the Council's current financial situation and rank the proposal against other funding requirements. This would include whether Council could afford to either replenish the fund or repay debt, both options will likely have a rating requirement. It should be noted that under either option, a decision to purchase would impact on the Councils net debt ratio.
- 5.2 The current balance of the HPF is **\$2,525,217**. This excludes the \$412,500 outstanding and unresolved loan to the Sydenham Heritage Trust. Should the loan be returned the balance will be **\$2,937,717**. Should the officer recommendation be resolved as stated in 6.1 (a), then there is no change to the current financial status given the funding is already allocated.
- 5.3 While the fund is designed to enable heritage buildings to be saved from demolition it is recognised that the Council needs to be protected as much as possible from financial risk and loss. Any potential financial loss must be weighed against the positive heritage outcomes. It is widely recognised that heritage can enhance the quality of life, the attractiveness and vitality of the city.
- 5.4 The possible HPF options of purchase, loan or grant will have various financial implications for the fund. For example, if the grant option is utilised, it will be expected that funds will not be returned to Council since it is gift. A loan or a purchase and on-sale (short or medium term) would in time return at least a portion of the funds to the HPF. The use of any option would depend on the circumstances and specifics of the application. To maintain a viable fund, replenishment of the fund would need to be considered, together with the impact on rates.
- 5.5 Loans from the HPF could apply to projects where there is a more certain economic return from the venture. This limitation on the amounts of public money and the requirement for similar or greater amounts of private investment to match will reduce the risk of loss for the Council and tend to ensure that only economically viable projects will succeed through the application process.
- 5.6 The level of the fund has grown over the years, due to interest, and there is the potential now for some return back to the Council for alternative uses. This would help with the operating deficit in the current financial year if a decision were made prior to June 30<sup>th</sup>. The fund, however, should be maintained at a viable core level where it can be effective in achieving the goal of heritage protection when the need arises. The proposed policy and operational guidance will establish criteria necessary to ensure a clear prioritisation of buildings at risk and a viable outcome for any building must be established prior to fund expenditure.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**  
**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**6 Cont'd**

5.7 A level of \$1 million was previously used as a minimum level for the fund to be maintained at. It is suggested that this level, adjusted to take into account such factors as inflation and more complex and costly structural upgrades should be used. A figure of approximately \$1.5 million is proposed as the long term minimum. Based on previous experience, it is expected that any top ups to the proposed minimum funding level is not likely to be required annually.

**6. STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

6.1 That the Committee recommend to the Council that it:

- (a) Retain the Historic Places Fund and maintain the balance at \$1.5 million. By dropping the fund from ~\$2.5m, and returning approx \$1m to working capital, this would help with the current years operating deficit.
- (b) Agree the Historic Places Fund is available to:
  - 1. Both listed and non listed heritage places of significance to the community
  - 2. Heritage places subject to threat of demolition, including demolition by neglect, district wide
  - 3. Community groups (trusts) or private owners who can not access other funding sources.
- (b) Direct officers to prepare detailed policy and operational guidelines to support the fund as a tool for heritage protection.
- (c) Request officers report back to Council prior to December 2014.

**7. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee recommends:

7.1 That the staff recommendation be adopted.

7.2 To request a memo clarifying the status of the Sydenham Heritage Trust loan, clearance of the site, and any other related issues.

**7. HERITAGE CONSERVATION POLICY REVIEW**

		Contact	Contact Details
<b>Executive Leadership Team Member responsible:</b>	Chief Planning Officer Strategy & Planning	Y	Diane Campbell, 941 8281
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Natural Environment and Heritage Unit Manager	Y	Michelle Oosthuizen, 941 8812
<b>Author:</b>	Fiona Wykes	Y	941 8052

**1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Council the result of a review of the current Heritage Conservation Policy. The Heritage Protection Activity Management Plan requires the Heritage Conservation Policy review to be completed by 30 June 2014.



7 Cont'd

**2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 The Heritage Conservation Policy (1999, **Attachment 1**) was drafted to guide the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) scheme. The HIG scheme has since developed strong policy and operational guidelines significantly limiting the need for the Heritage Conservation Policy – essentially it has become redundant. There exist two other heritage related documents – a Heritage Values, Vision and Mission Statement (2004) and a draft Heritage Policy Statement (2010). A comprehensive Heritage Strategy is recommended to replace all three policy documents.
- 2.2 A Heritage Strategy would pull together existing information, provide a vision, principles and goals, a policy framework, priorities and work programme actions for up to ten years. The proposed 2014/15 heritage work programme contains a project to scope a strategy and set out a process for community engagement

**3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The current Heritage Conservation Policy was adopted by Council in 1999, revised in December 2006 and revised again in 28 February 2007. The policy was initially required because of inadequate guidance and lack of a robust approval process of the Heritage Incentive Grant scheme. The 2007 review included development of a comprehensive heritage incentives policy with operational guidelines. The existing policy therefore centred on the management of grants and not the wider heritage work performed by Council.
- 3.2 The 2009/10 Heritage Review considered the role and scope of heritage and character as it relates to the City and Banks Peninsula identity. The understanding of heritage was broadened to encompass built, natural and cultural heritage. Following this review a Heritage Policy Statement was drafted in 2010. The Statement identified principles to guide Council's role in heritage protection and set strategic goals and priorities. The intent was to focus on the issues identified in the review and align the future work programme.
- 3.3 The Canterbury earthquake events highlighted the limited ability of the existing district plan provisions to conserve and maintain heritage. The earthquakes caused significant damage to buildings within the central city, including many listed and non-listed heritage and character buildings. As a result large numbers of heritage buildings have been demolished or partly demolished. As at April 2014 33% of listed heritage items across Christchurch and Banks Peninsula had been demolished and 3% partly demolished. This includes 42% of listed heritage items in the central city being demolished and 10% of listed heritage items in Banks Peninsula. The loss presents a significant challenge in retaining our links to the past. Through the response and recovery periods following the earthquakes the heritage team has gained considerable insight that could inform a heritage strategy to improve the conservation and protection of heritage places.
- 3.4 The loss of fabric of some buildings may mean only a façade or small part of a building may be able to be retained and Council needs to consider acceptable solutions in the context of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) Conservation Principles that the Council Heritage Conservation Policy is based on.
- 3.5 Loss of so much of our built heritage further reinforces the need to broaden our focus to include Māori heritage, landscape heritage, archaeology, intangible heritage, documentary heritage and moveable heritage.

7 Cont'd

4. COMMENT

4.1 The acknowledged narrow focus of the current Heritage Conservation Policy does not meet the needs of Council with regards to heritage identification and protection. The review identified gaps in the existing policy that will inform a broader strategic approach for managing heritage, they include the following matters:

- Failure to identify Banks Peninsula specifically within the policy
- Lack of recognition and protection of sites and values of significance to tangata whenua
- Need for a broader approach to heritage
- No reference to the responsibility of Council for its own heritage assets

4.2 The current Heritage Conservation Policy has deficiencies, beyond the major gaps noted above, with regards to the following matters:

4.2.1 Currently the policy is identified as being for the assessing of applications for major assistance to the owners of heritage buildings, meaning the Heritage Incentive Grant scheme. A policy needs to cover more than this matter. This approach also means that some of the matters covered in the Heritage Conservation Policy are, in some instances, too specific and detailed, such as Conservation Covenants.

4.2.2 The discussion around heritage identification and listing is no longer in line with the proposed approach in the District Plan Review. This is a thematic approach to broaden the range heritage places and comprehensively represent the different historical themes and types of heritage.

4.2.3 There is no discussion of more innovative approaches to protection and collaboration with interested parties.

4.2.4 Some conservation incentives currently identified in the policy are not being applied. Most notable waiving fees for non-notified resource consent applications, other than via Heritage Incentive Grants and providing some rates relief for listed heritage buildings used by non-profit making groups. It is noted that rates relief was investigated, implemented through a trial scheme between August 2001 and June 2004 and eventually discarded.

4.2.5 A separate piece of work undertaking a comprehensive review of conservation incentives needs to be undertaken – noting that part of this work has been done through the heritage review that was started pre-earthquakes and also that the Heritage Incentive Grants and Central City Landmark Heritage Fund grants are working well. The Heritage Conservation Policy needs to include these matters and focus on gaps and other stated deficiencies.

4.2.6 Heritage education and advocacy is not addressed as well as it should be in the policy and is currently merely a note that appreciation of listed heritage buildings, places and objects should be promoted. No mention is currently made of interpretation which is also a key matter.

4.2.7 Any approach to historic heritage identification and protection would also include specific identification of Banks Peninsula historic heritage and the need to identify and recognise the protection of sites and values of significance to tangata whenua along with a requirement to work with runanga to develop an acceptable framework.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**  
**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**7 Cont'd**

- 4.3 The initial drafting of the current conservation policy was to provide guidance to the Heritage Incentive Grant scheme, itself a narrow framework. The policy is no longer necessary since the scheme has in place strong policy and operational guidelines.

Heritage Strategy

- 4.4 Rather than redrafting the Heritage Conservation Policy the heritage team recommends the development of a formal Heritage Strategy for Council. A comprehensive Heritage Strategy developed in consultation with the community would guide the heritage work programme for the next 10 years.
- 4.5 A heritage strategy is the preferred direction. A project to scope the heritage strategy has been identified in the 2014-15 heritage work programme awaiting approval. The scope will incorporate the above matters and seek to identify other gaps or needs. Moreover the strategy will provide a firm direction, clearly articulate the overarching heritage vision, principles and goals and provide a policy framework, priorities and actions. Ideally the strategy will integrate heritage conservation and management both internally and externally. The strategy will require internal and external consultation to gain the widest possible support.

**5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 There are no financial implications associated with this report. The proposed 2014-15 heritage work programme identifies the need to prepare a strategy scope. The strategy will be financed via the 2014- 15 work programme and annual plan approvals.

**6. STAFF AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council:

- 6.1 Note that the Heritage Conservation Policy has been largely superseded by the Heritage Incentive Grant policy guidelines.
- 6.2 Agree that there is a need to develop a Heritage Strategy.

**PART B – REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**8. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

- 8.1 Philip Haythornthwaite, regarding more accessible bus stops.
- 8.2 Karim Baradi, Christchurch Office Manager for the Disabled Person's Authority, regarding the importance of having more accessible bus stops and bus routes in the CDB for disabled people.
- 8.3 Denis O'Sullivan, President of the South Island Polo Association, regarding an application to the Council to play in the final day of the Gould Cup, at Hagley Park, in March 2015.

The Committee noted its concern over the state of bus stops and accessibility issues for disabled people highlighted in items 8.1 and 8.2.

The Committee requested a regular three-monthly report from the Council's Disability Advisory Group.

The Committee requested staff to provide a report by August 2014 on holding the final of the Gould Cup in South Hagley Park addressing such issues as health and safety issues, timing and parking.

**COUNCIL 26. 6. 2014**  
**Community Committee 10. 6. 2014**

**9. FACILITIES REBUILD PORTFOLIO: MONTHLY STATUS UPDATE**

The Committee received the information in this report.

**PART C – DELEGATED DECISIONS**

**10. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**11. HERITAGE INCENTIVE GRANT APPROVAL FOR 86 CHESTER STREET EAST**

**STAFF AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee **resolved**:

- (a) That a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to \$73,563 for conservation and maintenance work for the protected heritage building at 86 Chester Street East subject to compliance with the agreed scope of works and certification of the works upon completion.
- (b) That payment of this grant is subject to the applicants entering a 20 year limited conservation covenant with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the property title.

The meeting concluded at 12.25pm.

**CONSIDERED THIS 26 DAY OF JUNE 2014**

**MAYOR**