

Social, Community Development and Housing Committee AGENDA

Notice of Meeting:

An ordinary meeting of the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee will be held on:

Date: **Wednesday 6 March 2019**
Time: **9.30am**
Venue: **Council Chambers, Civic Offices,
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch**

Membership

Chairperson	Councillor Phil Clearwater
Deputy Chairperson	Councillor Glenn Livingstone
Members	Councillor Jimmy Chen
	Councillor Mike Davidson
	Councillor Anne Galloway
	Councillor Yani Johanson
	Councillor Aaron Keown
	Councillor Tim Scandrett

1 March 2019

Principal Advisor

Brent Smith
Principal Advisor Citizens &
Community
Tel: 941 8645

David Corlett
Committee and Hearings Advisor
941 5421
david.corlett@ccc.govt.nz
www.ccc.govt.nz

Note: The reports contained within this agenda are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. If you require further information relating to any reports, please contact the person named on the report.

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, visit:

<https://www.ccc.govt.nz/the-council/meetings-agendas-and-minutes/>

Strategic Framework

The Council's Vision – Christchurch is a city of opportunity for all.

Open to new ideas, new people and new ways of doing things – a city where anything is possible.

Whiria ngā whenu o ngā papa Honoa ki te maurua tāuikiuki

Bind together the strands of each mat
And join together with the seams of respect
and reciprocity.

The partnership with Papatipu Rūnanga
reflects mutual understanding and respect,
and a goal of improving the economic,
cultural, environmental and social
wellbeing for all.

Overarching Principle

Partnership – Our
people are our taonga
– to be treasured and
encouraged. By working
together we can create
a city that uses their
skill and talent, where
we can all participate,
and be valued.

Supporting Principles

Accountability	Collaboration
Affordability	Prudent Financial Management
Agility	Stewardship
Equity	Wellbeing and resilience
Innovation	Trust

Community Outcomes

What we want to achieve together as our city evolves

Strong communities

Strong sense of
community
Active participation in
civic life
Safe and healthy
communities
Celebration of our
identity through arts,
culture, heritage and
sport
Valuing the voices of
children and young
people

Liveable city

Vibrant and thriving
central city, suburban
and rural centres
A well connected and
accessible city
Sufficient supply of, and
access to, a range of
housing
21st century garden city
we are proud to live in

Healthy environment

Healthy waterways
High quality drinking
water
Unique landscapes and
indigenous biodiversity
are valued
Sustainable use of
resources

Prosperous economy

Great place for people,
business and investment
An inclusive, equitable
economy with broad-
based prosperity for all
A productive, adaptive
and resilient economic
base
Modern and robust
city infrastructure and
community facilities

Strategic Priorities

Our focus for improvement over the next three years and beyond

Enabling active citizenship and connected
communities

Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant,
prosperous and sustainable 21st century city

Climate change
leadership

Informed and proactive
approaches to natural
hazard risks

Increasing active, public
and shared transport
opportunities and use

Safe and sustainable
water supply and
improved waterways

SOCIAL, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING COMMITTEE - TERMS OF REFERENCE

Chair	Councillor Clearwater
Membership	Councillor Livingstone (Deputy Chair), Councillor Chen, Councillor Davidson, Councillor Galloway, Councillor Keown, Councillor Johanson, Councillor Scandrett
Quorum	Half of the members if the number of members (including vacancies) is even, or a majority of members if the number of members (including vacancies) is odd.
Meeting Cycle	Monthly
Reports To	Council

Responsibilities

The focus of the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee is the governance of operational matters relating to social and community wellbeing.

The Committee:

- Promotes active citizenship, community participation and community partnerships
- Seeks to address cultural, social and economic disadvantage and promote equity for all citizens
- Works in partnerships with key agencies, organisations and communities of place, identity and interest
- Is innovative and creative in the ways it contributes to social and community wellbeing

The Social, Community Development and Housing Committee considers and reports to Council on operational matters and, if specifically authorised by the Council, capital projects relating to:

- Arts and culture including the Art Gallery
- Heritage protection, including heritage grant funding
- Housing across the continuum of social, affordable and market housing, including innovative housing solutions that will increase the supply of affordable housing
- Libraries (including community volunteer libraries)
- Museums
- Sports, recreation and leisure services and facilities
- Parks (sports, local, metropolitan and regional), gardens, cemeteries, open spaces and the public realm
- Hagley Park, including the Hagley Park Reference Group
- Community facilities and assets
- Public Health and health in all policies
- Community safety and crime prevention, including family violence
- Civil defence and rural fire management including disaster planning and local community resilience plans
- Community events, programmes and activities
- Community development and support, including grants and sponsorships
- Citizen services

- Community engagement and participation
- Communities of place, identity and interest.

Delegations

The Council delegates to the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee authority to:

- Approve Heritage Incentive Grant applications.
- Approve extensions of up to two years for the uptake of Heritage Incentive Grants.
- Approve applications to the Events and Festivals Fund.
- Give Council's consent under the terms of a Heritage Conservation Covenant
- Give Council's consent to the removal of a Heritage Conservation Covenant from a vacant section.

The Committee delegates to the following subcommittees or working groups the responsibility to consider and report back to the Committee:

- Safer Communities Council for matters relating to Safety and Crime Prevention, including Family Violence
- Housing Subcommittee for matters relating to housing as stated in its terms of reference
- Multicultural Subcommittee for matters relating to the Multicultural Strategy
- Disability Issues Working Group

Part A	Matters Requiring a Council Decision
Part B	Reports for Information
Part C	Decisions Under Delegation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

C	1.	Apologies.....	6
B	2.	Declarations of Interest	6
C	3.	Confirmation of Previous Minutes.....	6
B	4.	Public Forum.....	6
B	5.	Deputations by Appointment.....	6
B	6.	Presentation of Petitions	6

MULTICULTURAL SUBCOMMITTEE

C	7.	Multicultural Subcommittee Minutes - 1 February 2019	13
---	----	--	----

STAFF REPORTS

C	8.	Monarch Butterfly Overwintering Sites in Response to Likely Predation	19
C	9.	Approval of a Heritage Incentive Grant for Kilwinning Lodge, 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton	29
C	10.	Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch	41
C	11.	Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 158 High Street, Christchurch	55
C	12.	Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 226 Kilmore Street.....	67
C	13.	Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton	77
C	14.	Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 30 Hackthorne Road	89
A	15.	Heritage Incentive Grant for 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	101
C	16.	Community Facilities Network Plan	121
C	17.	Resolution to Exclude the Public.....	125

1. Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. Declarations of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant and to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

3. Confirmation of Previous Minutes

That the minutes of the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee meeting held on [Wednesday, 30 January 2019](#) be confirmed (refer page 7).

4. Public Forum

A period of up to 30 minutes may be available for people to speak for up to five minutes on any issue that is not the subject of a separate hearings process.

5. Deputations by Appointment

There were no deputations by appointment at the time the agenda was prepared.

6. Petitions

There were no petitions received at the time the agenda was prepared.

Social, Community Development and Housing Committee OPEN MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 30 January 2019
Time: 9.30am
Venue: Committee Room 1, Level 2, Civic Offices,
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

Present

Chairperson	Councillor Phil Clearwater
Deputy Chairperson	Councillor Glenn Livingstone
Members	Councillor Jimmy Chen
	Councillor Mike Davidson
	Councillor Anne Galloway
	Councillor Yani Johanson
	Councillor Aaron Keown
	Councillor Tim Scandrett

25 January 2019

Principal Advisor
Brent Smith
Principal Advisor Citizens &
Community
Tel: 941 8645

David Corlett
Committee and Hearings Advisor
941 5421
david.corlett@ccc.govt.nz
www.ccc.govt.nz

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, visit:
www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/meetingminutes/agendas/index

Part A Matters Requiring a Council Decision

Part B Reports for Information

Part C Decisions Under Delegation

•

The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. Apologies

Part C

Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00001

Committee Decision

That the apology from Councillor Johanson for lateness be accepted.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Scandrett

Carried

2. Declarations of Interest

Part B

There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. Confirmation of Previous Minutes

Part C

Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00002

Committee Decision

That the minutes of the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 5 December 2018 be confirmed.

AND

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee receive the Minutes from the Housing Subcommittee meeting held 17 December 2018.

AND

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee receive the Minutes from the Multicultural Subcommittee meeting held 3 December 2018.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Livingstone

Carried

4. Public Forum

4 Public Forum

Part B

The Chair of Historic Places Canterbury, Mark Gerrard, presented to the Committee on the process for demolitions and significant alterations to Council owned (unscheduled) buildings. Staff were called to the table to answer questions of clarification from the Committee re Dr Gerrards presentation.

The Committee asked staff to provide further information to the Committee on Yaldhurst Memorial Hall by way of a memorandum.

Part B

Councillor Johanson joined the meeting at 9.47am, during the discussion on the Public Forum presentation.

5. Deputations by Appointment

Part B

There were no deputations by appointment.

6. Presentation of Petitions

Part B

There was no presentation of petitions.

7. Housing Subcommittee Minutes - 17 December 2018

Committee Decision

Refer to Item 3.

8. Multicultural Subcommittee Minutes - 3 December 2018

Committee Decision

Refer to Item 3.

9. Approval of an extension of time for a Heritage Incentive Grant for 143-157 High Street, Christchurch

Committee Comment

1. Original Staff recommendation accepted without change

Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00003

Part C

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Approve an extension of time of one year for the uptake of the Heritage Incentive Grant previously approved for part of the Duncan's building, 143-157 High Street. The new completion date for the project would be 13th February 2020.

Councillor Davidson/Councillor Chen

Carried

10. Approval of an extension of time for a Heritage Incentive Grant for 88 Chester Street East, Christchurch

Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Approve a further extension of time of six months for the uptake of the Heritage Incentive Grant previously approved for the building at 88 Chester Street East. The new completion date for the project would be 08 July 2019.

Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00004

Part B

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Approve a further extension of time of six months for the uptake of the Heritage Incentive Grant previously approved for the building at 88 Chester Street East. The new completion date for the project would be 08th July 2019.

The Committee notes that there are legitimate reasons for the recent delay in the completion of the work but also that this is the third application for an extension of time.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Keown

Carried

11. Avon River Precinct Art Status

Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Receive the information in the Avon River Precinct Art Status Report.

Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00005

Part C

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Receive the information in the Avon River Precinct Art Status Report.

Note: that the Committee request a memorandum from staff on how much funding Ōtākaro Ltd has available for funding of public art works. Are there any plans for 'The Spires'? If not what happened to the funding?

Note: that the Committee request a presentation, to the Committee from the Public Arts Advisory Group.

Councillor Galloway/Councillor Keown

Carried

Meeting concluded at 10.37am.

CONFIRMED THIS 6TH DAY OF MARCH 2019

COUNCILLOR PHIL CLEARWATER
CHAIRPERSON

Item 3 - Minutes of Previous Meeting 30/01/2019

7. Multicultural Subcommittee Minutes - 1 February 2019

Reference: 19/117319

Presenter(s): Councillor Chen, Chair

1. Purpose of Report

The Multicultural Subcommittee held a meeting on 1 February 2019 and is circulating the Minutes recorded to the Council for its information.

2. Recommendation to Social, Community Development and Housing Committee

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee receives the Minutes from the Multicultural Subcommittee meeting held 1 February 2019.

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A	Minutes Multicultural Subcommittee - 1 February 2019	14

Signatories

Author	Liz Ryley - Committee Advisor
--------	-------------------------------



Multicultural Subcommittee OPEN MINUTES

Date: Friday 1 February 2019
Time: 9.03am
Venue: Committee Room 2, Level 2, Civic Offices,
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

Present
Chairperson Councillor Jimmy Chen
Members Councillor Anne Galloway
Councillor Glenn Livingstone

31 January 2019

Claire Phillips
Principal Advisor
Tel: 941 5408

Liz Ryley
Committee Advisor
941 8153
liz.ryley@ccc.govt.nz
www.ccc.govt.nz

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, visit:
www.ccc.govt.nz/the-council/meetings-agendas-and-minutes/

Multicultural Subcommittee
01 February 2019

Christchurch
City Council 

-
- Part A** **Matters Requiring a Council Decision**
Part B **Reports for Information**
Part C **Decisions Under Delegation**
-

The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

Councillor Chen wished everyone a Happy New Year for 2019 – Chinese Year of the Pig.

1. Apologies

Part C

There were no apologies recorded.

2. Declarations of Interest

Part B

There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. Confirmation of Previous Minutes

Part C

Committee Resolved MCSC/2019/00001

That the minutes of the Multicultural Subcommittee meeting held on Monday, 3 December 2018 be confirmed.

Councillor Galloway/Councillor Livingstone

Carried

4. Public Forum

Part B

There were no public forum presentations.

5. Deputations by Appointment

Part B

There were no deputations by appointment.

6. Updates from Mandated Groups

Part B

There were no updates from mandated groups.

Multicultural Subcommittee
01 February 2019



7. ChristchurchNZ - Lantern Festival - 22 - 24 February 2019

Loren Heaphy, General Manager of Destination and Attraction, and Jen Beatty, Event Development Manager, of ChristchurchNZ provided an update and power point presentation on the Lantern Festival being held on 22-24 February. The Festival is being co-ordinated with the Town Hall opening. They tabled posters about the event that had been delivered to businesses and retailers.

The Multicultural Subcommittee thanked Loren and Jen for the update.

8. Culture Galore Event - 23 February 2019

Community Recreation Advisors, Lisa Gregory (Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood) and Emily Toase (Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton) updated the Subcommittee on the Culture Galore event and displayed photos of participants from previous events. Points noted included:

- Culture Galore is in its 17th year
- The Festival is for different ethnic groups
- There are over 65 food and craft stalls
- At past events over 6000 people have attended over the day
- 30 different countries are presented
- 75 groups are registered to participate this year, nine are groups new to the event.

Lisa expressed thanks to the Council and Community Boards for supporting the 23 February event.

The Multicultural Subcommittee thanked Lisa and Emily for their presentation.

An adjournment was taken from 10am to 10.12am.

**9. Multicultural Report
Committee Comment**

Claire Phillips provided a verbal update on the:

- Multicultural Strategy implementation – currently working on improving Council's capture of ethnicity statistics and reporting achievements against Strategy outcomes.
- Staff are planning two civic related sessions for multicultural groups in April 2019 with a focus on the machinery of Local Government and participating in the upcoming local body elections. Staff are to liaise with the Multicultural Council and Office for Ethnic Communities in relation to this.
- Funding – The Strengthening Community Fund will open for applications from 4 March to 9 April 2019. Community information sessions will be promoted widely to CALD communities. Dates are to be confirmed.
- Refugee Resettlement– update on sector co-ordination – New refugee intake is still on track for March 2019. Staff will be investigating how best to provide a welcome for them. Welcome signage for the Civic building in Hereford Street is being worked on and staff will report back to the next Subcommittee meeting on progress made.

Multicultural Subcommittee
01 February 2019



- INFORM schedule for 2019 – on 14 February 2019 at the upcoming INFORM meeting the National Settlement Manager from MBIE will present on National Migrant Consultations.
- Gary Watson, Manager Community Partnerships and Governance, provided a brief update about Hagley Community College's proposal for a multicultural centre.
- Multicultural subcommittee mandated group presentations for 2019 – an update on this matter will be provided to the next meeting.

Staff will follow up and present to the next meeting about welcoming signage across Council, the process for welcoming refugees into the city, and the framework for the Implementation Strategy.

Councillor Livingstone departed the meeting at 10:55 am.

Committee Resolved MCSC/2019/00002

Part C

That the Multicultural Subcommittee:

1. Receive the verbal update by staff on Multicultural activities.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Galloway

Carried

Meeting concluded at 11.02am.

CONFIRMED THIS 5TH DAY OF APRIL 2019

COUNCILLOR JIMMY CHEN
CHAIRPERSON

8. Monarch Butterfly Overwintering Sites in Response to Likely Predation

Reference: 19/9142

Presenter(s): Dr Antony Shadbolt (Team Leader - Parks Biodiversity)
Vicky Steele (Project Wingz)

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee to endorse staff recommendations to implement protection measures at selected monarch butterfly overwintering trees in Christchurch Parks to remove/reduce suspected predation by rats.

Origin of Report

- 1.2 This report has been co-written by Council Staff and Vicky Steele (Project Wingz) to fulfil the request at the 8 August 2018 Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee to provide further information to the Committee.

2. Significance

- 2.1 The decision in this report is low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
- 2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the project being low cost and affecting a limited group of residents

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Endorse the following protection measures:
 - a. That monarch butterfly overwintering trees at Abberly Park and Burnside Park be banded within seven days of butterflies beginning their overwintering behaviour.
 - b. That staff monitor butterfly mortality at Abberley Park and Burnside Park and other sites to determine the effectiveness of tree banding.

4. Key Points

- 4.1 This report supports the [Council's Long Term Plan \(2018 - 2028\)](#):
- 4.1.1 Activity: Parks & Foreshore
- Level of Service: 6.8.2.2 Parks are provided managed and maintained in a clean, tidy, safe, functional and equitable manner (Asset Condition) - Gardens - condition average or better: 70%
- 4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
- Option 1 – Fit overwintering trees with pest proof tree bands (preferred option)

- Option 2 – Carry out Rat trapping and/or poisoning
- Option 3 – A combination of Options 1 and 2
- Option 4 – Do nothing

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- Will assist Council staff and the community in determining the cause of significant mortality in monarch butterfly over-wintering sites.
- Is likely to prevent significant mortality at target sites
- Is a relatively cost effective and proven intervention compared with ongoing predator control in the urban environment

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Will not provide protection at all monarch overwintering sites
- Minor adverse visual effect of tree bands

5. Context/Background

Monarch Butterfly Predation in Urban Parks

- 5.1 Monarch Butterflies are described as an 'assisted native' by some entomologists and they are thought to have arrived in New Zealand via a natural colonisation event. However there are no New Zealand native plant species that support their larval (caterpillar) stage and therefore, they require swan plants (add genus name), their natural host, to be cultivated and planted by humans in gardens to fill this gap in their lifecycle requirements. Hence their survival in New Zealand is dependent on people. They have not been assigned a 'Threat Classification' under the New Zealand Threat Classification system.
- 5.2 During two overwintering seasons (2016 and 2018) Christchurch City Council (Council) staff were alerted by members of the public to high monarch butterfly mortality in some urban parks (Refer Table 1). It has been suggested by members of the community that the dead butterflies have been victims of predation, and through investigation it seems that the likely cause of this predation has been black rats (*Rattus rattus*) which have been observed in the overwintering trees at Abberley Park. Unlike Norway rats (*Rattus norvegicus*), black rats are good climbers.

5.3 Colonies monitored consistently (weekly and after severe weather) since 1997 include:

- Woodham Park
- Abberley Park
- Ruru Lawn Cemetery/Linwood Cemetery
- Redwood Park
- St James Park
- Bishopdale Park
- Burnside Park

5.4 Predation was first discovered in Abberley Park and Ruru Lawn Cemetery in May 2016. There was no predation recorded in 2017, but in 2018 it occurred again at Abberley Park and also Burnside Park and Ernle Clark Reserve.

5.5 Table 1 shows monitoring data from 2012 until present, from Abberley and Burnside Parks. Numbers are approximate, recorded by eye, and taken after 4pm while the butterflies roost. Note: deaths are recorded by the recovery of dead butterflies and/or wings (set of 4 made up of 2 forewings and 2 hindwings of matching sex). Not all reduction in numbers is related to mortality - female butterflies leave parks after mating usually around mid-July/early August (weather dependent)

1. *Table 1: Monarch butterfly monitoring data from 2012 until present, from Abberley and Burnside Parks¹.*

Abberley Park									
	Pop. Est. late April	Deaths recorded	% since April	Pop. Est. mid July	Deaths recorded	% since July	Pop. Est. Late August	Overall Mortality	Cause (if known)
2012	450	113	25%	290	22	10%	110	35%	Snow, cold
2013	650	185	28.5%	410	35	9%	160	37.5%	Snow, cold
2014	700	32	4.6%	620	12	2%	140	6.6%	
2015	800	163	20.4%	590	97	19.4%	190	39.8%	Heavy rain, snow
2016	800	Substantial		15	1	.6%	10	97.3%	Predation
Wings were tallied for only a short period, then we were asked to leave them in situ. In early May the number of deaths per night was 25. Three deaths were recorded from natural causes. One butterfly was found ½ eaten but still alive.									
2017	190	11	6%	170	2	1.2%	100	7.2%	
2018	700	Substantial		15	7	.47%	8	97%	Predation
Predation discovered on 3 rd May. Wings were tallied daily. Average per night during May was 18 butterflies. Three deaths were recorded from natural causes. Four live butterflies were labelled and relocated to Woodham Park (they have not been recovered).									
Burnside Park									
	Pop. Est. late April	Deaths recorded	% since April	Pop. Est. mid July	Deaths recorded	% since July	Pop. Est. Late August	Overall Mortality	Cause (if known)
2012	350	52	14.5%	240	17	8.5%	70	23%	Snow, cold
2013	450	83	18.5%	330	7	2.3%	100	20.8%	Snow, cold
2014	500	17	3.4%	420	3	.85%	90	4.25%	
2015	650	103	15.8%	470	41	9%	130	16.68%	Heavy rain, snow
2016	450	7	1.5%	400	3	.75%	110	2.35%	
2017	370	6	1.6%	330	2	.7%	100	2.30%	
2018	400	Substantial		8	1	1.25%	4	98%	Predation
Predation was discovered on 6 th June after noticing the colony diminishing. Three deaths were recorded from natural causes, and one from a Praying Mantis (old sample). Three live butterflies were labelled and relocated to Woodham Park (they have not been recovered).									

¹ Data used in this document has been collected by co-author Vicky Steel (Project Wingz) and is not for use or publication outside of Christchurch City Council without consent

- 5.6 Due to accumulated toxins (cardenolides) in monarch butterflies, they have no known major mammalian predators of any significance except for the black eared mouse which is native to South America and has evolved an ability to prey upon the monarch. This species does not occur in New Zealand. Elsewhere rats have also been observed feeding on monarchs in overwintering trees, so while it may be unusual that black rats are predating monarch butterflies in Christchurch's urban parks, it is certainly not out of the question.
- 5.7 In 2016 and 2018 the Styx Living Laboratory Trust lent the Council Parks Unit staff a motion sensing wildlife surveillance cameras which were set up in the overwintering trees in Abberley Park. No rats were detected in the 2016 session, however it is possible that this may have been due to a) poor camera set-up and/or b) the cameras only being deployed for a short session. However, rats were frequently detected on the cameras within the overwintering tree during the 2018 monitoring session.
- 5.8 Monarch butterflies are not considered a threatened or at-risk species in New Zealand, and therefore Monarch butterflies are not considered a high priority species for management by the Christchurch City Council from a biodiversity perspective. However, they are regarded as charismatic species in their own right and usually thrive in Christchurch, even throughout the winter. Many residents of Christchurch buy or grow swan plants during spring, summer and autumn to attract monarchs to their gardens. **Their overwintering sites are an aesthetic novelty in our urban parks, and their presence here and across the city unquestionably supports our Garden City image and identity.**
- 5.9 New Zealand has a higher rate of unique butterfly and moth species than anywhere else, and particularly so in Canterbury. However you rarely see many other species in our city, making the Monarch a welcome sight. As pollinators, they are also a beneficial species and one of the few butterflies seen during the colder months with most other Canterbury butterflies overwintering as a larva or pupa.
- 5.10 Furthermore Monarch butterflies are one of the first wildlife species that young children come to recognise and are captivated by. Exposure to, and appreciation of urban nature at any age, whether it be indigenous, exotic (or in this case an assisted native species) is likely to lead to an increased sense of care and kaitiaki of the natural environment, including our parks and open spaces.
- 5.11 Brian Patrick, a well-known Canterbury entomologist and butterfly/moth expert also believes the monarch is an iconic feature of Christchurch parks and gardens and would like to see measures put in place to protect them. He has discussed such solutions as fitting the overwintering trees with metal predator/pest exclusion bands and planting winter flowering plants in the vicinity of the overwintering trees.
- 5.12 Although there is no conclusive (scientific) evidence that it is indeed black rats predating on the monarch butterflies at their overwintering sites, the degree of anecdotal evidence and expert opinion suggests that this is the likely scenario and is a theory that could be further investigated.
- 5.13 Therefore it is recommended that a degree of predator control, monitoring, and assessment of its success is undertaken prior to and during the 2019 and 2020² overwintering seasons. Note that opportunities to incorporate winter flowering plant species be incorporated into planting renewals to help improve the butterflies fitness and robustness at this time of the year.

² Note that it is possible that the predation may skip a year (as per 2017) when the returning numbers to the colonies are smaller than usual.

- 5.14 Options for reducing the level and impacts of predation in urban parks therefore include:
- Do nothing approach
 - Rat trapping and/or poisoning
 - Banding of selected overwintering trees (preferred option), and
 - A combination of tree banding and trapping/poisoning
 - Incorporation of winter flowering plants into planted areas (refer below)
- 5.15 **Do Nothing:** This option is likely to have no beneficial effect on monarch butterfly populations at the overwintering sites and may result on ongoing predation and increased adverse publicity.
- 5.16 **Trapping and/or Poisoning:** Trapping and poisoning on its own is not likely to be an effective solution due to the continual reinvasion of predators from adjacent areas. Given the low priority from a biodiversity perspective and not being part of a wider pest control initiative within the Christchurch urban area it is unlikely that this approach would be supported by (e.g.) Predator Free 2050.
- 5.17 **Tree Banding:** Attaching steel bands that prevent rats and other predators from accessing overwintering sites is a cost effective solution depending on the complexities of the overwintering trees (IE are there multiple, interlacing tree canopies necessitating the banding of multiple trees?). An estimated cost of each tree band is in the vicinity of \$180 each – again dependant on the complexities of each tree.
- 5.18 **Winter Flowering Plants:** The Council Parks unit has a programme of Urban Park and Garden Heritage Park plant border renewals. Plant borders may be able to be retrofitted/supplemented with winter flowering plant species at no additional cost to status quo plant species election.

6. Option 1 – Selected Tree Banding (preferred)

Option Description

- 6.1 Supply and install rat and predator-proof steel tree bands to monarch butterfly overwintering trees.

Significance

- 6.2 The level of significance of this option is Low consistent with section 2 of this report.
6.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are none.

Impact on Mana Whenua

- 6.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

- 6.5 This option is consistent with Council's Plans and Policies

Financial Implications

- 6.6 Cost of Implementation - \$1500
6.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – Likely Nil
6.8 Funding source – Urban Parks

Legal Implications

- 6.9 There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision
6.10 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit

Risks and Mitigations

- 6.11 There is a risk that the general public may have a negative view of Council spending public money on monarch butterfly protection. This may result in media negative attention
- 6.11.1 Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk after the below treatment is Low
- 6.11.2 Planned treatment(s) include tolerating this risk and also take advantage of such a situation to educate the wider public, highlight this novel phenomenon in the City's Parks, and highlight biodiversity threats caused by exotic predators.

Implementation

- 6.12 Implementation dependencies - Presence of overwintering butterflies
6.13 Implementation timeframe – Late Spring 2019 (determined by time butterfly overwintering)

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

- 6.14 The advantages of this option include:
- Will assist Council staff and the community in determining the cause of significant mortality in monarch butterfly over-wintering sites.
 - Is likely to prevent significant mortality at target sites
 - Is a relatively cost effective intervention compared with ongoing predator control

- 6.15 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Minor adverse visual effect of tree bands

7. Option 2 – Trapping and/or Poisoning

Option Description

- 7.1 Set traps and/or lay poison in vicinity of overwintering trees

Significance

- 7.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua

- 7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

- 7.4 This option is consistent with Council's Plans and Policies

Financial Implications Cost of Implementation - <enter text>

- 7.5 Cost of Implementation - \$1100
7.6 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - \$900
7.7 Funding source – Urban Parks

Legal Implications

- 7.8 There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision
7.9 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit

Risks and Mitigations

- 7.10 There is a risk that the general public may have a negative view of Council spending public money on monarch butterfly protection. This may result in media negative attention
- 7.10.1 Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk after the below treatment is Low
- 7.10.2 Planned treatment(s) include tolerating this risk and also take advantage of such a situation to educate the wider public, highlight this novel phenomenon in the City's Parks, and highlight biodiversity threats caused by exotic predators.

Implementation

- 7.11 Implementation dependencies - Presence of overwintering butterflies
7.12 Implementation timeframe – Late Spring 2019 (determined by time butterfly overwintering)

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.13 The advantages of this option include:

- Does not entail attaching tree bands to trees and therefore avoids adverse aesthetics

7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Will entail continual trapping and poisoning as rats and/or other predators will continually recolonise the control area from (e.g.) adjacent properties.
- Rats and/or other predators may avoid traps and will therefore still pose a threat to the overwintering populations
- Diverts animal pest control resources away from high(er) priority/threatened indigenous species

8. Option 3 – Do Nothing

Option Description

8.1 No control action is taken and butterfly colonies will be exposed to possible decimation by rats

Significance

8.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua

8.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

8.4 This option is consistent with Council's Plans and Policies

Financial Implications

8.5 Cost of Implementation - Nil

8.6 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Nil

8.7 Funding source – N/A

Legal Implications

8.8 There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision

8.9 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit

Risks and Mitigations

8.10 There is a risk that interested members of the public will have a negative view of Council not investing in protecting this unique feature of the public open space. This may in-turn result in negative media attention

8.10.1 Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk after the below treatment is Low

8.10.2 Planned treatment includes tolerating this risk.

Implementation

8.11 Implementation dependencies - N/A

8.12 Implementation timeframe – N/A

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

8.13 The advantages of this option include:

- No cost to Council

8.14 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Does not protect overwintering monarch butterfly colonies
- Council and the community will still not know whether tree banding successfully protects butterfly colonies

Attachments

There are no attachments to this report.

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

- (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
- (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

Author	Antony Shadbolt - Team Leader Biodiversity
Approved By	Andrew Rutledge - Head of Parks Mary Richardson - General Manager Citizen and Community

9. Approval of a Heritage Incentive Grant for Kilwinning Lodge, 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton

Reference: 18/1014794

Presenter(s): Brendan Smyth, Team Leader Heritage

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee to recommend to Council a Heritage Incentive Grant for the heritage building at 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton also known as 'Kilwinning Lodge'.

Origin of Report

- 1.2 This report is staff generated in response to an application from the owners of the building who wish to repair, strengthen, renovate and partially reconstruct this building so that it can function again, both as their own office and with leased commercial space.

2. Significance

- 2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
- 2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding relative to that already approved by Council for allocation in the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Approve a Heritage Incentive Grant of \$258,782 for 'Kilwinning Lodge', 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton, subject to the following requirements:
 - a. That the applicant enters into a full conservation covenant with the Council to cover the heritage building and heritage setting;
 - b. The grant is split with \$158,782 of the grant awarded from the 2018/19 financial year and \$100,000 from 2019/2020, and the second part not paid out before the start of that financial year.

4. Key Points

- 4.1 This report supports the [Council's Long Term Plan \(2018 - 2028\)](#):
- 4.1.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy
- Level of Service: 1.4.2.0 Support the conservation and enhancement of the city's heritage places - 100% of approved grant applications are allocated in accordance with the policy.
 - Level of Service 1.4.3: Maintain the sense of place by conserving the city's heritage places.
- 4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 – A Heritage Incentive Grant of up to \$258,782, (twenty-one percent, preferred option);
- Option 2 - A Heritage Incentive Grant of up to \$180,000 (fifteen percent).

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option):

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- It supports the retention of a 'Significant' heritage building;
- It promotes the repair and reconstruction of a building which is a landmark building in Lyttelton, is adjacent the town centre and contributes to the unique identity of the town centre;
- It promotes the retention of a building which has dual significance to the district, both as a former Masonic Lodge and as the former studio and residence of one of New Zealand's foremost contemporary artists, Bill Hammond;
- The work includes reconstruction of previous exterior features of the building that have been lost over the years;
- Through a conservation covenant the grant affords protection to the landmark value of the building in Lyttelton, where so much heritage was lost following the Canterbury earthquakes;
- With the grant acting as an incentive, the project to restore the building will generate a significant amount of private investment.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- This would be a large grant to a single building.

5. Context/Background

Former Kilwinning Lodge Brief History

- 5.1 The former Masonic Lodge is scheduled in the Christchurch District Plan as 'Significant', and is part of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Lyttelton Historic Area. Further information is provided in the attached Statement of Significance (Attachment A).
- 5.2 The building was originally built in 1881 as a single storey, slate-roofed, brick Masonic Lodge. However, a fire in 1903 resulted in much of the building being lost leaving only the external shell. Unusually, rather than demolish what was left and start again, the existing building was constructed reusing the existing brick walls and façade, and a full second storey was added above. The resultant building is therefore a rare composite structure in a classical style, with solid masonry walls at the lower level and a lightweight timber framed upper storey. Classical architecture is particularly associated with the Masonic movement and the façade at 26 Canterbury Street reflects this with classical detailing. Both the original and the modified lodges were designed by local lodge member 'Bro.' J Barnes, and decorated by William Radcliffe, a painter based in London Street, Lyttelton.
- 5.3 The premises were sold to prominent New Zealand artist Bill Hammond in 2000, especially noted for his paintings of 'bird-people', depictions initially inspired by a visit to the Auckland Islands in 1991. 'Bird-people' and 'horse-people' have continued to feature in his work ever since.
- 5.4 Bill Hammond had the hall adapted for use as an artist's studio, commissioning Christchurch architect Stewart Ross for the design. This included the installation of three large windows on the south elevation, to light the studio, and internally a new staircase and mezzanine floor. Bill Hammond was the owner of the building when the 2010/2011 Canterbury earthquakes

occurred and was fully committed to repairing the building following those events. However, the lodge was finally sold to the director of a structural engineering company in 2015.

- 5.5 The Canterbury Earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 resulted in the loss of many of the larger and older buildings within Lyttelton Town Centre including the Albion Building across the road from the Lodge. This site is now Albion Square and the Lodge is now a very prominent and distinct backdrop for the Square. Following the loss of so many buildings in the Canterbury earthquakes the building is a landmark for Lyttelton and the Port.



Photograph, Former Kilwinning Lodge, December 2014 and in context, 2018

- 5.6 The applicant for the grant is the owner who purchased the building in 2015, 'Kilwinning Limited'. They are undertaking the structural engineering work themselves under the umbrella of their company Structex Studio 2, and are employing Fulton Ross Team Architects; Stewart Ross, a partner in this company, undertook the earlier design for Bill Hammond. The proposal includes the strengthening and re-development of the building to incorporate a new studio for the engineering company on the first floor, while making the ground floor available for lease as commercial premises. They are committed to finding a tenant that will be able to utilise the lower space without compromising the building's principal western facade.
- 5.7 The works to be undertaken are significant, given the deterioration of the structure since the earthquakes. They include undertaking strengthening while maintaining much of the heritage fabric and unique character of the building, including work to the foundations, floors, interior walls and roof. They wish to reconstruct the former decorated parapet on the façade as well as reinstate the flagpole and front fence. They also wish to adapt the interior of the building with the insertion of a removable mezzanine structure, as well as altering some windows and doors, and adding a patio space to the rear.
- 5.8 The owners state that the work '*...will remedy damaged areas, provide viable space for occupation, and bring the building up to current codes and standards. Without this work, the building's deterioration will accelerate and sadly a new chapter cannot be added to its storied past.*' They consider that the end result will be '*...a functional building that can once again contribute to the community.*'

6. Option 1 – Heritage Incentive Grant Funding of up to \$258,782 (preferred)

Option Description

- 6.1 This report proposes funding of \$258,782 from the Heritage Incentive Grant Fund, part from the current financial year and part from the 2019/20 financial year. The second part of the funding would only be paid out in that financial year or later. The applicants are seeking the grant confirmation to give them some certainty of funding so as to start the works as soon as possible to prevent further deterioration of the building.
- 6.2 The proposed work includes all the required upgrades for structure, fire and emergency egress and fire protection systems that are all required by the intended future use of the building. The building's previous use as a residence is no longer a viable option. The owners will be applying for resource and building consents for these change of use works.
- 6.3 All relevant costs of the works have been summarised as outlined in the table below:

Particulars	Costs (GST exclusive)
Propping, scaffolding and deconstruction of façade elements	\$24,025
Stonework repairs	\$150,000
Façade reinstatement of features (flagpole, parapet, trim)	\$44,810
Door and window repairs	\$12,590
Façade painting	\$12,225
Wall and fence reconstruction	\$2,860
Structural work (foundations, steel frame, bracing walls & roof)	\$479,677
External repairs	\$148,023
Interior heritage feature reinstatement and repairs	\$122,406
Professional fees and contingency sums	\$199,323
Total of heritage related structural, repair & reconstruction work	\$1,195,939

- 6.4 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. However, given the limited amount of available funding and the high demand on the fund, it is proposed that a grant of approximately twenty-one percent would be appropriate for this project.

Proposed heritage grant (approx. twenty-one per cent of itemised work)	\$258,782
---	------------------

Significance

- 6.5 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with Section 2 of this report. There are no engagement requirements in the Operational Guidelines or policy for this grant scheme.

Impact on Mana Whenua

- 6.6 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

- 6.7 The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes '*The city's heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations*'. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is a measure for these outcomes.

- 6.8 No members of the community are specifically affected by this option. However, in the past members of the Lyttelton Community have indicated their support for the repair and retention of this building.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

- 6.9 The recommendations of this report align with the relevant strategies, plans and policies as listed below:
- Christchurch Central Recovery Strategy
 - Christchurch District Plan
 - Heritage Conservation Policy
 - Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
 - Christchurch City Council Multi-cultural Strategy
 - New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
 - International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New Zealand Charter 1993

Financial Implications

- 6.10 Cost of implementation for all HIG applications in this financial year and of those presented at this Committee meeting (with the percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (21% in total over 2 years*)	\$158,782
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (5%)	\$71,509
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (29% in total over 2 years*)	\$72,741
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (18%)	\$100,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street (30%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (2%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$0
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$100,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$70,000
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$527,700

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

- 6.11 It is expected that further grant applications will be received but staff believe that given the current high demand for assistance, that the funding outlined above is appropriate. Future building owners enquiring about funding can be advised of the full allocation of funding in the current financial year and prepare for an application in July within the 2019/2020 financial year.

- 6.12 The Strategic Planning and Policy activity includes the provision of heritage advice, the heritage grants schemes, and the confirmation of a Heritage Strategy for Council. The Council aims to maintain and protect built, cultural and natural heritage items, areas and values which contribute to a unique city, community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past. The Council promotes heritage as a valuable educational and interpretation resource which also contributes to the tourism industry and provides an economic benefit to the City.
- 6.13 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide financial assistance for the retention, maintenance and enhancement of heritage items and buildings.
- 6.14 Funding source - The Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.
- 6.15 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – There will be no on-going maintenance costs to the Council as a result of this grant.

Legal Implications

- 6.16 Limited conservation covenants are required under the Heritage Conservation Operational Guidelines for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of \$15,000 to \$149,999. A full covenant is required for grants of \$150,000 or more.
- 6.17 Covenants are a comprehensive form of protection of the buildings because they are registered against the property title, ensuring that the Council's investment is protected. A full conservation covenant will be required in relation to this grant.

Risks and Mitigations

- 6.18 The Council's Heritage Grant Policy Operational Guidelines only allow funds to be paid out upon completion of the works and upon presentation of receipts. This ensures that the grant scheme is effective and that funds are not diverted or lost.

Implementation

- 6.19 Implementation dependencies - The grant recipient is expected to acquire all resource, building, and other consents required for the works.
- 6.20 Implementation timeframe – The grant recipient has an 18-month time period from the date of approval to undertake the works and to claim the grant. An application to extend this timeframe can be made to the Committee.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

- 6.21 The advantages of this option include:
- It supports the retention of a 'Significant' heritage building;
 - It promotes the repair and reconstruction of a building which is a landmark building in Lyttelton, is adjacent the town centre and contributes to the unique identity of the town centre;
 - It promotes the retention of a building which has dual significance to the district, both as a former Masonic Lodge and as the former studio and residence of one of New Zealand's foremost contemporary artists, Bill Hammond;
 - The work includes reconstruction of previous exterior features of the building that have been lost over the years;
 - Through a conservation covenant the grant affords protection to the landmark value of the building in Lyttelton, where so much heritage was lost following the Canterbury earthquakes;

- With the grant acting as an incentive, the project to restore the building will generate a significant amount of private investment.

6.22 The disadvantages of this option include:

- This would be a large grant to a single building.

7. Option 2 – A lower level of funding, \$180,000 (fifteen percent).

Option Description

7.1 Option 2 would be for a lower level of financial support to the project. Grant support has varied on previous projects but has been generally between thirty and fifty percent of the cost of eligible works. A lesser grant of fifteen percent (\$180,000) is shown in the table below, split over two years. Other grant levels are obviously possible other than these two options. Apart from the level of financial support, this option has all the same impacts and alignments as Option 1. The table below includes the previously approved grants along with the **lesser** level of grants for all of the current applications for **this** Committee meeting (with the lower percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (15% in total over 2 years*)	\$90,000
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (3%)	\$50,000
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (20% in total over 2 years*)	\$48,494
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (11%)	\$60,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton (20%)	\$6,437
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (3%)	\$14,500
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$153,601
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$90,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$48,494
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$559,206

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.2 The advantages of this option include:

- It supports the retention of a key, 'Significant' heritage building;
- It promotes the repair and reconstruction of a building which is a landmark building in Lyttelton, is adjacent the town centre and contributes to the unique identity of the town centre;

- It promotes the retention of a building which has dual significance to the district, both as a former Masonic Lodge and as the former studio and residence of one of New Zealand's foremost contemporary artists, Bill Hammond;
- The work includes reconstruction of previous features of the building that have been lost over the years;
- Through a conservation covenant the grant affords protection to the landmark value of the building in Lyttelton, where so much heritage was lost following the Canterbury earthquakes;
- With the grant acting as an incentive, the project to restore the building will generate a significant amount of private investment.

7.3 The disadvantages of this option include:

- This would still be a reasonable grant to a single project but may be insufficient to act as an incentive to the owners to undertake the complex repair and upgrade works;
- The lower grant funds may undermine the ability of the owners to raise funds from other sources and will make the delivery of the project much harder for the owner.

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A ↓	26 Canterbury Street Statement of Significance	37

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

- sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
- adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

Author	Brendan Smyth - Team Leader Heritage
Approved By	Carolyn Ingles - Head of Urban Regeneration, Design and Heritage Brendan Anstiss - General Manager Strategy and Transformation

DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 1052
**FORMER MASONIC LODGE KILWINNING AND SETTING – 26
CANTERBURY STREET, LYTTELTON**



PHOTOGRAPH: BRENDAN SMYTH, 2014

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Historical and social values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political or other patterns.

The former Kilwinning Lodge has historical and social significance as the meeting place of the Lyttelton Masonic Lodge which was founded under the Scottish Constitution. It also has more recent social significance as the studio of well-known New Zealand artist Bill Hammond. The property was bought in 1878 by the Canterbury Kilwinning Lodge, having for most of its existence before then belonged to John Watts Russell, an early settler and prominent member of Canterbury society who owned a 500 acre property in Riccarton called Ilam. The property was leased to a succession of occupiers before being sold by John Russell's widow Elizabeth to cabinet maker John Wilcox in 1875. Three years later Wilcox sold the property to the Canterbury Kilwinning Lodge.

The Canterbury Kilwinning Lodge was formed in Lyttelton in 1875. All Masonic lodges in New Zealand at this time were founded under an English or a Scottish Constitution. The

Kilwinning Lodge was the 585th lodge to be formed under the Scottish Constitution and in the early 1890s it became the 23rd lodge of the new Grand Lodge of New Zealand. Three years after purchasing the site the Kilwinning Lodge started construction of a new purpose-built Masonic hall. Designed by lodge member Brother John Barnes (1849-1928), built by Mr Hughes and decorated by local painter William Radcliffe, the building was consecrated on 13 October 1881.

The original lodge building was a substantial single-storey brick building with a slate roof and a room in the attic. In 1903 fire badly damaged the building and its replacement was also designed by Bro. Barnes and painted by Radcliffe. It was built by Lyttelton builders Hollis and Brown, the latter was then the lodge treasurer. The brick walls of the former building were retained, but a full first floor was added with a timber façade and corrugated iron side and rear walls. The building was used by the lodge for 60 years before alterations were undertaken in 1962 with the replacement of the roof, downpipes and spouting. The lodge sold the hall to the painter Bill Hammond in 2000. Hammond had the hall adapted for use as a studio with the addition of windows on the south elevation, French doors and a balcony on the north elevation, a new staircase and a mezzanine. The alterations were designed by Christchurch architect Stewart Ross. The building suffered damage in the Canterbury earthquakes. It is now owned by a publishing company.

CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

The former Kilwinning Lodge has cultural significance for its association with the Masonic movement, more particularly with the Scottish Masonic movement. Freemasonry is a belief system, encompassing a particular way of life, which is followed worldwide according to long established traditions. The Freemasons played an important role in the social history of New Zealand as a philanthropic organisation and as a force within local politics. Lodge members played a significant social role in the local community, providing fellowship and care for members and their families. Lodges of a number of different orders were important social institutions, providing social events such as cricket games, card tournaments, musical evenings, and classes for self-improvement from sports to literature.

ARCHITECTURAL AND AESTHETIC SIGNIFICANCE

Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place.

The former Kilwinning Lodge has architectural and aesthetic significance as a composite 1881 and 1903 Italianate structure built to serve a Masonic lodge. Classical architecture is particularly associated with the Masonic movement and the façade of 26 Canterbury Street features a classical portico, window hoods and sills with carved brackets, a cornice between the ground and first floor and ground floor brickwork moulded to look like rusticated stonework. John Barnes was a London-born builder and joiner who arrived in New Zealand in 1874. He was a life member of the Canterbury Kilwinning Lodge, as well as a noted amateur singer.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE

Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with: the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period.

The former Kilwinning Lodge has technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate construction techniques used in the erection of both brick and timber buildings in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail; recognised landmarks and landscape which are recognised and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.

The former Kilwinning Lodge and its setting have contextual significance as part of the streetscape of Canterbury Street. It is a recognised landmark on the street and is well recognised and visible from further afield in Lyttelton. Commercial buildings on the downhill, south side of the Lodge provide an urban, town centre setting, while to the north of the Lodge are the grounds of the Anglican Church and the former site of Holy Trinity Church (demolished). The setting includes the rectangular parcel of land on which the former Lodge building stands. The building is located close to the street boundary and occupies almost the full width of the property. An ornamental brick and wire fence was severely damaged by the Canterbury earthquakes.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

Archaeological or scientific values that demonstrate or are associated with: the potential to provide information through physical or scientific evidence an understanding about social historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values of past events, activities, structures or people.

The former Kilwinning Lodge and its setting have archaeological significance because of the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site, including that which occurred prior to 1900.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

The former Kilwinning Lodge and its setting has overall significance to Banks Peninsula and Christchurch. The building has historical and social significance as the meeting place of Lyttelton Freemasons for almost 120 years and as the studio of well-known New Zealand artist Bill Hammond. The former Lodge has cultural significance for its links to the Masonic movement and architectural and aesthetic significance as an Italianate building designed and built by members of the Lodge. The former Kilwinning Lodge has technological and craftsmanship significance for its brick and timber construction and contextual significance as

a local landmark and defining feature of the Canterbury Street streetscape. The building and its setting has archaeological significance in view of its location and date at which the first stage of the building was erected.

REFERENCES:

Christchurch City Council Heritage File *26 Canterbury Street, Former Kilwinning Lodge*
Wright, Gareth, *Background Information Listed Heritage Place, Kilwinning Lodge Hall (fmr), 26 Canterbury Street (1903) - 2009*
'Obituary – John William Barnes' *Evening Post* 6 June 1928 p. 11.

REPORT DATED: 2 MARCH, 2015

PLEASE NOTE THIS ASSESSMENT IS BASED ON INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF WRITING. DUE TO THE ONGOING NATURE OF HERITAGE RESEARCH, FUTURE REASSESSMENT OF THIS HERITAGE ITEM MAY BE NECESSARY TO REFLECT ANY CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF ITS HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE.

PLEASE USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CCC HERITAGE FILES.

10. Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch

Reference: 18/1069683

Presenter(s): Fiona Wykes – Senior Heritage Advisor

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee to recommend to Council to approve a Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) for work to the buildings at 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch, also known as the former Pumphouse.

Origin of Report

- 1.2 This report is staff generated in response to an application for Heritage Incentive Grant funding from the buildings' owner.

2. Significance

- 2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
- 2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than \$500,000;
- 2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

- a) approve a Heritage Incentive Grant of \$71,509 for conservation, strengthening and repair work to the protected heritage building located at 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch.
- b) note that the applicant has already entered into a full conservation covenant.

4. Key Points

- 4.1 This report supports the [Council's Long Term Plan \(2018 - 2028\)](#):

4.1.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy

- Level of Service: 1.4.2.0 Support the conservation and enhancement of the city's heritage places - 100% of approved grant applications are allocated in accordance with the policy.
- Level of Service 1.4.3: Maintain the sense of place by conserving the city's heritage places.

- 4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 – A nominated amount of \$71,509 (preferred option)
- Option 2 – A nominated amount of \$50,000

- 4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- The work will help to ensure the repair, ongoing use and future protection of this highly significant heritage building. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentives Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines;
- The building has recognised local and national architectural, social, historical and cultural significance;
- The grant will support the completion of the works outlined, the former Pumphouse will be repaired and upgraded; the owners are committed to the continued use and maintenance of the building.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- This is a significant grant for a single building.
- The proposal to assist the owners in their works on the building is substantially less than the full amount requested by the applicant; a lesser amount may impact on the likelihood of the works being completed.

5. Context/Background

Building History

- 5.1 The former Pumphouse is scheduled as a 'Highly Significant' (Group 1) building in the Christchurch District Plan. The building is listed 'Category 2' by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) List Number 3736. See Attachment A, Statement of Significance for further information.
- 5.2 The former Pumphouse building has high historical and social significance for its association with the formation of the Christchurch Drainage Board, and the individuals responsible for the sewerage system's design and construction. It has high cultural significance as it represents the birth of an effective and technologically advanced sewerage system that improved the quality of peoples' lives, as well as their way of life. The building has high architectural significance, for its utilitarian design and classical detailing. It also has technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate construction and engineering techniques from a particular era. There is contextual significance in that the building is a city landmark, and through the relationship with other buildings on the site and with surviving underground sewerage infrastructure. The building is one of the few visible, above ground components of the city's 19th century sewerage system.
- 5.3 The former Pumphouse is a complex of individual buildings, the earliest of which were designed by English civil engineer William Clark. Clark had previously worked for the York and North Midland railway system in England, and the East Indian Railway Company, along with designing drainage schemes for Kingston-upon-Hull, Calcutta, and Madras. He also worked on water supply and drainage schemes for many places in Australia, along with Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch.
- 5.4 The overall building complex is a utilitarian structure with multiple gabled roofs and restrained classical detailing. It is constructed of brick with Oamaru stone details, distinctive multi-paned steel arched windows, arched doors, and round windows in some of the gables. The roofs are a mixture of slate and corrugated iron. Over time the furnace stack and the pump machinery have been removed from the site.
- 5.5 The current owners of the building are Paddy and Jackie Snowdon. In relation to the Operational Guidelines 'Potential Conflict of Interest' disclosure the Committee should note that there is no conflict of interest with this application.

- 5.6 The buildings suffered moderate damage in the 2010/2011 Canterbury earthquakes, although considering their age and masonry construction they performed well. The complex has continued to be occupied, but the owners need to repair and strengthen the buildings to ensure ongoing use of the site. Due to the age and condition of the buildings the owners had been unable to get insurance cover in recent years meaning that there was no cover in place at the time of the Canterbury earthquakes. The cost to repair and strengthen the buildings is considerable and so the owners are seeking help from external funders for the project.

History of the proposed works

- 5.7 The owners have decided to strengthen the buildings to 67% of New Building Standard (NBS) rather than the minimum required 34%, to ensure the security of the buildings' future. The owners have obtained both a resource consent, and a building consent for the proposed works.
- 5.8 The proposed works comprise structural upgrades and repairs to the complex of buildings. The rooves and the brickwork walls are to be repaired and strengthened with metal ties. The windows, doors and stonework are also to be repaired. Items such as the gantry crane are to be retained, and electrics and fire protection upgraded. All the works are in line with the Heritage Incentive Grant Policy – Operational Guidelines, and will contribute towards strengthening and retaining these important Christchurch heritage buildings for ongoing use. Works have been carried out on Buildings One, Two and Five.



Building 2 repaired, and Building 3 not yet started – Owner's photo, September 2018



Building 1 – June
2018

- 5.9 The total cost for the works when the previous grant was applied for (including heritage and non-heritage related costs) was estimated at **\$1,529,986.70**, excluding GST. There is no insurance payment associated with these works. The owners initially requested \$400,000 from the Council's HIG fund, paid over two years. This equated to 26% of the overall heritage related costs, and would generally have been considered to be a reasonable proposal which could be supported by heritage staff. They requested that it be split over two years, which staff noted was a pragmatic request, and also showed an awareness of the limits of the HIG funding. A grant of \$200,000 from the Heritage Incentive Grants fund was awarded in October 2017 as shown in the table below. When this grant was awarded the Council informed the owners that they could apply again the following year for a further grant of a similar amount.
- 5.10 The owners secured further grant funds of \$200,000 from the Heritage EQUIP fund, run by the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, for strengthening the building to 34% NBS. The owners are funding the balance of the works through insurance payments from other properties they own, business earnings and a bank loan.

The current application

- 5.11 As suggested by Council in 2017 the owners of the buildings have reapplied to the HIG fund for a further \$200,000. The project has progressed well to date, but anticipated costs have grown and rather than the \$1,529,986.70 excluding GST estimated in 2017, the budget is now \$1,885,737 excluding GST. The amount being put in by the owners from their own funds has increased to over \$980,000, and they are applying to the bank for a loan to cover outstanding amounts – below is the table of *the applicants proposed* funding for the project

Owners funds	\$985,737
Heritage EQUIP Grant (confirmed)	\$200,000
Council Heritage Incentive Grant, Stage 1, 2017-2018 (confirmed)	\$200,000
Council Heritage Incentive Grant, Stage 2, 2018-2019 (not confirmed)	\$200,000
Proposed bank loan	\$300,000
Total excluding GST	\$1,885,737

6. Option 1 – A Heritage Incentive Grant of \$71,509 (preferred)

Option Description

- 6.1 The proposed works are to structurally upgrade and repair the building. They involve structurally upgrading the interior of the building and carrying out repairs and reinstatement works to the interior and exterior fabric, including repairs to the stonework.
- 6.2 As noted above, overall the total heritage and non-heritage works being proposed are priced at \$1,885,737, excluding GST. All relevant costs of the heritage related works, less the grants awarded (\$) are summarised in the table below:

Particulars	Costs (GST exclusive)
Repairs and strengthening	\$1,095,647
Lifting and reinstating gantry crane	\$6,000
Stonework repairs	\$263,000
Professional fees/consents	\$100,000
Contingency	\$223,700
Total of conservation and restoration related work requiring assistance	\$1,688,347
Less previous HIG grant and EQUIP grant	- \$400,000
Total of conservation and restoration related work requiring assistance	\$1,288,374

- 6.3 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. This has already been determined to equate to more money than the grant fund could support.
- 6.4 The building has high historical, and social significance to Canterbury, as well as high cultural and architectural significance. The building also has technological and craftsmanship, and contextual significance. Its ongoing repair, retention and upgrade to ensure its continuing use is worthy of support. Balancing the high cost of the works, and the current limitations of this grant fund has led to the suggestion of a grant of \$71,509 being appropriate for this project. It is less than requested by the applicant, and equates to 5% of the total works.
- 6.5 This seeks to balance the value of both the building and the eligible works being undertaken, and the fact that the building has received previous grant funding, albeit limited in relation to the overall costs, but reflecting the limited funds available this year, and the demand for grant funding.

Proposed Heritage Incentive Grant (approx. five percent of itemised work)	\$71,509
--	-----------------

Significance

- 6.6 The level of significance of this option is low in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
- 6.6.1 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than \$500,000.
- 6.7 There are no engagement requirements for this level of significance.

Impact on Mana Whenua

- 6.8 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

- 6.9 There are no community groups or members that are specifically affected by this option.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

- 6.10 This option is consistent with Council's Plans and Policies as listed below:

- Christchurch Central Recovery Strategy
- Christchurch District Plan
- Heritage Conservation Policy
- Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
- Christchurch City Council Multi-cultural Strategy
- New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
- International Council on Monuments and Site (ICOMOS) NZ Charter 2010

Financial Implications

- 6.11 Cost of Implementation - for all HIG applications in this financial year and of those presented at this Committee meeting (with the percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (21% in total over 2 years*)	\$158,782
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (5%)	\$71,509
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (29% in total over 2 years*)	\$72,741
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (18%)	\$100,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street (30%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (2%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$0
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$100,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$70,000
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$527,700

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

- 6.12 It is expected that further grant applications will be received, but staff believe that given the current high demand for assistance, the funding outlined above is appropriate. Future building owners enquiring about funding can be advised of the full allocation of funding in the current year and prepare for an application in July within the 2019/2020 financial year.
- 6.13 The Strategic Planning and Policy activity includes the provision of heritage advice, the heritage grants schemes, and the confirmation of a Heritage Strategy for Council. The Council aims to maintain and protect built, cultural and natural heritage items, areas and values which contribute to a unique city, community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past. The Council promotes heritage as a valuable educational and interpretation resource which also contributes to the tourism industry and provides an economic benefit to the City.
- 6.14 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide financial assistance for the retention, maintenance and enhancement of heritage items and buildings.
- 6.15 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - there will be no on-going maintenance costs to the Council as a result of this grant.
- 6.16 Funding source – the Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Legal Implications

- 6.17 Legal conservation covenants are required under the Heritage Conservation Operational Guidelines for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of \$15,000 to \$149,999. A full covenant is required for grants of \$150,000 or more.
- 6.18 Conservation covenants are required under the Heritage Conservation Operational Guidelines for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of \$15,000 to \$149,999. A full covenant is already in place on this property.

Risks and Mitigations

- 6.19 The Council's Heritage Grant Policy Operational Guidelines only allow funds to be paid out upon completion of the works and upon presentation of receipts. This ensures that the grant scheme is effective and that funds are not diverted or lost.

Implementation

- 6.20 Implementation dependencies - The grant recipient is expected to acquire all resource, building, and other consents required for the works.
- 6.21 Implementation timeframe – The grant recipient has an 18-month time period from the date of approval to undertake the works and to claim the grant. An application to extend this timeframe can be made to the Committee.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

- 6.22 The advantages of this option include:
- The work will help to ensure the repair, ongoing use and future protection of this highly significant heritage building. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentives Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines;
 - The building has recognised local and national architectural, social, historical and cultural significance;
 - The grant will support the completion of the works outlined, the former Pumphouse will be repaired and upgraded; the owners are committed to the continued use and maintenance of the building.
- 6.23 The disadvantages of this option include:

- This is a significant grant for a single building;
- The preferred option to assist the owners in their works on the building is less than the amount requested by the applicant; this may impact on the likelihood of the works being completed.

7. Option 2 – A Heritage Incentive Grant of \$50,000 (approx. 3% of itemised work)

Option Description

- 7.1 Option 2 would be for a lower level of financial support to the project. Grant support has varied on previous projects but has been generally between thirty and fifty percent of the cost of the eligible works. A lesser grant of \$50,000 (about 3% of the eligible works) is shown in the table below. A lesser grant has been considered as a second option, and not the preferred option, due to the scale of the overall eligible heritage works for the building – which equates to more than \$1,200,000.
- 7.2 Other grant levels are obviously possible between or above the two options. Apart from the level of financial support, this option has all the same impacts and alignments as Option 1. The table below includes the previously approved grants along with the **lesser** level of grants for all of the current applications for **this** Committee meeting (with the lower percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (15% in total over 2 years*)	\$90,000
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (3%)	\$50,000
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (20% in total over 2 years*)	\$48,494
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (11%)	\$60,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton (20%)	\$6,437
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (3%)	\$14,500
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$153,601
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$90,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$48,494
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$559,206

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

- 7.3 The advantages of this option include:

- It would help support the repair, ongoing use and future protection of this highly significant heritage building. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentives Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines;
- The building has recognised local and national architectural, social, historical and cultural significance;
- Funding would still be available for allocation for the remainder of the 2018/19 financial year.

7.4 The disadvantages of this option include:

- This is option to assist the owners in their works on the building is less than the amount requested by the applicant; this may impact on the likelihood of the works being completed.

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A A	544 Tuam Street - Statement of Significance	50

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

- (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
- (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

Author	Fiona Wykes - Senior Heritage Advisor
Approved By	Brendan Smyth - Team Leader Heritage Carolyn Ingles - Head of Urban Regeneration, Design and Heritage Brendan Anstiss - General Manager Strategy and Transformation

DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 520
**FORMER WATERWORKS PUMPING STATION AND
SETTING, No. 1 PUMPHOUSE – 544, 544B, 544E
TUAM STREET, CHRISTCHURCH**



PHOTOGRAPH: M.VAIR-PIOVA, 06/01/2015

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Historical and social values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political or other patterns.

The former No. 1 Pumphouse is of high historical and social significance as it is associated with the establishment of the Christchurch Drainage Board in 1875/76, and the development of an engineering solution to address Christchurch's inadequate 19th century sewage and drainage problems. Further, it is one of the few visible above ground components of the city's 19th century sewerage system.

By the mid 1870s the absence of an organised sewerage and rubbish disposal system, coupled with an inadequate drainage had become a city-wide problem and the City's high death rates from water borne diseases was a direct consequence of this unhygienic situation. In an effort to address the drainage and sewage issues on a city-wide basis an Act of Parliament passed special legislation bringing the Drainage Board into existence. The Board was tasked with planning and constructing a systematic drainage and sewerage network for both the City and the suburbs.

At Christchurch ratepayer's suggestion, following a negatively-received scheme prepared by the Drainage Board's first engineer, John Carruthers, an English civil Engineer William Clark was engaged as consulting engineer by the Board. Clark revised Carruthers plans and in April

1878 presented the board with a comprehensive drainage scheme for Christchurch and the suburbs. The key point of Clark's scheme, which was approved by the Drainage Board in May 1878, was that wastewater flows were to be admitted into the sewers, but was to be kept separate from stormwater at all costs and discharged into rivers or direct to the Estuary. A sewage pumping station and sewage tank beneath it was to be built on land the Board owned on Mathesons Road. This would pump the city's sewerage along a rising main eastwards out of town, where a sewage farm was to be established on the sandhills. Here the sewage would be irrigated over the paddocks, fertilising the soil.

Clark provided the Drainage Board with detailed plans for the pumping station and sewage tank in April 1879 and under the management of the Drainage Boards replacement engineer C. Napier Bell, construction works began in March the following year. This involved the construction of 3.5 miles of brick and concrete sewers, the construction of the sewage tank and pumping station and the erection of English-sourced machinery. This work was carried out by Thomas H. Parsons under contract for £33,875, 1 shilling and 4 pence.

Construction of the sewage tank underneath the pumping station progressed slowly, on account of the unstable, quicksand-like subsoil, and the many baby eels that continually clogged the fans of the groundwater pumping apparatus (*Star*, 16 July 1879) and it wasn't until September 1882 that No. 1 Pumphouse became fully operational.

Enlarged over time, the No. 1 Pumphouse complex continued to play a key role in the disposal of city sewage until 1957, when the Drainage Board opened a new pumping station in Pages Road. The buildings were used as a maintenance depot until the 1980s when the Board vacated the site. The building and surrounds are currently used as a salvage yard.

CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

The former No. 1 Pumphouse is of high cultural significance. The sewerage system, of which the pumphouse was the cornerstone, transformed 19th Christchurch effecting significant improvement in residents quality and way of life and the overall amenity of the City.

The building is the subject of two paintings by Christchurch artist Doris Lusk - Pump Station (1958) and 1970

ARCHITECTURAL AND AESTHETIC SIGNIFICANCE

Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place.

The building has high architectural significance for its brick construction, utilitarian design and classical detailing, and technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate period construction and engineering techniques and practices. The former No. 1 Pumphouse is a complex of individual buildings, the earliest of which are of architectural and aesthetic significance for their design by English civil engineer William Clark (1821-

1880). Clark's training and work history were diverse and involved engineering roles with the York, and North Midland railway system and the East Indian Railway Company. He designed drainage systems for Kingston-upon-Hull, Calcutta, Madras and helped to prepare water supply and drainage schemes for Port Adelaide, Newcastle, Bathurst, Goulburn, Orange, Maitland (the Waka Water Works), and Brisbane, and afterwards for Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch.

The Pumphouse building is a utilitarian structure with multiple gabled roofs and restrained classical detailing. Constructed of brick with Oamaru stone detailing the building has distinctive arched windows and doors, multipaned steel windows and round windows in some of the gables. These small round windows are associated with the French Baroque style and revived by English Victorian architects in the mid-nineteenth century are also used in some of the former Dean's Estate Farm Buildings (1883) in Kahu Road, Riccarton. The roofs are variously slate and corrugated iron.

Alterations to the building have included the removal of the furnace stack and removal of pump machinery.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE

Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with: the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period.

The former No. 1 Pumphouse is of technological and craftsmanship significance for its construction methods, materials and detailing. The construction of the building, in particular sewage tank and below ground pump chamber, on an extensive area of quicksand involved considerable innovation and skill and was described at the time as a remarkable undertaking (Star, 16/6/1881, p 3).

It is possible that some of the pump and drainage technology remains in the sub floor area of the building and within the setting, in which case this would also be of technological significance, as evidence of innovative pumping and drainage technology and the work of William Clark who designed the equipment.

CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail; recognised landmarks and landscape which are recognised and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.

The former No. 1 Pumphouse and setting is of contextual significance for its City landmark status, the result of its visibility and distinctive brick gabled roof forms. The building, is part of a group of Pumping Station and underground archaeology (decommissioned portions and working, relined portions of the sewerage system) which evidence Christchurch's 19th century sewerage infrastructure. These above ground structures share a degree of consistency in scale, form, materials and detailing. The setting of the Pumphouse consists of the immediate parcel of land with some boundary plantings of shrubs and native and exotic trees.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

Archaeological or scientific values that demonstrate or are associated with: the potential to provide information through physical or scientific evidence an understanding about social historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values of past events, activities, structures or people.

The building and setting are of archaeological significance because they have potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, drainage and sewage technology and other human activity, including that which pre-dates 1900.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

The former No. 1 Pumphouse and setting have overall high significance to the Christchurch District, including Banks Peninsula as one of the few visible above ground components of the city's 19th century sewerage system and for the buildings role in effecting significant improvement in the overall amenity of the City and in the lives of Christchurch residents .

The building and setting has high historical and social significance for its association with the formation of the Christchurch Drainage Board, and the individuals responsible for the sewerage systems design and construction. It has high cultural significance as the building represents the birth of an effective and technologically advanced sewerage system that brought cultural change to the City by improving people's quality and way of life. The building has high architectural significance for its brick construction, utilitarian design and classical detailing, and technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate period construction and engineering techniques and practices. It has contextual significance as a city landmark and through its relationship with the other buildings on the site and also with surviving underground sewerage infrastructure. The building and setting have archaeological significance for their potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site including that which pre-dates 1900.

REFERENCES:

Christchurch City Council, *The Architectural Heritage of Christchurch: 10. Pavilions, temples and four square walls - Christchurch pump houses and substations*, 2003
Wilson, J. (1989) *Christchurch Swamp to City: A short history of the Christchurch Drainage Board 1875-1989* (Christchurch)
'No poo in the sewers, please...' Christchurch uncovered blog dated 17 October 2014
<http://blog.underoverarch.co.nz/2014/10/no-poo-in-the-sewers-please/>
William Clark biography. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Clark_%28inventor%29
Description of Pumphouse construction, *Star* , 16 June 1881, p.3

REPORT DATED: 4 MARCH 2015

PLEASE NOTE THIS ASSESSMENT IS BASED ON INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF WRITING. DUE TO THE ONGOING NATURE OF HERITAGE RESEARCH, FUTURE REASSESSMENT OF THIS HERITAGE ITEM MAY BE NECESSARY TO REFLECT ANY CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF ITS HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE.

PLEASE USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CCC HERITAGE FILES.

11. Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 158 High Street, Christchurch

Reference: 18/1127187

Presenter(s): Fiona Wykes – Senior Heritage Advisor

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee to approve a Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) for work to the building at 158 High Street, Christchurch.

Origin of Report

- 1.2 This report is staff generated in response to discussions with the building's owner and their application for Heritage Incentive Grant funding.

2. Significance

- 2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
 - 2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than \$500,000.
 - 2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Approve a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to \$142,741 for conservation, strengthening and repair work to the protected heritage building located at 158 High Street, Christchurch subject to the following requirements:
 - a. The applicant enters into a limited conservation covenant with Council to cover the grant assisted works;
 - b. The grant is split with \$72,741 of the grant awarded from the 2018/19 financial year, and \$70,000 from the 2019/2020 financial year and the second part not paid out before the start of that financial year.

4. Key Points

- 4.1 This report supports the [Council's Long Term Plan \(2018 - 2028\)](#):
 - 4.1.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy
 - Level of Service: 1.4.2.0 Support the conservation and enhancement of the city's heritage places - 100% of approved grant applications are allocated in accordance with the policy.
 - Level of Service: 1.4.2 Support the conservation and enhancement of the city's heritage places – 100% of approved grant applications are allocated in accordance with the policy.

- Level of Service 1.4.3: Maintain the sense of place by conserving the city's heritage places.
- 4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
- Option 1 – A Heritage Incentive Grant of twenty-nine percent (preferred option)
 - Option 2 – A Heritage Incentive Grant of twenty percent
- 4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)
- 4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:
- The work will help to ensure the structural upgrade, repair and retention of this significance heritage façade. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentives Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines;
 - The retention of this structure will assist in reinforcing the Central City as the focus for commercial, social and cultural activities;
 - The retained façade will be a key part of a small cluster of remaining heritage structures in this part of the Central City.
- 4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
- The grant may seem large to retain a façade.

5. Context/Background

Building History

- 5.1 The commercial building at 158 High Street is scheduled as a 'Significant' Building in the Christchurch District Plan. The 'Statement of Significance' for the building is attached to this report (Attachment A).



158 High Street – December 2014 (left) and Pre-earthquake 2005 (right)

- 5.2 The former C F Cotter and Co. building dates from c. 1900, when it replaced a timber building which had previously occupied the site. As the city's transport system developed High Street became an increasingly important route which encouraged the retail activity that defined this part of the central city for over a century. As with other buildings in this the area, a variety of businesses have occupied the site over time. In 1919 C F Cotter and Co., electrical engineers moved into part of the building and remained in High Street until 2004. They still operate out of premises on Tuam Street, while this building still retains their name on the parapet.
- 5.3 The building is a good example of late 19th/early 20th Century commercial classicism and has high contextual heritage significance as a remnant of a group of late Victorian and Edwardian commercial buildings. Prior to the Canterbury earthquakes the building had other listed heritage buildings either side of it, also in the commercial classical style. It remains as one of the two

remaining buildings on the triangular parcel of land bounded by Lichfield Street, the east side of High Street, and Tuam Street. It retains its contextual significance with the nearby former High Street Post Office, and the façade at 201 High Street, and with other remaining heritage buildings further south on High Street.

- 5.4 The current owner of the building is Shaun Stockman. Mr Stockman has also bought, and is restoring the heritage façade on the other side of the road at 201 High Street. He recently purchased 158 High Street in order to save as much as is possible of the building for its heritage value. He has had ongoing discussions with Council staff to ensure that his proposals for this building are acceptable, and is obtaining the relevant consents for the proposed works. Mr Stockman is well known for his work with heritage buildings in the Central City and is aware of the challenges of trying to save these important structures.
- 5.5 The building suffered damage in the 2010/2011 Canterbury earthquakes and has been unoccupied, and fenced off by shipping containers ever since.

The proposed works

- 5.6 The owner is planning to develop the site while saving and restoring the heritage facade. While the street façade has remained in reasonable condition, the remainder of the building has not fared so well, with a neighbouring structure collapsing onto the roof of 158 High Street, and the side walls being damaged by demolition of the adjoining structures. The rear section of the building, and the interior have been open to the elements since the earthquakes meaning retention of the building beyond the façade is not feasible.
- 5.7 The proposed works comprise protecting and propping the façade and removing the damaged rear section of the building. The façade will then be repaired and reinstated where necessary, as well as being structurally upgraded. The propping and containers will then be removed. A new building will be constructed behind the façade once all of these works are complete.

6. Option 1 – A Heritage Incentive Grant of twenty-nine percent (preferred)

Option Description

- 6.1 The proposed works for which grant assistance is requested comprise structural repairs and upgrades to the façade, along with repairs to brickwork, plaster and windows, the reinstatement of previous heritage architectural details, and the reconstruction of the cantilevered verandah. These works will enable the façade to be retained.
- 6.2 The proposed grant would support the work necessary to repair, reconstruct and retain the heritage form and fabric of the structure. With the completion of the works outlined the façade will be fully repaired, and able to be attached to the proposed new building behind.
- 6.3 This report proposes funding of \$142,741 from the Heritage Incentive Grant Fund, part from the current financial year and part from the 2019/2020 financial year. The second part of the funding would only be paid out in that financial year or later. The applicant is seeking the grant confirmation to enable them to start the works as soon as possible to prevent further deterioration of the building.
- 6.4 All relevant costs of the works are summarised in the table below:

Particulars	Costs (GST exclusive)
Propping and protection of original fabric	\$130,095
Structural work	\$150,200
Fabric repairs	\$139,500
Reconstruction	\$42,000
Fees	\$23,147
Total of repair, structural and reconstruction work	\$484,942

- 6.5 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. The building is very important as a remaining, two storey, commercial, brick façade in the centre of Christchurch, and its retention and repair is worthy of support. However, given the limited amount of available funding and the high demand on the fund, it is proposed that a grant of approximately twenty-nine percent would be appropriate for this project. Given the limited funds available this year, it is suggested that it is split across two financial years.

Proposed heritage grant (approx. twenty-nine percent of itemised work)	\$142,741
--	-----------

Significance

- 6.6 The level of significance of this option is low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

6.6.1 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than \$500,000

- 6.7 There are no engagement requirements for this level of significance.

Impact on Mana Whenua

- 6.8 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

- 6.9 There are no community groups or members that are specifically affected by this option. The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes '*The city's heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations*'. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is a measure for these outcomes.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

- 6.10 This option is consistent with Council's Plans and Policies as listed below:

- Christchurch Central Recovery Strategy
- Christchurch District Plan
- Heritage Conservation Policy
- Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
- Christchurch City Council Multi-cultural Strategy
- New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
- International Council on Monuments and Site (ICOMOS) NZ Charter 2010

Financial Implications

- 6.11 Cost of Implementation - for all HIG applications in this financial year and of those presented at this Committee meeting (with the percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (21% in total over 2 years*)	\$158,782
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (5%)	\$71,509
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (29% in total over 2 years*)	\$72,741
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (18%)	\$100,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street (30%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (2%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$0
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$100,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$70,000
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$527,700

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

- 6.12 It is expected that further grant applications will be received but staff believe that, given the high demand for assistance at the current time, the funding outlined above is appropriate. Future building owners enquiring about funding can be advised of the full allocation of funding in the current financial year and prepare for an application in July within the 2019/2020 financial year.
- 6.13 The Strategic Planning and Policy activity includes the provision of heritage advice, the heritage grants schemes, and the confirmation of a Heritage Strategy for Council. The Council aims to maintain and protect built, cultural and natural heritage items, areas and values which contribute to a unique city, community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past. The Council promotes heritage as a valuable educational and interpretation resource which also contributes to the tourism industry and provides an economic benefit to the City.
- 6.14 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide financial assistance for the retention, maintenance and enhancement of heritage items and buildings.
- 6.15 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - there will be no on-going maintenance costs to the Council as a result of this grant.
- 6.16 Funding source – the Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Legal Implications

- 6.17 Limited conservation covenants are required under the Heritage Conservation Operational Guidelines for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of \$15,000 to \$149,999. A full covenant is required for grants of \$150,000 or more.
- 6.18 A limited conservation covenant is required in relation to this grant.

Risks and Mitigations

- 6.19 The Council's Heritage Grant Policy Operational Guidelines only allow funds to be paid out upon completion of the works and upon presentation of receipts. This ensures that the grant scheme is effective and that funds are not diverted or lost.

Implementation

- 6.20 Implementation dependencies - The grant recipient is expected to acquire all resource, building, and other consents required for the works.
- 6.21 Implementation timeframe – The grant recipient has an 18-month time period from the date of approval to undertake the works and to claim the grant. An application to extend this timeframe can be made to the Committee.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

- 6.22 The advantages of this option include:
- The work will help to ensure the structural upgrade, repair and retention of this significance heritage façade. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentives Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines;
 - The retention of this structure will assist in reinforcing the Central City as the focus for commercial, social and cultural activities;
 - The retained façade will be a key part of a small cluster of remaining heritage structures in this part of the Central City.
- 6.23 The disadvantages of this option include:
- This grant may seem large to retain a façade.

7. Option 2 – A lower level of funding – twenty percent

Option Description

- 7.1 Option 2 would be for a lower level of financial support to the project. Grant support has varied on previous projects but has been generally between thirty and fifty percent of the cost of the eligible works. A lesser grant of \$96,988 over 2 years (20% of the eligible works) is shown in the table below. A lesser grant has been considered as a second option, and not the preferred option, due to the overall eligible heritage works for the item equating to nearly \$500,000.
- 7.2 Other grant levels are obviously possible between the two options. Apart from the level of financial support, this option has all the same impacts and alignments as Option 1. The table below includes the previously approved grants along with the **lesser** level of grants for all of the current applications for this Committee meeting (with the lower percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678

Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (15% in total over 2 years*)	\$90,000
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (3%)	\$50,000
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (20% in total over 2 years*)	\$48,494
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (11%)	\$60,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton (20%)	\$6,437
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (3%)	\$14,500
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$153,601
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$90,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$48,494
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$559,206

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.3 The advantages of this option include:

- The work will help to ensure the structural upgrade, repair and retention of this significance heritage façade. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentives Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines;
- The retained façade will be a key part of a small cluster of remaining heritage structures in this part of the Central City;
- A greater amount of money is retained in the fund for other eligible projects.

7.4 The disadvantages of this option include:

- This grant may seem large to retain a façade.

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A A	158 High Street - Statement of Significance	63

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

- sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
- adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

Author	Fiona Wykes - Senior Heritage Advisor
Approved By	Brendan Smyth - Team Leader Heritage Carolyn Ingles - Head of Urban Regeneration, Design and Heritage Brendan Anstiss - General Manager Strategy and Transformation

Item 11

DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 275
**COMMERCIAL BUILDING AND SETTING, FORMER C F
COTTER AND COMPANY – 158 HIGH STREET,
CHRISTCHURCH**



PHOTOGRAPH: M.VAIR-PIOVA, 5/12/2014

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Historical and social values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political or other patterns.

The former C F Cotter and Co. building has historical significance as a c1900 commercial building with a long association with Cotter's Electrical, the company which owned and occupied the building for over 80 years. The current masonry building replaced a timber

building on the site in c1900. As the city's transport systems developed, including tram routes, High Street became an increasingly important arterial which in turn encouraged the focused retail activity that has defined this part of the city for over a century. Typical for the street a variety of businesses have occupied the building at 158 High Street including a fishmonger, a ladies' outfitter, a fruiterer and confectioner, and a cycle depot.

In 1919 CF Cotter and Co, electrical engineers, moved into part of the building. The company was founded by Christopher Cotter (1891-1952) who had trained with Turnbull and Jones in Christchurch and previously worked in Reefton. Cotter's provided electrical sales and services, made their own radio and telephone batteries, and sold music recordings and floor cleaning equipment. Cotter's remained in the High Street building until 2004 when the business moved to new premises in Fitzgerald Avenue. Today Cotter's Electrical operates out of premises in Tuam Street and its former High Street premises await a decision as to their future repair.

CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

The former C F Cotter and Co building has cultural significance due to its association with the way of life of a three generation family business that has operated for almost a century.

ARCHITECTURAL AND AESTHETIC SIGNIFICANCE

Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place.

The former C F Cotter and Co building has architectural significance as an example of late 19th/early 20th century commercial classicism. The two-storey building has a rectangular footprint, a hipped roof and a single storey extension to the rear. The latter provides access to a laneway behind the building. Above a suspended veranda the first floor façade is symmetrical with paired round-headed windows flanking a triple arched window beneath a cornice and stepped parapet. The solid parapet is decorated with scrolls containing floral reliefs and bears the wording 'CF Cotter & Co' and the building's street number. Large display windows and entrance doors on the ground floor once gave access to Cotters on the left hand side and the Lucky Tea Shoppe on the right.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE

Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with: the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period.

The former C F Cotter and Co building has technological and craftsmanship significance for what it may reveal of turn-of-the-century brick masonry construction methodologies, materials, fixtures and fittings and the decorative treatment of the parapet on the façade.

CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail;

recognised landmarks and landscape which are recognised and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.

The former C F Cotter and Co building has high contextual significance as a remnant of a widely admired group of late Victorian and Edwardian commercial buildings. Before the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury earthquakes, the building was flanked by other listed heritage buildings in the commercial classical style. It was set within a city block that had ten out of its fourteen buildings listed for their historical and architectural significance. Today it is one of two buildings on the triangular parcel of land bounded by Lichfield, east side of High Street and Tuam Streets and the service lane to its east that connects Lichfield and Tuam. The building retains its contextual relationship with the former High Street Post Office (1930-32) and with other listed buildings in the wider urban streetscape.

The setting consists of the rectangular footprint of the listed building. The facade addresses High Street whilst the rear of the building is accessible from a lane behind the building.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

Archaeological or scientific values that demonstrate or are associated with: the potential to provide information through physical or scientific evidence an understanding about social historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values of past events, activities, structures or people.

The former C F Cotter and Co building and its setting has potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site, including that which occurred before 1900. The TS Lambert map of 1877 records previous buildings on this site.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

The former C F Cotter and Co building has overall significance to Christchurch, including Banks Peninsula for its part in the development of High Street and its long-standing association with Cotter's Electrical. The building has historical and social significance for its association with the Cotter family who founded the company in 1919 and owned and occupied the building for three generations over 80 years. The building has cultural significance due to its association with the culture of generational ownership of a business. The former C F Cotter and Co building has architectural significance as an example of commercial classicism, which was once the dominant architectural style in the High Street retail precinct. The building has high contextual significance for its survival in an area of the city that was once widely recognised for its Victorian and Edwardian commercial streetscapes. The former C F Cotter and Co building and its setting has potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site, including that which occurred before 1900.

REFERENCES:

CCC Heritage files – 158 High Street

'Dramatic changes over the years' *Christchurch Star* 5 November 1994, p. 6.

Opus Consultants 'Urban Conservation Areas Study for the Local and Central City Commercial Areas' for CCC, Christchurch, 2005.

<http://www.highstreetstories.co.nz/stories/8-cotter's-electrical>

REPORT DATED: 3 FEBRUARY 2015

PLEASE NOTE THIS ASSESSMENT IS BASED ON INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF WRITING. DUE TO THE ONGOING NATURE OF HERITAGE RESEARCH, FUTURE REASSESSMENT OF THIS HERITAGE ITEM MAY BE NECESSARY TO REFLECT ANY CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF ITS HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE.

PLEASE USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CCC HERITAGE FILES.

12. Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 226 Kilmore Street

Reference: 19/266

Presenter(s): Fiona Wykes, Senior Heritage Advisor

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee to approve a Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) for works to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch.

Origin of Report

- 1.2 This report is staff generated in response to an application for Heritage Incentive Grant funding from the building's owner.

2. Significance

- 2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
 - 2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than \$500,000.
 - 2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Approves a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to \$100,000 for conservation, strengthening and repair works to the protected heritage building located at 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch subject to the applicant entering into a limited conservation covenant with Council to cover the grant assisted works.

4. Key Points

- 4.1 This report supports the [Council's Long Term Plan \(2018 - 2028\)](#):
 - 4.1.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy
 - Level of Service: 1.4.2.0 Support the conservation and enhancement of the city's heritage places - 100% of approved grant applications are allocated in accordance with the policy.
 - Level of Service 1.4.3: Maintain the sense of place by conserving the city's heritage places.
- 4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
 - Option 1 – A Heritage Incentive Grant of up to \$100,000, (eighteen percent, preferred option);
 - Option 2 – A Heritage Incentive Grant of up to \$60,000, (eleven percent).
- 4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- The work will help to ensure the structural upgrade, repair and retention of this significant, but neglected commercial heritage building. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines;
- The work will enable the retention of one of the very few bullnose verandahs that still remains on a commercial building in Christchurch;
- The repaired and upgraded building will be a distinctive landmark on a key crossroads in central Christchurch.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- This would be a large grant to a single building.

5. Context/Background

226 Kilmore Street – Brief History



Photo: 226 Kilmore Street, December 2014

- 5.1 The building at 226 Kilmore Street dates from c. 1899, and is a property with a commercial ground floor and residential use above. It is scheduled as 'Significant' in the Christchurch District Plan. Further information is provided in the attached Statement of Significance (Attachment A).
- 5.2 The building is a two storey, timber framed corner building that has had a mix of commercial uses over time, primarily grocers or hairdressers, generally with residential use above the shop. This use has continued to the present day, although the current owners are planning to alter the ground floor to create two commercial tenancies, and to let the upper floor as offices.
- 5.3 The building retains much of its architectural integrity with many original features having survived. Most notable of these is the bullnose verandah, once a common feature of commercial buildings in the city, but now one of only a very few remaining. It is the only surviving building of a group of shops which occupied all four corners of the Kilmore/Barbadoes Street intersection prior to the 2010-2011 Canterbury earthquakes. With its distinctive verandah, double storey

height and position on the corner of two of the streets in central Christchurch, the building has considerable landmark significance.

- 5.4 The building recently changed ownership and, as noted above, the new owners are intending to divide the ground floor into two tenancies and change the use of the first floor into office space whilst retaining the potential for it to return to residential use at a future time.
- 5.5 As part of the works they are intending to undertake structural upgrades, install a fire alarm system and insulation, and upgrade the electrical wiring and plumbing. The roof, walls and rainwater goods will be repaired, and the windows, doors, internal decorative features, flooring, verandah and staircase will all be repaired and restored. 1960's alterations to the building will be removed, returning the internal layout to something more aligned with the original.
- 5.6 The works are significant, but the building has suffered from some neglect since the earthquakes while the previous owner worked to resolve an insurance settlement and decide on the future of the building. Ultimately this led to the sale of the building to the new owner 'Bullnose Limited' (the contact is Anna Chesney).

6. Option 1 – A Heritage Incentive Grant of eighteen percent (preferred)

Option Description

- 6.1 This report proposes funding of up to \$100,000 from the Heritage Incentive Grant fund. This will help to enable the new owners to undertake the work to repair, upgrade and conserve this important commercial heritage building.
- 6.2 The proposed work includes all the required upgrades for structure, fire and emergency egress and fire protection systems that are all required by the intended future use of the building. The building's previous use partly as a residence is not currently an economically viable option, although the owners are ensuring that the current works do not prevent the use of the first floor being returned to residential use in the future if possible. The owners are applying for resource and building consents for these 'change of use' works.
- 6.3 All relevant costs of the works have been summarised as outlined in the table below:

Particulars	Costs (GST exclusive)
Conservation and restoration works	\$106,226
Maintenance works	\$240,414
Structural upgrade works	\$103,755
Fire and egress works	\$8,750
Professional and Council Fees	\$82,400
Total of heritage related structural, repair & reconstruction work	\$541,545

- 6.4 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. However, given the limited amount of available grant funding and the high demand on the fund, it is proposed that a grant of approximately eighteen percent is appropriate for this project.

Proposed heritage grant (approx. eighteen per cent of itemised work)	\$100,000
---	------------------

Significance

- 6.5 The level of significance of this option is low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than \$500,000.
- 6.6 There are no engagement requirements for this level of significance.

Impact on Mana Whenua

- 6.7 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

- 6.8 There are no community groups or members that are specifically affected by this option. The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes '*The city's heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations*'. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is a measure for these outcomes.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

- 6.9 This option is consistent with Council's Plans and Policies as listed below:

- Christchurch Central Recovery Strategy
- Christchurch District Plan
- Heritage Conservation Policy
- Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
- Christchurch City Council Multi-cultural Strategy
- New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
- International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) NZ Charter 2010

Financial Implications

- 6.10 Cost of Implementation for all HIG applications in this financial year, and of those presented at this committee meeting are shown below (with the percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (21% in total over 2 years*)	\$158,782
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (5%)	\$71,509
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (29% in total over 2 years*)	\$72,741
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (18%)	\$100,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street (30%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (2%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$0
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$100,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$70,000
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$527,700

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

- 6.11 It is expected that further grant applications will be received but staff believe that given the high demand for assistance at the current time, that the funding outlined above will be an appropriate level of allocation. Future building owners enquiring about funding can be advised of the full allocation in the current financial year and prepare for an application in July within the 2019/2020 financial year.
- 6.12 The Strategic Planning and Policy activity includes the provision of heritage advice, the heritage grants schemes, and the confirmation of a Heritage Strategy for Council. The Council aims to maintain and protect built, cultural and natural heritage items, areas and values which contribute to a unique city, community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past. The Council promotes heritage as a valuable educational and interpretation resource which also contributes to the tourism industry and provides an economic benefit to the City.
- 6.13 Maintenance/Ongoing Costs – There are no ongoing costs associated with this option.
- 6.14 Funding source – the Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Legal Implications

- 6.15 Limited conservation covenants are required under the Heritage Conservation Operational Guidelines for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of \$15,000 to \$149,999. A full covenant is required for grants of \$150,000 or more.
- 6.16 A limited conservation covenant is required in relation to this grant.

Risks and Mitigations

- 6.17 The Council's Heritage Grant Policy Operational Guidelines only allow funds to be paid out upon completion of the works and upon presentation of receipts. This ensures that the grant scheme is effective and that funds are not diverted or lost.

Implementation

- 6.18 Implementation dependencies - the grant recipient is expected to acquire all resource, building, and other consents required for the works.
- 6.19 Implementation timeframe – the grant recipient has an 18-month time period from the date of approval to undertake the works and to claim the grant. An application to extend this timeframe can be made to the Committee.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

- 6.20 The advantages of this option include:
- The work will help to ensure the structural upgrade, repair and retention of this significant, but neglected commercial heritage building. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines;
 - The work will enable the retention of one of the very few bullnose verandahs that still remains on a commercial building in Christchurch;
 - The repaired and upgraded building will be a distinctive landmark on a key crossroads in central Christchurch.
- 6.21 The disadvantages of this option include:
- This would be a large grant to a single building.

7. Option 2 – A lower level of funding – eleven percent

Option Description

- 7.1 Option 2 would be for a lower level of financial support to the project. Grant support has varied on previous projects, but has generally been between thirty and fifty percent of the cost of the eligible works. A lesser grant of \$60,000 (11% of the eligible works) is shown in the table below. A lesser grant has been considered as an option, but not the preferred option, due to the overall eligible heritage works for the item equating to over \$500,000.
- 7.2 Other grant levels are obviously possible for this project. Apart from the level of financial support, this option has all the same impacts and alignments as Option 1. The table below includes the previously approved grants along with the **lesser** level of grants proposed for all of the current applications for this Committee meeting (with the lower percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (15% in total over 2 years*)	\$90,000
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (3%)	\$50,000
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (20% in total over 2 years*)	\$48,494
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (11%)	\$60,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton (20%)	\$6,437
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (3%)	\$14,500
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$153,601
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$90,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$48,494
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$559,206

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

- 7.3 The advantages of this option include:

- The work will help to ensure the structural upgrade, repair and retention of this significant, but neglected commercial heritage building. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines;
- The work will enable the retention of one of the very few bullnose verandahs that still remains on a commercial building in Christchurch;
- The repaired and upgraded building will be a distinctive landmark on a key crossroads in central Christchurch.

- 7.4 The disadvantages of this option include:

- This would be a large grant to a single building.

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A ↓	Statement of Significance - 226-228 Kilmore Street	74

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

- (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
- (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

Author	Fiona Wykes - Senior Heritage Advisor
Approved By	Brendan Smyth - Team Leader Heritage Carolyn Ingles - Head of Urban Regeneration, Design and Heritage Brendan Anstiss - General Manager Strategy and Transformation

DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 316
**COMMERCIAL BUILDING AND SETTING – 226-228 KILMORE
STREET, CHRISTCHURCH**



PHOTOGRAPH : M.VAIR-PIOVA, 9/12/2014

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Historical and social values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political or other patterns.

The building at 226-228 Kilmore Street has historical and social significance due to its continuous history as a commercial building since it was built c.1899. The building was built by Charles Frances Campbell Sycamore who from 1893-1900 ran a tobacconist and hairdressing business from the site on the corner diagonally opposite. Sycamore purchased the property at 226-228 Kilmore Street in 1899 and raised a mortgage to build himself a shop with accommodation above. From 1900 to 1906 Sycamore and his wife, who ran a grocery business, ran their shops from the building and resided upstairs. Following his wife's death in 1907 Sycamore married Hannah Frizzell. Through this marriage he gained access to the brick building next door on Kilmore Street, moving his shop into it. Following Sycamores death in 1919, his wife Hannah retained an interest in the property until her death in 1954. Since Sycamore moved next door a series of tenants and owners have played their part in the history of the building. The Pierce Brothers ran a grocery store there from 1907 to c.1925. From 1976 to 1987 William and Elizabeth Stone ran a fruit shop, owing the building from 1980. Having begun as a hairdressers, the building has returned to that use in the early 21st century.

CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

The building at 226-228 Kilmore Street has cultural significance due to its continued use as a commercial and residential building. The building is indicative of the corner shop style of development with retail premises attached to living accommodation. This retailing model, once common in the city, is today becoming increasingly rare with people preferring to live separately from their businesses.

ARCHITECTURAL AND AESTHETIC SIGNIFICANCE

Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place.

The building at 226-228 Kilmore Street has architectural and aesthetic significance as a Victorian commercial building which has retained its bullnose verandah, once a common feature of commercial buildings in the city. The two-storeyed colonial weatherboard building addresses the corner with a chamfered corner and corner entrance. Bracketed eaves support a hipped corrugated iron roof. Although some alterations have been made to the interior to accommodate changing businesses' needs this building retains its architectural integrity with many of its original features having survived the passage of time.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE

Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with: the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period.

The building at 226-228 Kilmore Street has technological and craftsmanship significance due to its late nineteenth century methods of construction, use of materials including timber and ironwork and retention of turn-of-the-century detailing.

CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail; recognised landmarks and landscape which are recognised and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.

The building and setting at 226-228 Kilmore Street have contextual significance because it shares the attribute of being a Victorian era street corner commercial premises with 147 and 187 Fitzgerald Avenue. It is also the only surviving building out of the group of shops that prior to the 2010-11 earthquakes occupied the four corners of the Kilmore/Barbadoes Street intersection. The setting consists of the footprint of the heritage building. The building at 226-228 Kilmore Street is also of landmark significance due to its height and distinctive verandah, combined with its position on the intersection of two of the streets in the central Christchurch one-way system.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

Archaeological or scientific values that demonstrate or are associated with: the potential to provide information through physical or scientific evidence an understanding about social historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values of past events, activities, structures or people.

The building at 226-228 Kilmore Street has archaeological significance because it has the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and to human activity on the site, including that which occurred prior to 1900. The T S Lambert map of 1877 records previous buildings on this site. The small buildings, set back from the street were most likely houses.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

The building at 226-228 Kilmore Street is of overall heritage significance to Christchurch and Banks Peninsula. It has historical significance as a timber inner city commercial building that has provided various goods and services to the local community from the time of its construction c. 1899 by the tobacconist and hairdresser Charles Frances Campbell Sycamore right through to the present day. It is also the last survivor of the commercial heritage buildings that once occupied this central city street corner. It has cultural significance as a corner shop, with accommodation above, which makes it a surviving example of what was once a popular way of life and commercial model in the city. Its restrained Victorian colonial architectural style, makes it of architectural significance, while it also has technological significance as an example of nineteenth century construction. It draws contextual significance from its landmark street corner position, and its proximity to other Victorian-era two storey, weatherboard corner shops located on Fitzgerald Avenue. Documentary evidence of previous buildings on the site mean the building and site are also of archaeological significance.

REFERENCES:

CCC Heritage File *Commercial Building - 226-228 Kilmore Street*

REPORT DATED: 4 FEBRUARY 2015, 21 MARCH 2017

PLEASE NOTE THIS ASSESSMENT IS BASED ON INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF WRITING. DUE TO THE ONGOING NATURE OF HERITAGE RESEARCH, FUTURE REASSESSMENT OF THIS HERITAGE ITEM MAY BE NECESSARY TO REFLECT ANY CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF ITS HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE.

13. Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton

Reference: 19/67533

Presenter(s): Brendan Smyth, Team Leader Heritage

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee to approve a Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) for works to 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton.

Origin of Report

- 1.2 This report is staff generated in response to an application for Heritage Incentive Grant funding from the building's owner.

2. Significance

- 2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding relative to that already approved by Council for allocation in the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. approve a Heritage Incentive Grant of \$10,000 for 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton.

4. Key Points

- 4.1 This report supports the [Council's Long Term Plan \(2018 - 2028\)](#):

4.1.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy

- Level of Service: 1.4.2.0 Support the conservation and enhancement of the city's heritage places - 100% of approved grant applications are allocated in accordance with the policy.
- Level of Service 1.4.3: Maintain the sense of place by conserving the city's heritage places.

4.1.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 - A Heritage Incentive Grant of up to \$10,000 (thirty percent - preferred option)
- Option 2 - A Heritage Incentive Grant of up to \$6,437 (twenty percent)
- Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

- 4.2 The advantages of this option include:

- It supports the retention of a 'Highly Significant' heritage building in Lyttelton township;

- It helps to ensure the conservation of the remaining original fabric and the appropriate, like-for-like replacement of damaged and/or decayed fabric;
- It helps to ensure the building retains its original use and has a viable role as a functioning dwelling;
- It ensures the streetscape, character and scale of development of this part of the town is retained.

4.3 There are no disadvantages identified with this option.

5. Context/Background

Brief history of the building

- 5.1 The building at 3 Winchester Street is scheduled in the Christchurch District Plan as 'Highly Significant', and is part of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Lyttelton Historic Area. Further information is provided in the attached 'Heritage Assessment - Statement of Significance' (Attachment A).
- 5.2 The building was originally built circa 1859. It is a two storey timber framed structure, clad with weatherboards and with a pitched roof and two level verandah on the north façade. The verandah includes ornate cast iron fretwork and the gables have decorative carved bargeboards. The structure survived the Great Fire in Lyttelton in 1870. Although the dwelling has been altered many times it still retains many original features and is a record of the changing demands put upon dwelling structures as living demands and lifestyles have evolved over time.
- 5.3 The Canterbury Earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 resulted in moderate damage and the need to remove the large, centrally placed masonry chimney. There were also new foundations required along with repairs to the superstructure and the two level verandah on the main façade. The earthquake repair works are currently underway but these works have highlighted areas of decay in the heritage fabric particularly the timber weatherboards. The replacement of these elements is not covered by insurance settlement payments. In addition, Medium Density Fibreboard (MDF) skirting boards and architrave components have had to be removed to facilitate repairs to wall linings. It is intended to renew these in more appropriate and hard wearing real timber. It is only these two components of the works which the applicant is seeking grant support for.
- 5.4 The applicant for the grant is the owner of the building, Mrs Elizabeth Briggs. Although the owner is a former employee of the Council there is no conflict of interest.



3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton, January 2019

6. Option 1 – Heritage Incentive Grant 30% (preferred)

Option Description

- 6.1 This report proposes funding of \$10,000 from the Heritage Incentive Grant Fund. The applicant is seeking the grant confirmation to give them some certainty of funding so as to complete the works as soon as possible to prevent further deterioration of the building.
- 6.2 All relevant costs of the works have been summarised as outlined in the table below:

Particulars	Costs (GST exclusive)
Weatherboard repair and replacement	\$27,412
Renewal of MDF skirting and architrave boards with timber	\$2,116
Provisional and general sums	\$2,658
Total of heritage related structural, repair & reconstruction work	\$32,186

- 6.3 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. However, given the limited amount of available grant funding and the high demand on the fund, it is proposed that a grant of approximately thirty percent would be appropriate for this project.

Proposed heritage grant (thirty per cent approx. of itemised work)	\$10,000
---	-----------------

Significance

- 6.4 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with Section 2 of this report.
- 6.5 There are no engagement requirements in the Policy Operational Guidelines for this grant scheme.

Impact on Mana Whenua

- 6.6 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

- 6.7 The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes *'The city's heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations'*. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is a measure for these outcomes.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

- 6.8 The recommendations of this report align with the relevant strategies, plans and policies as listed below:
- Christchurch Central Recovery Strategy
 - Christchurch District Plan
 - Heritage Conservation Policy
 - Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
 - Christchurch City Council Multi-cultural Strategy
 - New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
 - International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New Zealand Charter 1993

Financial Implications

- 6.9 Cost of implementation for all Heritage Incentive Grant applications in this financial year and of those presented at this Committee meeting are shown below (with the percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (21% in total over 2 years*)	\$158,782
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (5%)	\$71,509
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (29% in total over 2 years*)	\$72,741
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (18%)	\$100,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street (30%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (2%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$0
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$100,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$70,000
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$527,700

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

- 6.10 It is expected that further grant applications will be received but staff believe that given the high demand for assistance at the current time, that the funding outlined above will be an appropriate level of allocation. Future building owners enquiring about funding can be advised of the full allocation in the current financial year and prepare for an application in July within the 2019/2020 financial year.
- 6.11 The Strategic Planning and Policy activity includes the provision of heritage advice, the heritage grants schemes, and the confirmation of a Heritage Strategy for Council. The Council aims to maintain and protect built, cultural and natural heritage items, areas and values which contribute to a unique city, community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past. The Council promotes heritage as a valuable educational and interpretation resource which also contributes to the tourism industry and provides an economic benefit to the City.
- 6.12 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide financial assistance for the retention, maintenance and enhancement of heritage items and buildings.
- 6.13 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – There will be no on-going maintenance costs to the Council as a result of this grant.
- 6.14 Funding source - The Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Legal Implications

- 6.15 Limited conservation covenants are required under the Heritage Conservation Operational Guidelines for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of \$15,000 to \$149,999. A full covenant is required for grants of \$150,000 or more.
- 6.16 Covenants are a comprehensive form of protection of the buildings because they are registered against the property title, ensuring that the Council's investment is protected. In this case, the proposed grant of \$10,000 is below the threshold level for a covenant to be required.

Risks and Mitigations

- 6.17 The Council's Heritage Grant Policy Operational Guidelines only allow funds to be paid out upon completion of the works and upon presentation of receipts. This ensures that the grant scheme is effective and that funds are not diverted or lost.

Implementation

- 6.18 Implementation dependencies - The grant recipient is expected to acquire all resource, building, and other consents required for the works.
- 6.19 Implementation timeframe – The grant recipient has an 18-month time period from the date of approval to undertake the works and to claim the grant. An application to extend this timeframe can be made to the Committee.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

- 6.20 The advantages of this option include:
- It supports the retention of a 'Highly Significant' heritage building in the Lyttelton township;
 - It helps to ensure the conservation of the remaining original fabric and the appropriate, like for like replacement of damaged and/or decayed fabric;
 - It helps to ensure the building retains its original use and has a viable role as a functioning dwelling;
 - It ensures the streetscape, character and scale of development of this part of the town is retained.
- 6.21 There are no disadvantages identified with this option.

7. Option 2 - A lower level of funding – \$6,437 (twenty percent)

Option Description

- 7.1 Option 2 would be for a lower level of financial support to the project. Grant support has varied on previous projects but has been generally between thirty and fifty percent of the cost of eligible works. A lesser grant of twenty percent (\$6,437) is shown in the table below. Other grant levels are obviously possible other than these two options. Apart from the level of financial support, this option has all the same impacts and alignments as Option 1. The table below includes the previously approved grants along with the lower level of grants for all of the current applications for **this** Committee meeting (with the lower percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808

Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (15% in total over 2 years*)	\$90,000
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (3%)	\$50,000
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (20% in total over 2 years*)	\$48,494
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (11%)	\$60,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton (20%)	\$6,437
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (3%)	\$14,500
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$153,601
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$90,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$48,494
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$559,206

* Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.2 The advantages of this option include:

- It supports the retention of a 'Highly Significant' heritage building in the Lyttelton township;
- It helps to ensure the conservation of the remaining original fabric and the appropriate, like for like replacement of damaged and/or decayed fabric;
- It helps to ensure the building retains its original use and has a viable role as a functioning dwelling;
- It ensures the streetscape, character and scale of development of this part of the town is retained.

7.3 The disadvantage of this option is that the smaller grant may undermine the ability of the to complete the delivery of the project.

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A A	Statement of Heritage Significance, 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton	85

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

- sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
- adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

Author	Brendan Smyth - Team Leader Heritage
Approved By	Carolyn Ingles - Head of Urban Regeneration, Design and Heritage Brendan Anstiss - General Manager Strategy and Transformation

DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 1187
***DWELLING AND SETTING – 3 WINCHESTER STREET,
LYTTELTON***



PHOTOGRAPH: SIMON DAISLEY, 2013

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Historical and social values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political or other patterns.

The dwelling at 3 Winchester Street has high historical and social significance as an early colonial dwelling, and for its association with first owners Henry and Hannah Derry, and prominent later owners George and Charles Agar, and William Lester.

Lyttelton Town Section 61 was part of a portfolio of land purchased from the Canterbury Association by Dr William Draper in 1851. Draper was the brother-in-law of first Superintendent of Canterbury Province, James Fitzgerald. The following year Draper sold TS 61 to London merchant Frederick Smith. Smith retained the section until October 1858, when he sold it to blacksmith Henry Derry for £150.

Henry William Derry had arrived in Lyttelton with the First Four Ships in 1850, and established a forge on London Street. Shortly after purchasing TS 61 in 1858, Derry drew a large £600 mortgage on local merchant John Thomas Peacock. Research suggests that this was used to build the house at 3 Winchester Street, which Derry called *Lentonville* after his wife Hannah's maiden name (Lenton), and a Livery and Bait Stables nearby. In late 1864

Henry and Hannah separated and Derry placed the property in trust for the benefit of his wife and three children. The next years however the mortgage was defaulted on and *Lentonville* passed to J T Peacock. Merchant David Davis (who had a warehouse on the Gladstone Quay/Oxford Street corner that later became the British Hotel) took a 21 year lease on the property in June 1865, but was himself bankrupt in 1869. In 1870 the house narrowly survived the destruction of the Great Fire, which wiped out Lyttelton's commercial centre. In 1871 Peacock subdivided off and sold the property at 5 Winchester Street. 3 Winchester Street on its remaining land was sold to waterman George Agar in 1878 for £405. Agar renamed the property *Trevor House*.

George Agar established himself as a boatman in Lyttelton in 1863, moving goods from ships in the roadstead to the wharves. As the wharf facilities in the port improved, there was less demand for boatmen, and Agar moved to the West Coast. Later he returned to Lyttelton and initiated a steam launch service in 1877 which proved very successful. Agar was genial, public-spirited and well-regarded in the port town. He died on a visit to London in 1898 aged 61. Later *Trevor House* became the home of George's son Charles Havelock Agar. After working for his father, Charles (1857-1931) became proprietor of a grocery business in Lyttelton and of the New Brighton pier. He served as a member of the Lyttelton Borough Council and was a keen bowler, representing New Zealand. He had *Trevor House* auctioned in 1919. The property was purchased by William Thomas Lester.

W T (Bill) Lester (1878-1960) was a painter and Lyttelton's undertaker. A popular man and an excellent speaker, Lester was involved in many organisations and served three terms as Mayor (1917-25, 1933-35 and 1944-47). Bill and his wife Mary Ann called their home *Teynham* after Mary Ann's home village in Dorset. After her husband's death, Mary Ann lived on in the house until her own death in 1967. The dwelling has had only two owners in the intervening years.

CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

3 Winchester Street has cultural significance for its ability to demonstrate the way of life of early settlers in colonial Lyttelton and as a home that has longevity of ownership and been retained in near original form.

ARCHITECTURAL AND AESTHETIC SIGNIFICANCE

Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place.

3 Winchester Street has high architectural and aesthetic significance as a large early colonial vernacular dwelling that retains a high degree of integrity and authenticity.

The dwelling was constructed in c1859 for Henry and Hannah Derry. The house is a square-plan two-storeyed building with a twin gabled roof end-on to Winchester Street. The house originally had a single level verandah across the north elevation, but this was replaced with the present galleried verandah during the period of Agar family ownership. The first floor windows were also replaced with French doors, and a bay window added in this period. The rear of the property has been extensively altered with an extension to accommodate a kitchen and the original fenestration replaced. The building was strengthened by the current

owner in 1999. The property sustained moderate damage in the Canterbury Earthquakes of 2010-2011. The large central chimney was subsequently removed.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE

Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with: the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period.

3 Winchester Street has technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate construction techniques and the use of materials from the mid nineteenth century, and for its decorative glass and ironwork.

CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail; recognised landmarks and landscape which are recognised and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.

3 Winchester Street has high contextual significance as a well-known domestic residence in the historic centre of Lyttelton. It is located on a street that contains a number of nineteenth and early twentieth century houses, including the adjacent former Lyttelton Gaol's Warder's House (c1875) and a number of other listed heritage buildings. The setting of the dwelling consists of its immediate land parcel, a suburban section which slopes downhill from Winchester Street. The house is set back from the road with a large informal garden at the front and a small court at the rear.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

Archaeological or scientific values that demonstrate or are associated with: the potential to provide information through physical or scientific evidence an understanding about social historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values of past events, activities, structures or people.

3 Winchester Street and its setting are of archaeological significance because have the ability to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site, including that which occurred prior to 1900. The present dwelling dates from c1859, but it is possible that there were earlier buildings on the site.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

3 Winchester Street and its setting are of high overall heritage significance to the Christchurch district including Banks Peninsula. The building has high historical and social significance as an early colonial dwelling, and for its association with first owners Henry and Hannah Derry, and prominent later owners George and Charles Agar, and William Lester. The building has cultural significance as a demonstration of the way of life of its former inhabitants. The building has high architectural and aesthetic significance as a large early colonial vernacular dwelling that retains a high degree of integrity and authenticity. The building has technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate construction techniques and the use of materials in the mid nineteenth century, and for its decorative ironwork and glass. 3 Winchester Street has high contextual significance as a

well-known domestic residence in the historic centre of Lyttelton and it is located on a street that contains a number of 19th century timber houses, large and small. The building and its setting are of archaeological significance because have the ability to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site, including that which occurred prior to 1900.

REFERENCES:

Christchurch City Council, *Heritage File, 3 Winchester Street*

Daisley, Simon, *Background Information Listed Heritage Place, 3 Winchester Street* - 2013

REPORT DATED: 03/03/2015

PLEASE NOTE THIS ASSESSMENT IS BASED ON INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF WRITING. DUE TO THE ONGOING NATURE OF HERITAGE RESEARCH, FUTURE REASSESSMENT OF THIS HERITAGE ITEM MAY BE NECESSARY TO REFLECT ANY CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF ITS HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE.

PLEASE USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CCC HERITAGE FILES.

14. Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 30 Hackthorne Road

Reference: 19/67578

Presenter(s): Victoria Bliss, Conservation Projects Planner

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee to approve a Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) for works to 30 Hackthorne Road, Christchurch.

Origin of Report

- 1.2 This report is staff generated in response to an application for Heritage Incentive Grant funding from the dwelling's owner.

2. Significance

- 2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
 - 2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than \$500,000.
 - 2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

Approve a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to \$10,000 for the dwelling at 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere.

4. Key Points

- 4.1 This report supports the [Council's Long Term Plan \(2018 - 2028\)](#):
 - 4.1.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy
 - Level of Service: 1.4.2.0 Support the conservation and enhancement of the city's heritage places - 100% of approved grant applications are allocated in accordance with the policy.
 - Level of Service: 1.4.3.0 Maintain the sense of place by conserving the city's heritage places.
- 4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
 - Option 1 – A fixed sum of \$10,000 (preferred option)
 - Option 2 – A fixed sum of \$14,500
- 4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)
 - 4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:
 - It supports the retention of a significant heritage building;

- It supports the conservation of original heritage fabric and features, including deferred maintenance to protect the exterior envelope of the dwelling;
- It helps to ensure the building is retained as a viable, well maintained dwelling.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- It is small grant in relation to the overall costs of the work.

5. Context/Background

Brief history of the building



Photo: 30 Hackthorne Road, November 2015

- 5.1 The dwelling is scheduled in the Christchurch District Plan as 'Significant'. It dates from the early 20th Century, and is part of the first phase of development of the hill suburb of Cashmere. Further information is provided in the attached 'Statement of Significance' (Attachment A).
- 5.2 The dwelling is a large, two storey timber framed house with a slate roof, built during World War One and designed in the English Gothic Revival style. The key elements of this style are highly visible in this example with timber shingles, board and batten cladding, tall brick chimney stacks (reinstated following the Canterbury earthquakes), a slate roof and timber casement windows. Although the architect of the building has not been identified, the son of the original owner worked for two well-known Christchurch architects around this time – Cecil Wood in 1915 and Samuel Hurst Seager in 1917. The current owners are Hugh Roberts and Jessica Mouat.
- 5.3 The dwelling retains many of its original architectural features, both internally and externally. The work that this grant application relates to is conservation and deferred maintenance following the completion of earthquake repairs, upgrades and an addition.

6. Option 1 – A Heritage Incentive Grant of 2% (preferred)

Option Description

- 6.1 This report proposes funding of \$10,000 from the Heritage Incentive Grant Fund. The applicants are seeking the funding to assist with the conservation and maintenance of the dwelling, following a large and complex repair, upgrade, reconstruction and alteration project. The conservation and maintenance is overdue, but has had to be deferred until the completion of the earthquake repair works. All the works are being undertaken by craftsmen and contractors with experience in heritage conservation projects.
- 6.2 The application and the information in this report relate only to the conservation and maintenance costs. Works which are earthquake damage repairs, upgrades and alterations have been excluded from the application and the information in this report. All relevant heritage costs of the remaining works have been summarised in the table below:

Particulars	Costs (GST exclusive)
Joinery conservation	\$92,354
Exterior painting	\$138,224
Slate roof	\$207,744
Provisional and general sums	\$54,162
Total of heritage related maintenance and conservation work	\$492,484

- 6.3 The Operational guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. However, given the limited amount of available funding in the current financial year, and the high demand on the fund, it is proposed that a sum of \$10,000 is awarded to this project. This equates to approximately two percent of the eligible works.

Proposed heritage grant (two per cent approx. of itemised work)	\$10,000
--	-----------------

Significance

- 6.4 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with Section 2 of this report.
- 6.5 There are no engagement requirements associated with this option.

Impact on Mana Whenua

- 6.6 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

- 6.7 The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes '*The city's heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations*'. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is a measure for these outcomes.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

- 6.8 This option is consistent with Council's Plans and Policies, as listed below:
- Christchurch Central Recovery Strategy
 - Christchurch District Plan
 - Heritage Conservation Policy
 - Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

- Christchurch City Council Multi-cultural Strategy
- New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
- International Council on Monuments and Site (ICOMOS) New Zealand Charter 1993

Financial Implications

- 6.9 Cost of Implementation – for all HIG applications in this financial year and of those presented at this Committee meeting are shown below (with the percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (21% in total over 2 years*)	\$158,782
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (5%)	\$71,509
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (29% in total over 2 years*)	\$72,741
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (18%)	\$100,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street (30%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (2%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$0
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$100,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$70,000
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$527,700

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

- 6.10 This grant would allocate the remaining funds available for the 2018/29 financial year. Given the high demand for assistance at the current time, staff recommend that the funding outlined above is an appropriate level of allocation which acknowledges and supports the conservation works being undertaken.
- 6.11 It is anticipated that further applications will be received in the current financial year. Applicants would be advised of the full allocation of the current years grant fund and could prepare for an application in July within the 2019/2020 financial year.
- 6.12 The Strategic Planning and Policy activity includes the provision of heritage advice, the heritage grants schemes, and the confirmation of a Heritage Strategy for Council. The Council aims to maintain and protect built, cultural and natural heritage items, areas and values which contribute to a unique city, community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past. The Council promotes heritage as a valuable educational and interpretation resource which also contributes to the tourism industry and provides an economic benefit to the City.
- 6.13 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – There are no ongoing costs associated with this option.

- 6.14 Funding source – the Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Legal Implications

- 6.15 Limited conservation covenants are required under the Heritage Conservation Operational Guidelines for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of \$15,000 to \$149,999. A full covenant is required for grants of \$150,000 or more.
- 6.16 Covenants are a comprehensive form of protection of the buildings because they are registered against the property title, ensuring that the Council's investment is protected. In this case, the proposed grant of \$10,000 is below the threshold level for a covenant to be required.

Risks and Mitigations

- 6.17 The Council's Heritage Grant Policy Operational Guidelines only allow funds to be paid out upon completion of the work and upon presentation of receipts. This ensures that the grant scheme is effective and that funds are not diverted or lost.

Implementation

- 6.18 Implementation dependencies - The grant recipient is expected to acquire all resource, building, and other consents required for the works.
- 6.19 Implementation timeframe – The grant recipient has an 18-month time period from the date of approval to undertake the works and to claim the grant. An application to extend this timeframe can be made to the Committee.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

- 6.20 The advantages of this option include:
- It supports the retention of a significant heritage building;
 - It supports the conservation of original heritage fabric and features, including deferred maintenance to protect the exterior envelope of the dwelling;
 - It helps ensure the building retains its use and functions as a viable, well maintained dwelling.
- 6.21 The disadvantages of this option include:
- It is small grant in relation to the overall costs of the work;
 - It would commit the remaining heritage grant funds for the 2018/2019 financial year.

7. Option 2 – A Heritage Incentive Grant of 3%

Option Description

- 7.1 Option 2 is for a higher level of funding, at 3% of the heritage conservation works to the dwelling. Grant support has varied on other projects, but has generally been in the region of up to 30-50% of the cost of the eligible works. There is insufficient grant funding available to provide this level of support.
- 7.2 Should the Committee make the decision to allocate other grant applications at this meeting a lower percentage, an increased grant total of \$14,500 could be available. This equates to approximately 3% of the works. This is not the preferred option as staff are recommending that other applications have a higher priority for the limited funding available.
- 7.3 This option would have the same impacts and alignments as Option 1. The table below includes the previously approved grants along with the lower level of grants proposed for all of the current applications for this Committee meeting (with the percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (15% in total over 2 years*)	\$90,000
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (3%)	\$50,000
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (20% in total over 2 years*)	\$48,494
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (11%)	\$60,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton (20%)	\$6,437
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (3%)	\$14,500
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$153,601
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$90,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$48,494
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$559,206

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.4 The advantages of this option include:

- It supports the retention of a significant heritage building;
- It supports the conservation of original heritage fabric and features, including deferred maintenance to protect the exterior envelope of the dwelling;
- It helps to ensure the building is retained as a viable, well maintained dwelling.

7.5 The disadvantages of this option include:

- It is a small grant in relation to the overall costs of the work
- It would reduce funding available to other applicants;
- It would commit the remaining heritage grant funds for the 2018/2019 financial year.

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A A	30 Hackthorne Road - Statement of Significance	96

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

- (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
 - (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
- (b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

Authors	Victoria Bliss - Heritage Conservation Projects Planner Fiona Wykes - Senior Heritage Advisor
Approved By	Brendan Smyth - Team Leader Heritage Carolyn Ingles - Head of Urban Regeneration, Design and Heritage Brendan Anstiss - General Manager Strategy and Transformation

DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 227
***DWELLING AND SETTING, BLAKENEY –
30 HACKTHORNE ROAD, CHRISTCHURCH***



PHOTOGRAPH: B. SMYTH, 2015

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Historical and social values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political or other patterns.

30 Hackthorne Road has historical and social significance for its association with solicitor Henry Cotterill, and as evidence of the first phase of development of the new hill suburb of Cashmere. By 1914 the extension of the electric tram network along Cashmere Road and up Hackthorne Road, as well as the installation of a high-pressure water system, greatly encouraged suburban development on the Cashmere Hills. One of those who made the shift to Cashmere in the 1910s was Henry Cotterill, a noted solicitor and foundation partner of the prominent law firm of Duncan Cotterill. The Cotterill family moved into their new Hackthorne Road house in August 1917 and called it 'Blakeney'. Cotterill (1855-1943) had been a successful sportsman, representing Canterbury in cricket and rugby in the 1870s and 1880s, and served as a member of the Board of Governors of Christ's College for more than 35 years. Prior to shifting to Cashmere, the Cotterills had lived in Bryndwr Road. Henry Cotterill lived at 30 Hackthorne Road until 1935. The house remains in use as a private dwelling.

CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

30 Hackthorne Road has cultural significance as a demonstration of the lifestyle of a well-known city solicitor in the suburb of Cashmere which had 'a distinct sense of community based on its early popularity with intellectuals and university people' (Contextual Historical Overview).

ARCHITECTURAL AND AESTHETIC SIGNIFICANCE

Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place.

30 Hackthorne Road has architectural and aesthetic significance as an example of a large English Domestic Revival style house built during World War I. The house exhibits typical features of the style, such as an irregular form, tall chimney stacks, timber shingling, board and batten cladding, casement windows and a slate roof. The architect has not been identified. Henry Cotterill's son Henry Guy was articled to Cecil Wood in 1915 and then transferred to Samuel Hurst Seager's office in 1917, when Wood enlisted for war. H G Cotterill later became a notable architect in his own right as one half of the successful inter-war partnership of Helmore and Cotterill.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE

Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with: the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period.

30 Hackthorne Road has technological and craftsmanship significance as a representative example of a large timber house built in the mid-1910s. Its construction, materials and detailing evidence the period in which it was built.

CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail; recognised landmarks and landscape which are recognised and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.

The dwelling and its setting at 30 Hackthorne Road have contextual significance due to it being situated amongst many other large Arts and Crafts and English Domestic Revival homes of a similar period. This includes the listed heritage dwelling and gardens of Ngaio

Marsh at 37 Valley Road designed by notable Christchurch architect Samuel Hurst Seager. Other listed buildings within the vicinity include the dwelling at 16 Hackthorne Road which was designed by and for Hurst Seager himself. Together these homes define the early character of the Cashmere Hills area.

30 Hackthorne Road occupies a large sloping section on the western side of Hackthorne Road, overlooking Princess Margaret Hospital. The house is located in a mature garden setting, with a driveway zig-zagging down from Hackthorne Road. Although the house is visible in part from Hackthorne Road, the fall of the site means that only the rear of the upper storey can be glimpsed.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

Archaeological or scientific values that demonstrate or are associated with: the potential to provide information through physical or scientific evidence an understanding about social historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values of past events, activities, structures or people.

The dwelling and its setting at 30 Hackthorne Road have archaeological significance because of the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site prior to 1900.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

The dwelling known as Blakeney and its setting at 30 Hackthorne Road has overall heritage significance to Christchurch, including Banks Peninsula. The dwelling has historical and social significance for its association with solicitor Henry Cotterill, and as a record of the early 20th century development of the new hill suburb of Cashmere. 30 Hackthorne Road has cultural significance as a demonstration of the lifestyle of a well-known city solicitor in the suburb of Cashmere which had 'a distinct sense of community based on its early popularity with intellectuals and university people'. 30 Hackthorne Road has architectural and aesthetic significance as an example of a large English Domestic Revival house that was the family home of architect Henry Guy Cotterill. The dwelling has technological and craftsmanship significance because the construction, materials and detailing evidences the period in which it was built. The dwelling and its setting at 30 Hackthorne Road have contextual significance due to it being situated amongst many other large Arts and Crafts and Domestic Revival homes of a similar period. The dwelling and its setting at 30 Hackthorne Road have archaeological significance because of the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site prior to 1900.

REFERENCES:

Christchurch City Council Heritage files *30 Hackthorne Road*
Duncan Cotterill, The History of a Law Firm 1857-2007

Cyclopedia of New Zealand: <http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Cyc03Cycl-t1-body1-d3-d25-d6.html>

John Wilson et al *Contextual Historical Overview of Christchurch* (Christchurch, 2005)

REPORT DATED: 16 FEBRUARY 2015

PLEASE NOTE THIS ASSESSMENT IS BASED ON INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF WRITING. DUE TO THE ONGOING NATURE OF HERITAGE RESEARCH, FUTURE REASSESSMENT OF THIS HERITAGE ITEM MAY BE NECESSARY TO REFLECT ANY CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF ITS HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE.

PLEASE USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CCC HERITAGE FILES.

15. Heritage Incentive Grant for 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa

Reference: 18/1295599

Presenter(s): Victoria Bliss, Heritage Conservation Projects Planner

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee to consider a retrospective Heritage Incentive Grant for works to the building at 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa, and if necessary for the Council to approve the removal of the limited conservation covenant.

Origin of Report

- 1.2 This report is staff generated in response to an application for Heritage Incentive Grant funding by the building's owner.

2. Significance

- 2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
 - 2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than \$500,000.
 - 2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Does not approve a retrospective Heritage Incentive Grant to the protected heritage building located at 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa.

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee recommends that the Council:

2. Approves the removal of the limited conservation covenant on the property located at 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa;
3. Notes that the cost of removing the covenant is covered by Council as no grant has been disbursed to this property.

4. Key Points

- 4.1 This report supports the [Council's Long Term Plan \(2018 - 2028\)](#):

4.1.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy

- Level of Service: 1.4.2.0 Support the conservation and enhancement of the city's heritage places - 100% of approved grant applications are allocated in accordance with the policy.
- Level of Service: 1.4.3.0 Maintain the sense of place by conserving the city's heritage places.

- 4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 – No grant awarded. Limited covenant removed from the property (preferred option);
- Option 2 – A retrospective grant awarded for 20% of the works originally awarded a grant;
- Option 3 – A grant award of 20% on the basis of the new costs and works submitted.

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option).

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- Heritage Incentive Grant funding will not be awarded retrospectively to a project;
- The Council would be acting in accordance with the Heritage Incentive Grant Policy Operational Guidelines;
- By not awarding a grant, funds remain available to provide support for other projects.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- The Council could be perceived as not supporting an owner in the conservation of their heritage building and the owners may consider they are not being supported in the conservation of their heritage building;
- The Council could be perceived as being inconsistent as the works have previously been awarded a Heritage Incentive Grant;
- The limited conservation covenant currently registered on the property and associated with the previous application would be removed.

5. Context/Background



58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa – September 2015

Building history

- 5.1 The building at 58 Rue Lavaud is scheduled as Significant (Group 2) in the Christchurch District Plan, and is listed Category 2 by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) List Number 5287.
- 5.2 The detached two storey building was constructed in 1883 as a pharmacy for Henry Citron. The architect was Thomas Cane, at one time the Canterbury Provincial architect, and unusually the building retained its original use throughout its lifetime, until the last few years. The building has been owned by the same family since 1935.
- 5.3 The exterior of the building has only been modified slightly over the years, with the addition of two more windows on the first floor side of the Cross Street façade, and a series of alterations to the shop front and entrance on the street corner. There has also been an extension to the rear of the building, facing the harbour, which includes a first floor deck, with a staircase providing independent access to the first floor flat. Internally the alterations have been more substantial to accommodate changing use requirements over time.
- 5.4 The building is owned by the applicant, Richard Stewart.

History of the Heritage Incentive Grant for 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa

- 5.5 The history and administration of this grant and the related building and resource consents from the Council has been complex. A brief summary is set out below, given the nature of this application.
- 5.6 On 31 March 2015 the applicant was awarded a Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) of \$81,482. This was for structural upgrade works, upgrades to the fire protection, and associated fees and on site costs. The overall costs for the work were estimated at \$162,964 and the grant awarded was 50% of these costs. A letter of Approval of Grant, dated 1 April 2015, was sent to the applicant. As is set out in the Heritage Incentive Grants policy, the grant was available for an 18-month

period, which lapsed on 31 September 2016. As part of the grant award, a limited conservation covenant was placed on the property.

- 5.7 Between March and May 2015 the resource consent application was put on hold by the applicant as the scope of works for the project were extended and new plans required. There were also outstanding RFI (Request for Further Information) on both the resource and building consent applications. The RFIs included a request for a Temporary Protection Plan (TPP) to protect the heritage fabric of the building during the works, details of the extent of alterations and removal of heritage fabric from the first floor, and details of the methodologies for the works proposed. On 6 May 2015, the applicant responded requesting that the TPP be waived, but did not supply any other information.
- 5.8 During May-June 2015 emails were exchanged with the project manager for the works, seeking clarification as to what works had been undertaken, and information on the scope of works for the project which were still to be completed. Resource and building consent had not yet been issued. Requests for information were made around the scope to enable staff to work with the applicant to resolve any issues with resource consent and compliance with the conditions of the Heritage Incentive Grant.
- 5.9 In September 2015 a site visit was undertaken to the property while staff were in Akaroa on other matters. It was observed that the works related to the grant appeared to have been completed and were now obscured by new wall coverings; grant recipients are required to notify staff when works commence which enables staff to confirm the works are consistent with the grant. In this case it was not possible to determine the extent of heritage fabric which had been removed during the works, or ensure that conservation principles had been applied as required by the heritage operational guidelines.
- 5.10 In June 2016 the owners were sent a 23-month reminder letter by the Council noting that they had yet to apply for their code compliance certificate for building works.
- 5.11 On 29 February 2016 the applicant provided details of the works undertaken to the building and requested a retrospective resource consent be granted. The retrospective resource consent was granted on 23 May 2016. The consent report noted that some elements of the scope of works undertaken had had an adverse effect on the heritage values and fabric of the building. For example, no representative samples of original materials or technologies were left in situ as evidence of the original construction; other original fabric was removed and replaced with new materials which were not date stamped.
- 5.12 In early August 2016 the project managers contacted Council heritage staff asking whether any documentation was required beyond Code of Compliance documentation in order to process the grant. A detailed list of the requirements was provided, which also noted that one condition of the grant had not been met as no site visit had been arranged for certification of the works, and they were now obscured. No response was received.
- 5.13 In June 2017 the Council sent a letter to the owner noting that an application for a Code Compliance Certificate had still not been made and if it were not received by 16 July 2017 the Council would send a refusal to issue a code compliance certificate letter. Documentation was subsequently provided dated 29 June 2017, 30 June 2017, and 07 August 2017.
- 5.14 The applicants requested payment of the grant on 25 August 2017; the grant had lapsed on 31 September 2016. This request was declined noting that the grant had lapsed and the non-compliance with the conditions of the grant.
- 5.15 On 20 September 2017 a letter was received from the applicant's lawyer objecting to the withdrawal of the grant. A response was provided articulating the situation, but also providing a way forward which the option for the applicant to make a further application for Council to consider (see attachment B).

- 5.16 On 3 October 2018 an application was submitted for a retrospective grant for works carried out in 2015 to the building at 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa. This report relates to that application.

History of the eligible works

- 5.17 The eligible works consist of structural upgrades, conservation and maintenance as follows:

- Replacement of damaged ceilings with new structural diaphragms;
- Replacement of selected wall linings with structural bracing;
- Seismic upgrade to ground floor and sub-structure and installation of new floors;
- New fire rated linings as required;
- Removal of remaining brick chimneys.

- 5.18 Projected costings in 2015 were as follows:

Particulars	Costs (GST exclusive)
Structural upgrade work	\$94,542
Upgrade to fire linings	\$52,822
Structural engineer's fees	\$1,332
Site management, P & G, service charges and travel costs	\$14,268
Total cost of conservation and restoration related works	\$162,964

- 5.19 A grant of 50% was approved by the Community Committee on 31 March 2015 for \$81,482.

Heritage Incentive Grant application, October 2018

- 5.20 The owners of 58 Rue Lavaud have submitted a retrospective application for a grant in October 2018 for the following works:

- All the previous works from 2015 listed above;
- Disabled toilet;
- Disabled access;
- Fire alarm;
- Additional engineering;
- Council fees.

The additional works would have been eligible for Heritage Incentive Grant funding at the time, other than the disabled toilet (which would be eligible now with the 2018 changes to the grant criteria). While this was a required Building Code upgrade, the grant scheme is generally limited to structural upgrades, fire and security protection, access to buildings, and services where they are being replaced due to damage or deterioration. It should be noted that these works would have been required to be undertaken in a manner consistent with the conservation principles and practice of the ICOMOS (NZ) Charter.

- 5.21 The applicant has stated that the previous work came in at a lower total than originally estimate - \$158,081. All relevant costs are summarised in the table below:

Particulars	Costs (GST exclusive)
Disabled access	\$15,435
Fire protection	\$11,526
Additional engineering	\$12,374
Resource consent fees	\$261

Total cost of conservation and restoration related works	\$39,596
Previous eligible costs	\$158,081
Total cost of conservation and restoration related works	\$197,677

6. Option 1 - No grant awarded. Limited covenant removed from the property (preferred)

Option Description

6.1 It is recommended that no grant is awarded to the applicant for this property for the following reasons:

- This is consistent with the Heritage Incentive Grant policy.
- The previous grant lapsed, and despite notification to the owners of this, no action was taken on their part within the timeframes set out in the grant policy.
- It is not possible for staff to confirm that the works have been undertaken consistent with grant policy, as this grant would be retrospective.

It is noted that a limited conservation covenant was placed on the property when the previous Heritage Incentive Grant was granted, and since no grant has been paid to the owners, the Council should cover the cost of removing the limited covenant. Should the decision be made to support Option 1, a recommendation is included in this report to remove the covenant.

Significance

6.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with Section 2 of this report.

6.3 There are no engagement requirements for this level of significance.

Impact on Mana Whenua

6.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

6.5 There are no community groups or members that are specifically affected by this option.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

6.6 This option is consistent with Council's Plans and Policies as listed below:

- Christchurch Central Recovery Strategy
- Christchurch District Plan
- Heritage Conservation Policy
- Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
- New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
- Christchurch City Council Multi-Cultural Strategy
- International Council on Monuments and Site (ICOMOS) NZ Charter 2010

Financial Implications

- 6.7 Cost of Implementation – for all Heritage Incentive Grant applications in this financial year, and of those presented at this Committee meeting are shown below (with the percentage of works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (21% in total over 2 years*)	\$158,782
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (5%)	\$71,509
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (29% in total over 2 years*)	\$72,741
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (18%)	\$100,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street (30%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (2%)	\$10,000
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa (0%)	\$0
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$0
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$100,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$70,000
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$527,700

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

- 6.8 It is expected that further grant applications will be received but staff believe that, given the high demand for assistance, the funding outlined above will be an appropriate level of allocation at this time. Future building owners enquiring about funding can be advised of the full allocation of the 2018/19 financial year funds and prepare for an application in July within the 2019/2020 financial year.
- 6.9 The Strategic Planning and Policy activity includes the provision of heritage advice, the heritage grants schemes, and the confirmation of a Heritage Strategy for Council. The Council aims to maintain and protect built, cultural and natural heritage items, areas and values which contribute to a unique city, community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past. The Council promotes heritage as a valuable educational and interpretation resource which also contributes to the tourism industry and provides an economic benefit to the City.
- 6.10 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - there are no ongoing costs associated with this option.
- 6.11 Funding source – the Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Legal Implications

- 6.12 Legal conservation covenants are required under the Heritage Conservation Operational Guidelines for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of \$15,000 to \$149,999. A full covenant is required for grants of \$150,000 or more.

- 6.13 As a covenant is already in place on this property, should Council approve the staff recommendations this will require the covenant to be removed.

Risks and Mitigations

- 6.14 There is a risk that the applicant expects funding support through this funding application as a result of having previously been awarded a grant, and their belief that they were not required to take action when notified of the lapsing grant. This may result in them disagreeing with the decision and questioning the decision making process.
- 6.15 The lapsing and non-payment of the previous grant has already been reviewed by Council's legal team, and the suggestion of removal of the conservation covenant at no cost to the applicant was a recommendation of that review. See Attachment B for previous correspondence with the lawyers on the matter.

Implementation

- 6.16 Implementation dependencies – the works related to the grant application have already been completed. Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
- 6.17 The advantages of this option include:
- This decision would be consistent with the Heritage Incentive Grant policy;
 - By not awarding a grant, funds remain available to provide support for other projects which are not applying retrospectively and who are adopting an approach consistent with heritage conservation principles.
- 6.18 The disadvantages of this option include:
- The Council could be perceived as not supporting an owner in the conservation of their heritage building and the owners may consider they are not being supported in the conservation of their heritage building;
 - There could be a perception that Council is acting inconsistently as the works have previously been awarded a Heritage Incentive Grant;
 - The limited conservation covenant currently on the property would be removed.

7. Option 2 - A retrospective grant awarded for 20% of the works originally awarded a grant

Option Description

- 7.1 Option 2 provides for a retrospective grant to be awarded to the applicant, but only in relation to the original estimate of costs, and that it be awarded at the percentage which is currently the standard percentage being awarded to applicants for works with relatively higher costs – namely 20%.
- 7.2 This would not equate to the amount of the grant initially awarded to the applicants in 2015; however it would be in line with current practice.
- 7.3 The works applied for consist of structural upgrade works, conservation and maintenance works as follows:
- Replacement of damaged ceilings with new structural diaphragms;
 - Replacement of selected wall linings with structural bracing;
 - Seismic upgrade to ground floor and sub-structure and installation of new floor;
 - New fire rated linings as required;
 - Removal of remaining brick chimneys.

7.4 Costings in 2015 were as follows:

Particulars	Costs (GST exclusive)
Structural upgrade work	\$94,542
Upgrade to fire linings	\$52,822
Structural engineer's fees	\$1,332
Site management, P & G, service charges and travel costs	\$14,268
Total cost of conservation and restoration related works	\$162,964

7.5 The applicants have stated that the actual costs for the works in 2015 came in slightly lower than anticipated, as follows:

Particulars	Costs (GST exclusive)
Total cost of conservation and restoration related works	\$158,081

7.6 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. There is already a high demand for the grant funds for this financial year and where works are of a higher value, grants are generally being offered and awarded at less than 30% of eligible costs. It is recommended that 20% of eligible works could be an acceptable level of grant, which would equate to \$31,616. However, due to limited funds remaining for allocation this year, other grants would need to be adjusted down in order to meet this level of grant funding for this project.

Overall proposed Heritage Incentive Grant (20% of eligible works)	\$31,616
--	-----------------

Significance

7.7 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with Section 2 of this report

7.8 There are no engagement requirements for this level of significance.

Impact on Mana Whenua

7.9 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

7.10 There are no community groups or members that are specifically affected by this option.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

7.11 This option is consistent with Council's Plans and Policies. See Section 6.7.

Financial Implications

7.12 Cost of Implementation – the table below includes the previously approved grants, along with the **lower** level of grants for all of the current application for this committee meeting are shown below (with the lower percentage of the works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136

Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (15% in total over 2 years*)	\$90,000
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (3%)	\$50,000
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (20% in total over 2 years*)	\$48,494
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (11%)	\$60,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton (20%)	\$6,437
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (3%)	\$14,500
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa (20% of original funded works)	\$31,616
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$121,985
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$90,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$48,494
Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020	\$559,206

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

- 7.13 It is expected that further grant applications will be received but staff believe that given the high demand for assistance, that the funding outlined above will be an appropriate level of allocation for this option.
- 7.14 The Strategic Planning and Policy activity includes the provision of heritage advice, the heritage grants schemes, and the confirmation of a Heritage Strategy for Council. The Council aims to maintain and protect built, cultural and natural heritage items, areas and values which contribute to a unique city, community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past. The Council promotes heritage as a valuable educational and interpretation resource which also contributes to the tourism industry and provides an economic benefit to the City.
- 7.15 HIGs and conservation covenants provide assistance for the retention, maintenance and enhancement of heritage items and buildings.
- 7.16 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – there will be no ongoing maintenance costs to the Council as a result of this grant.
- 7.17 Funding source – the Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Legal Implications

- 7.18 Legal conservation covenants are required under the Heritage Conservation Operational Guidelines for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of \$15,000 to \$149,999. A full covenant is required for grants of \$150,000 or more.
- 7.19 The property already has a limited conservation covenant in place.

Risks and Mitigations

- 7.20 There is a risk that awarding a retrospective grant for these works may set a precedent for others to consider applying for retrospective consent. It could also set a precedent for works being completed in a manner which is not consistent with conservation principles or which does not meet the conditions of resource consent.

7.20.1 If Council were to award a grant, correspondence with the applicant would be clear that the reason for awarding a retrospective grant in these circumstances is based on the fact that:

- the property was previously awarded a HIG which was not claimed within the policy timeframes;
- evidence has been supplied that the works were completed to an acceptable standard for Building Code compliance, noting that the manner in which the works were undertaken has resulted in a loss of heritage fabric and values
- and no additional funding is being proposed beyond that which was previously agreed.

Implementation

7.21 Implementation dependencies - the works have already been completed.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.22 The advantages of this option include:

- The Council will be seen to be supporting an owner in the retention and repair of their heritage building;
- The limited conservation covenant will remain on the property.

7.23 The disadvantages of this option include:

- It would be inconsistent with the Heritage Incentive Grant policy.
- Council will be awarding a grant retrospectively for works not certified prior to completion;
- Less funds will be available to award to other eligible projects that are not applying for retrospective funding and who are adopting an approach consistent with heritage conservation principles.
- .

8. Option 3 - A retrospective grant awarded of 20% on the basis of the new costs and works submitted in October 2018.

Option Description

- 8.1 Option 3 would provide for a retrospective grant to be awarded to the applicant for all relevant costs incurred, and that it be awarded at the percentage which is currently the more typical percentage being awarded to applicants for works with higher costs – namely 20%.
- 8.2 This would not equate to the amount of grant initially awarded to the applicants back in 2015, however the percentage would be in line with current practice.
- 8.3 The works applied for consist of structural upgrade works, conservation and maintenance works as follows:
- Replacement of damaged ceilings with new structural diaphragms;
 - Replacement of selected wall linings with structural bracing;
 - Seismic upgrade to ground floor and sub-structure and installation of new floor;
 - New fire rated linings as required;
 - Removal of remaining brick chimneys;
 - Disabled access;
 - Fire alarm system;
 - Additional engineering costs;

- Council fees.

Particulars	Costs (GST exclusive)
Disabled access	\$15,435
Fire protection	\$11,526
Additional engineering	\$12,374
Resource consent fees	\$261
Total cost of conservation and restoration related works	\$39,596
Previous eligible costs	\$158,081
Total cost of conservation and restoration related works	\$197,677

- 8.4 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. There has been high demand for grant funds in the current financial year, and where works are of a higher value, grants are generally being offered and awarded at less than 30% of costs. For this proposal to be in line with other grants offered in this financial year, it is suggested that 20% of eligible works could be an acceptable level of grant to offer in this option.

Overall proposed heritage grant (20% of all new eligible works)	\$39,535
--	-----------------

- 8.5 Other grants are obviously possible, varying between the three options proposed. Apart from the level of financial support, this option has all the same impacts and alignments as Option 2. This option is only possible if all the other proposed grants are offered at a lower level of funding. The table below includes the previous approved grants, along with the lower level proposed grants for this Committee meeting are shown below (with the lower percentage of works to be funded in brackets):

Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019	\$697,700
Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$76,342
Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$88,650
Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)	\$12,678
Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)	\$5,136
Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)	\$6,500
Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)	\$63,808
Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)	\$21,554
Total grants approved to date	\$274,668
Total grant funding available for allocation	\$423,032
Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (15% in total over 2 years*)	\$90,000
Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (3%)	\$50,000
Proposed grant to 158 High Street (20% in total over 2 years*)	\$48,494
Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (11%)	\$60,000
Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street, Lyttelton (20%)	\$6,437
Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (3%)	\$14,500
Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa (20% of all works undertaken)	\$39,535
Total available funds remaining for 2018/2019	\$114,066
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 26 Canterbury St	\$90,000
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street	\$48,494

Total Available Funds remaining for 2019/2020

\$559,206

*Commitments over two financial years are proposed for larger scale and longer term projects

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

8.6 The advantages of this option include:

- The Council will be seen to be supporting an owner in the retention and repair of their heritage building;
- The limited conservation covenant will remain on the property.

8.7 The disadvantages of this option include:

- This would be inconsistent with the Heritage Incentive Grant policy
- Council will be awarding a grant retrospectively for works not certified prior to completion;
- Less funds are available to award to other eligible projects that are not applying for retrospective funding and who are adopting a conservation approach.

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A ↓	58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa - Statment of Significance	115
B ↓	58 Rue lavaud - Correspondence re Heritage Incentive Grant - October 2017	119

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

- (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
- (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

Author	Victoria Bliss - Heritage Conservation Projects Planner
Approved By	Brendan Smyth - Team Leader Heritage Carolyn Ingles - Head of Urban Regeneration, Design and Heritage Brendan Anstiss - General Manager Strategy and Transformation

DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 729
***PHARMACY AND SETTING –
58 RUE LAVAUD, AKAROA***



PHOTOGRAPH: DR VAUGHAN WOOD, 2013

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Historical and social values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political or other patterns.

Akaroa Pharmacy has historical significance through its continued use as a pharmacy since 1883. The land on which it stands was purchased by Akaroa pharmacist Henri Citron in 1879 and he opened a pharmacy on the site in 1883. Citron had arrived in Akaroa in 1877 and he was therefore amongst a handful of French settlers who arrived after the initial influx in 1840. There is no record of the land having been built on prior to this time. The building was designed by Thomas Cane, one-time Canterbury Provincial architect, and built by MR Goodwin. In 1888 the property was sold to George Fawcitt Dodds Snr who also ran a pharmacy on the site. The building remained in the ownership of the Dodds' family until 1947. Throughout this time a pharmacy operated in the building, although not always by the Dodds. Other pharmacists have owned the building since 1947 and it still operates as a pharmacy.

CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

Akaroa Pharmacy has cultural significance for its association with the way of life of Akaroa's chemists, and their customers, since 1883.

ARCHITECTURAL AND AESTHETIC SIGNIFICANCE

Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place.

Akaroa Pharmacy has architectural and aesthetic significance as a surviving commercial building designed by Thomas Cane (1830-1905). Cane had arrived in Christchurch in 1874 and, in the following year, succeeded Benjamin Mountfort as Canterbury Provincial Architect. In 1876, with the abolition of the provincial government system, Cane was appointed architect to the Canterbury Education Board, in which role he designed Christchurch Girls' High School at the Arts Centre site (1876). Cane also designed the Timeball Station in Lyttelton (1876) and the Grand Hotel in Akaroa (1882).

The building is a two-storey timber-frame commercial building clad in rusticated weatherboards with a hipped roof on concrete foundations. It stands on the corner of Rue Lavaud and Rue Croix. The principal frontage is on Rue Lavaud and here the building retains much of its original integrity with two display windows and two recessed doorways, one parallel to the street and one on a diagonal at the corner. The window and door frames have Italianate style decoration with matching details in the upper floor windows. Other than a difference in paint colour and the change from a corrugated iron roof to Decramastic tiles, with the original roof retained underneath, the façade is close to its original design.

The Rue Croix frontage has been altered, particularly by an extension west towards Rue Jolie. A series of alterations, starting with a lean-to that was in place by 1940, have culminated in an extended ground floor, partially constructed of concrete block, with an upper floor added in 1979. In the 1990s further changes were made meaning that only the placement of the central doorway and the sash-type fenestration has remained unchanged. Internally the property remains much as it was, with some small additional divisions within the rooms – five, first floor rooms becoming seven for instance. In 1991 the main shop was roughly doubled in size with a room at the back being divided into two. The central brick chimney and fireplaces remain in place (although one fireplace was replaced by a heater), but may be removed following the Canterbury earthquakes.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE

Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with: the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period.

Akaroa Pharmacy has technological and craftsmanship significance as it demonstrates the construction techniques and materials that were in use in the late 19th century in Akaroa. Its construction, materials and detailing evidence the period in which it was built.

CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail; recognised landmarks and landscape which are recognised and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.

Akaroa Pharmacy and its setting have contextual significance as a prominent corner building in one of two commercial areas that developed within Akaroa in the 19th century. The building is a prominent feature in the historic Rue Lavaud streetscape and is in close proximity to other heritage buildings, notably the former town hall next door and the former Presbyterian Church opposite.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

Archaeological or scientific values that demonstrate or are associated with: the potential to provide information through physical or scientific evidence an understanding about social historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values of past events, activities, structures or people.

Akaroa Pharmacy and its setting have archaeological significance because of the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site, including that which occurred prior to 1900.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

Akaroa Pharmacy and its setting has overall significance to Banks Peninsula and Christchurch. It has historical and social significance for its continuous use as a pharmacy since 1883. Akaroa Pharmacy has cultural significance for its association with the way of life of Akaroa's chemists, and their customers, since 1883. The pharmacy has architectural and aesthetic significance as a commercial building designed by Thomas Cane which retains many of its original features. Akaroa Pharmacy has technological and craftsmanship significance as it demonstrates the construction techniques and materials that were in use in the late 19th century in Akaroa. Akaroa Pharmacy has contextual significance as a prominent corner building in one of Akaroa's two early commercial areas and through its proximity to other heritage buildings, such as the former Town Hall and former Presbyterian Church. The building has archaeological significance in view of its pre-1900 date of construction.

REFERENCES:

Christchurch City Council Heritage File 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa Pharmacy
Historic Place # 5287 – Heritage NZ List: <http://www.heritage.org.nz/the-list/details/5287>

<http://www.akaroacivictrust.co.nz>

Wood, Dr Vaughan, *Background Information Listed heritage Place, 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa Pharmacy, 2013*

REPORT DATED: 25 FEBRUARY, 2015

PLEASE NOTE THIS ASSESSMENT IS BASED ON INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF WRITING. DUE TO THE ONGOING NATURE OF HERITAGE RESEARCH, FUTURE REASSESSMENT OF THIS HERITAGE ITEM MAY BE NECESSARY TO REFLECT ANY CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF ITS HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE.

PLEASE USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE CCC HERITAGE FILES.



26 October 2017

Corcoran French
PO Box 13001
Christchurch 8141

Via email: geraldine@corcoranfrench.co.nz

Dear Geraldine

Re: Heritage Incentive Grant – 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa

We refer to your letter dated 20 September 2017 regarding a Heritage Incentive Grant for the property located at 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa.

We have carefully considered your response and the points raised, we have also sought the advice of Council's legal team.

In summary, the Heritage Incentive Grant (the Grant) for the specific conservation and heritage work on 58 Rue Lavaud Akaroa which was approved on 1 April 2015 has lapsed as the terms and conditions of the Grant were not met and the funds granted from financial year 2014/15 are no longer available for allocation.

The Council needs to be confident that the ratepayer is delivered good value for its investment when awarding a grant. Council's grant programmes are oversubscribed and it is not possible for Council to meet all requests for funding. The onus is on the grant recipient to fulfil all obligations and meet the conditions in order to receive the benefit of a grant.

We appreciate that this is not the outcome your clients are seeking. Set out below is the Council's position on the matters raised and the conditions under which the Grant was originally approved. We also note a potential way forward.

Heritage Incentive Grant Funding

Christchurch City Council's Heritage Incentive Grants fund provides financial assistance to owner of heritage items scheduled in the Christchurch District Plan. There is a limited amount of funding provided each year. This is just one way in which the Council supports and recognises the value and contribution of heritage in our city, and the work that is undertaken by many building owners.

Owners of scheduled heritage items can apply for grants of up to 50 per cent towards conservation related works. Before applying for a grant, building owners are to review the criteria contained in the Operational Guidelines and Policy. Discussions also take place with Council heritage staff regarding the process and requirements.

The Grant of \$81,482.00 for 58 Rue Lavaud was approved on 1 April 2015 in relation to a scope of works which included structural upgrades and upgrades to fire linings, and fees and site management associated with these works.

Conditions of grant approval

Heritage Incentive Grant funding is available for a period of 18 months from the date of written approval provided that the other terms and conditions of grant approval are met. This time period is stated in the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines and is also in Council's Letter of Approval of Grant (dated 01 April 2015 for 58 Rue Lavaud).

The 18 month period for this Grant lapsed on 31 August 2016. Unfortunately your clients request for payment of the Grant was made on 25 August 2017 which was well outside the 18 month time limit. Your clients did not make a verbal or written request for an extension of time to be considered prior to the expiry of the 18 months. You refer to the correspondence of 2 August 2016, at that time it was simply a matter of providing evidence that the works were completed so the time period was not restated. However, the required evidence was not provided and there was no follow up until over a year later.

Certification of works is also a grant condition, this is stated within the Letter of Approval of Grant and within the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines and Policy. This is in addition to the grant timeframe condition of eighteen months. This condition is particularly important where conservation works are hidden from view once further works are completed.

We note your interpretation of the documents and have considered that carefully, our legal advisors and heritage staff consider that the Grant documentation is sufficiently clear and that the standard conditions are consistently met by grant recipients. In this case there was also advice from the Council's heritage staff regarding information requirements and where flexibility could be applied if conservation works had already progressed.

However, noting your feedback, we will consider the addition of further wording in the Letter of Approval of Grant to reinforce the grant recipients obligations and avoid any future misinterpretation. We will also discuss with our Committee the process around lapsing of grants.

We also recognise that some of the communication was with your clients building company/project manager Maxim Homes. In future we could seek confirmation that information is passed onto the grant recipient by the agent/building company, and vice versa, and copy both parties into any written correspondence as both should be aware of grant conditions and work together to meet these.

We note the point raised regarding the resource consent and code compliance delays. We are aware that the works were subject to consent and note from the file that your clients were prompted more than once by the Council's building consent staff regarding the required updates and information. If there were delays with the works, for any reason, your client could have informed the Council's heritage staff as the heritage incentive grant items could have been certified earlier.

Way forward

Retrospective grant applications may be considered by the Council. We are prepared to receive photographic evidence and breakdown of final costs for the conservation works that were subject to the original grant application. We can then advise our Committee and confirm whether a new retrospective grant application would be considered. Any new application would need to await confirmation of further grant funding from 1 July 2018.

The conservation covenant put on the title of the property in association with this grant can be removed by Council at no cost to the property owner. Please confirm if your clients would like this process commenced.

We do wish to acknowledge the significant amount of work that heritage building owners, such as your clients, undertake and the contribution these make to the wider community.

We trust you will communicate our response to your clients.

Yours sincerely



Ceciel DelaRue

Acting Head of Urban Regeneration, Urban Design & Heritage

16. Community Facilities Network Plan

Reference: 19/207225

Presenter(s): John Filsell, Head of Community Support Governance and Partnerships, Paul McKeefry, Community Facilities Specialist.

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee on the development of the Community Facilities Network Plan.

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 The development of a Community Facilities Network Plan project is underway and will include advice on specific facility opportunities identified by Council.
- 2.2 This report provides an overview of project goals, scope and timeframe along with emerging information.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Receives the report.

4. Key Points

- 4.1 Key points are discussed in section 5 of this report below.

5. Context/Background

Issue or Opportunity

- 5.1 A Community Facilities Network Plan is being developed that will provide a framework to inform and guide Council's decision making processes over the provision and operation of community facilities. It will also provide information on specific facility opportunities identified by Council; namely, a Shirley Community Centre, a Multicultural Centre, a Centre for the Dallington-Avondale-Burwood area and an Okains Bay Community Centre.
- 5.2 Project objectives include:
 - Explore the feasibility of four potential community facilities identified by Council.
 - Describe current community facility provision including use, capacity, degree to which facilities are fit-for-purpose, cost and asset condition.
 - Develop a current list and framework for recording facilities provided by Council and others.
 - Cross-reference existing provision against community need.
 - Develop a framework and criteria that assists Council in making decisions on the provision of community facilities including working with others.
 - Produce a Network Plan as a living document to be updated over time.

Strategic Alignment

- 5.3 The LTP 2018-2028 Service Plan is aligned with Council's strategic direction of enabling active citizenship and connected communities in respect of community facilities, it states:
- We [Council] provide community centres, halls and houses to encourage participation in local activities and build a sense of community.
 - We [Council] offer support to community organisations to help them deliver the valuable services they provide.
- 5.4 On 22 June 2018 Council resolved (CLTP/2018/00017):
- That the Council requests staff to complete the Community Facilities Network Plan as soon as practicable; and approves an additional \$170,000 operational expenditure in 2018/19 to expedite this, inform next year's and future years' annual plans. Potential developments include but are not limited to; the Shirley Community Centre, a Multicultural Centre, a Centre for Avondale, Burwood and Dallington area and an Okains Bay Community Centre.

Network Plan Scope

- 5.5 The Plan will primarily cover community facilities owned and/or managed by Christchurch City Council including halls, community centres and cottages, leased facilities for volunteer libraries, toy libraries, community gardens and play centres. For the avoidance of doubt these are detailed in Community Facilities Asset Management Plan (17/696137).
- 5.6 Other facilities will be analysed to inform the "network" and identify opportunities to partner with others and/or signal gaps:
- Community facilities (or similar) situated on reserve managed the Parks Unit.
 - Council-owned heritage classified buildings used as community facilities.
 - Facilities owned by others.
- 5.7 The plan process will consider but not be limited to the following inputs:
- Demographic, e.g. – Population, Diversity, Geographical spread
 - Financial, - CAPEX for new and R&R, OPEX
 - Range of options for facility provision, including but not limited to:
 - Mixed model use such as community centre and libraries (Citizen Hub Strategy)
 - Facilities provided in partnership including draft partnership documents and templates
 - The promotion of non-Council facilities
 - Non-asset solutions.
 - Current and planned provision of facilities by Council and others.
 - Utilization and availability of facilities.
- 5.8 Council owned facilities currently leased by Early Learning Centres will not be included in the Plan as Council has approved a process to determine its future involvement (13 December 2018).

Project time frame

- 5.9 The project involves two workstreams that are interconnected. The development of a Network Plan and the consideration of potential facility opportunities identified by Council (see section 5.1 of this report).

5.10 Information on the identified facilities will be available to Council in order to inform any debate at the conclusion of the 2019/2020 Annual Plan process in June 2019. Any Council decisions on these facilities in the Annual Plan process will inform and update the Draft Network Plan which will then be finalised for Council consideration prior to September 30 2019. Conversely the emerging findings of the Network Plan will be used to inform the advice provided to Council on the identified facilities.

5.11 The table below summarises the key outputs and dates:

Project Output	Date
Initiate background research, project plan including timelines and milestones	29 October 2018
Finalise project team and engage contractors	13 December 2018
Update and finalise a detailed project plan with timelines and milestones	15 February 2019
Update SCDH Committee	6 March 2019
Community Board engagement:	March 2019
Information report on non-Council facilities and their availability	March 2019
Individual draft feasibility assessments for Shirley, Okains Bay and Burwood-Avondale-Dallington facilities	March 2019
First Draft Network Plan available (will have gaps)	Late April 2019
Draft Business Cases for Shirley, Okains Bay and Burwood-Avondale-Dallington facilities	May 2019
Information from Draft network Plan and draft facility feasibility/business cases used to inform officer comment on Annual Plan submissions	April –May 2019
Report to SCDH Committee covering the Draft Network plan and feasibility and business cases (if applicable) for the four identified facilities	5 June 2019
Council consideration of facilities as part of the Annual Plan in the context of the draft Network Plan	June 2019
Present report Draft Network Plan and recommendations to the Council for consideration and decision, primarily on community engagement	18 July 2019
Present Draft Network Plan to the Council for consideration and adoption	26 September 2019

Network Update

5.12 The project team will provide an update on Council's current suite of community facility assets, their condition and fitness for purpose.

5.13 The project team will provide an update on Council's partnership approach to activating community facilities.

Facility Update

5.14 The project team will provide an update on progress on four facility opportunities as of, namely:

- Dallington-Avonside-Burwood
- Shirley
- Okains Bay

- Multicultural Centre.

Attachments

There are no attachments to this report.

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

- (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
- (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

Author	John Filsell - Head of Community Support, Governance and Partnerships
Approved By	Mary Richardson - General Manager Citizen and Community

17. Resolution to Exclude the Public

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely items listed overleaf.

Reason for passing this resolution: good reason to withhold exists under section 7.

Specific grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution: Section 48(1)(a)

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

“(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

- (a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and
- (b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority.”

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

ITEM NO.	GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED	SECTION	SUBCLAUSE AND REASON UNDER THE ACT	PLAIN ENGLISH REASON	WHEN REPORTS CAN BE RELEASED
18	PUBLIC EXCLUDED SOCIAL, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING COMMITTEE MINUTES - 5 DECEMBER 2018			REFER TO THE PREVIOUS PUBLIC EXCLUDED REASON IN THE AGENDAS FOR THESE MEETINGS.	