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## 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whiria ngā wheno o ngā papa</th>
<th>Overarching Principle</th>
<th>Supporting Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honoa ki te maurua tāukiuki</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bind together the strands of each mat And join together with the seams of respect and reciprocity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The partnership with Papatipu Rūnanga reflects mutual understanding and respect, and a goal of improving the economic, cultural, environmental and social wellbeing for all.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prudent Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wellbeing and resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Outcomes

What we want to achieve together as our city evolves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong communities</th>
<th>Liveable city</th>
<th>Healthy environment</th>
<th>Prosperous economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong sense of community</td>
<td>Vibrant and thriving central city, suburban and rural centres</td>
<td>Healthy waterways</td>
<td>Great place for people, business and investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation in civic life</td>
<td>A well connected and accessible city</td>
<td>High quality drinking water</td>
<td>An inclusive, equitable economy with broad-based prosperity for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and healthy communities</td>
<td>Sufficient supply of, and access to, a range of housing</td>
<td>Unique landscapes and indigenous biodiversity are valued</td>
<td>A productive, adaptive and resilient economic base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration of our identity through arts, culture, heritage and sport</td>
<td>21st century garden city we are proud to live in</td>
<td>Sustainable use of resources</td>
<td>Modern and robust city infrastructure and community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing the voices of children and young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Priorities

Our focus for improvement over the next three years and beyond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enabling active citizenship and connected communities</th>
<th>Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable 21st century city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate change leadership</td>
<td>Informed and proactive approaches to natural hazard risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing active, public and shared transport opportunities and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe and sustainable water supply and improved waterways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Councillor Clearwater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Councillor Livingstone (Deputy Chair), Councillor Chen, Councillor Davidson, Councillor Galloway, Councillor Keown, Councillor Johanson, Councillor Scandrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Cycle</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports To</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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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, 12 June 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.  
   It is intended that the public forum session will be held at [Approximate Time].

   OR

   There will be no public forum at this meeting

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.
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The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   
   Part C
   
   Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00026
   
   That an apology from Councillor Johanson for leave of absence, be received.
   
   Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Livingstone
   
2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   Part B
   
   Councillor Galloway declared an interest in item 16 (Public Excluded).

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   
   Part C
   
   Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00027
   
   That the minutes of the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 3 April 2019 be confirmed.
   
   Councillor Livingstone/Councillor Chen

4. **Public Forum**

   Part B
   
   There were no public forum presentations.

5. **Deputations by Appointment**

   Part B
   
   5.1 **Robert McDougall Art Gallery**
   
   Dr Anna Crighton spoke with regard to the future use of the Robert McDougall Art Gallery.
   
   Dr Crighton suggested that the Directors of the Canterbury Museum and the Christchurch Art Gallery jointly present to the citizens of Christchurch one major exhibition per year which includes works from the city’s historical collection. Dr Crighton also suggested a joint storage facility.
6. Presentation of Petitions

Part B
There was no presentation of petitions.

7. Multicultural Subcommittee Minutes - 8 April 2019

Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00028

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee receives the Minutes from the Multicultural Subcommittee meeting held 8 April 2019.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Livingstone  Carried

8. Installation of Public Artwork - Segments of Berlin Wall

Committee Comment

The Committee discussed a range of possible locations for the artwork and requested staff to seek the views of Ngāi Tahu and the Victoria Square Reference Group on the proposed location.

Staff Recommendations

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

1. Agree to the permanent installation of the two Berlin Wall sections subject to the following:
   a. All necessary consents and approvals are obtained and provided.
   b. Future maintenance costs for the two Berlin Wall sections are included in future maintenance planning.
   c. A condition report and long term maintenance and engineering plans are provided.

Committee Recommendation

Motion

Councillor Aaron Keown, seconded by Councillor Tim Scandrett, moved that Council:

1. Agree to the permanent installation of the two Berlin Wall sections subject to the following:
   a. All necessary consents and approvals are obtained and provided.
   b. Future maintenance costs for the two Berlin Wall sections are included in future maintenance planning.
   c. A condition report and long term maintenance and engineering plans are provided.
   d. In the interim the artwork be installed in the vicinity of Tūranga.
On voting a division was called for and the division was declared **lost** by 3 votes to 4 votes the voting being as follows:

**For:** Councillor Davidson, Councillor Keown and Councillor Scandrett  

**Against:** Councillor Clearwater, Councillor Livingstone, Councillor Chen and Councillor Galloway  

Councillor Keown/Councillor Scandrett **Lost**  

Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00029

Councillor Phil Clearwater moved by way of amendment that the following wording be added:

```
d. Request staff to seek the views of Ngāi Tahu and the Victoria Square Reference Group and provide this to Council.
```

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Livingstone and on being put to the meeting was declared carried.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Livingstone **Carried**  

Committee Decided SOC/2019/00030

**Part A**

That the Council:

1. Agree to the permanent installation of the two Berlin Wall sections subject to the following:
   
   a. All necessary consents and approvals are obtained and provided.
   b. Future maintenance costs for the two Berlin Wall sections are included in future maintenance planning.
   c. A condition report and long term maintenance and engineering plans are provided.

   *The division was declared **carried** by 4 votes to 3 votes the voting being as follows:*

   **For:** Councillor Clearwater, Councillor Livingstone, Councillor Chen and Councillor Galloway  

   **Against:** Councillor Davidson, Councillor Keown and Councillor Scandrett

   d. Request staff to seek the views of Ngāi Tahu and the Victoria Square Reference Group and provide this to Council.

   Councillor Galloway/Councillor Clearwater **Carried**
9. **Long-term Loan and Installation of Public Artwork - "Lift" on Barkers Plantation**

   **Committee Decided SOC/2019/00031**

   **Part A (Original Staff Recommendation Accepted without change)**

   That the Committee recommend that Council:
   1. Agree to the relocation and long term installation of the sculpture “Lift” on Barkers Plantation subject to the following:
      a. All necessary consents and approvals are obtained and provided
      b. Future maintenance costs are included within existing budgets
      c. A condition report and long term maintenance and engineering plans are provided
      d. The first 12 months maintenance is paid for by Ōtākaro
      e. An Artwork Lease Agreement is to be prepared between the Artist and Council consistent with the Artworks in Public Places Policy.

   Councillor Keown/Councillor Galloway  **Carried**

10. **Covenant Consent Approval for 37 Valley Road, Cashmere, Ngaio Marsh House**

    **Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00032**

    **Part C (Original Staff Recommendation Accepted without change)**

    That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:
    1. Approve a retrospective covenant consent for emergency tree removal and pruning at 37 Valley Road, Cashmere, the former residence of Dame Ngaio Marsh.

   Councillor Keown/Councillor Chen  **Carried**


    **Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00033**

    **Part C (Original Staff Recommendation Accepted without change)**

    That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:
1. Request staff by June 2020 to provide a further report on progress in implementing the Christchurch Alcohol Action Plan.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Scandrett

Carried


Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00034

Part B

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee receives the presentation.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Scandrett

Carried

13. Community Facilities Network Plan

Committee Comment

The Social, Community Development and Housing Committee were briefed on the principles underpinning the Plan which align with Council’s Strategic Framework. These principles were listed as: Partnership; Community; Governance; Activation; Sustainability and Design.

The Committee were briefed on, and indicated support for the next steps. These were stated as:

1. Staff to discuss draft Plan and emerging conclusions with Stakeholders and each Community Board detailing provision in the Board area.

2. Staff to seek feedback and incorporate into the draft Plan

John Filsell noted that staff will update the Committee in August 2019 and will be seeking to hold a workshop with the full Council in September 2019. The Community Boards will be updated on any changes as a result of this process and the final Plan will be presented to the Committee and Council for approval. He also noted that any proposed changes to levels of service will be through an Annual Plan or Long Term Plan process.

Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00035

Part B

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee receives the presentation.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Galloway

Carried

18. Resolution to Include Supplementary Reports

Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00036

That the reports be received and considered at the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee meeting on Wednesday, 12 June 2019.

Open Items

19. Multicultural Subcommittee - Chairperson's Report
Public Excluded Items

20. Community Facilities
Councillor Chen/Councillor Livingstone  Carried

19. Multicultural Subcommittee - Chairperson's Report

Committee Comment

1. The Social, Community Development and Housing Committee noted that staff are engaging with Hagley College and the Christchurch Multicultural Council about election processes.
2. The Committee noted staff will ensure that 2019 local election information in major languages is made available at the Council’s libraries and service centres.
3. The Committee noted that a translation facility on the Council’s website is a staff priority.

Committee Decided SOC/2019/00037

-Part B

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee receives the report.

  Councillor Chen/Councillor Keown  Carried

14 Resolution to Exclude the Public

Committee Resolved SOC/2019/00038

Part C

That Karena Finnie of Christchurch NZ remain after the public have been excluded for Item 15 of the public excluded agenda as she has knowledge that is relevant to that item and will assist the Committee.

AND

That at 11.26am the resolution to exclude the public set out on pages 80 to 81 of the agenda and page 5 of supplementary agenda no.2 be adopted.

  Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Livingstone  Carried

The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 12.35pm.

Meeting concluded at 12.3pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 13th DAY OF JUNE 2019
Item 3 - Minutes of Previous Meeting 12/06/2019
7. Multicultural Subcommittee Minutes - 7 June 2019

Reference: 19/709392

Presenter(s): Liz Ryley, Committee Advisor

1. Purpose of Report

The Multicultural Subcommittee held a meeting on 7 June 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 7 June 2019.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Minutes Multicultural Subcommittee - 7 June 2019</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signatories

| Author            | Liz Ryley - Committee Advisor                    |
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The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**

   **Part C**
   Committee Decision

   No apologies were recorded.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

   **Part B**
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**

   **Part C**
   Committee Resolved MCSC/2019/00006

   That the minutes of the Multicultural Subcommittee meeting held on Monday, 8 April 2019 be confirmed.

   Councillor Chen/Councillor Livingstone  
   **Carried**

4. **Public Forum**

   **Part B**

   **4.1 Dr Surinder Tandon, Christchurch Multicultural Council**

   Dr Surinder Tandon, Christchurch Multicultural Council (CMC), addressed the meeting on the CMC’s activities.

   Dr Tandon sought the City Council’s assistance in promoting education about the 2019 election process. The CMC would be inviting some community members to Question and Answer sessions in the community. The CMC acknowledged the support of the City Council, and particularly Councillor Chen, in helping it meet its objectives.

   **4.2 Anna Gruczynska, Polish Association**

   Anna Gruczynska, representing the Polish Association Christchurch, provided the meeting with information about the Association. She talked about the initial migration in the 1870s and the recent skilled migrants. The Association provides support to new migrants.
She noted that social isolation was a concern. The Association is active in city events and does appreciate the support of the Council.

4.3 Thi Phan, Hagley College
Thi Phan, Hagley College spoke about the College’s Diversity Support Programme running programmes at the College and out in the community. The College has six community liaison workers who speak many languages, working with the community. Students range in age from 20 to 65.

Thi sought information from the Council on how the College could secure the use swimming pools as part of their Physical Education programme. She thanked Claire Phillips for the organisation she had provided following the 15 March terror attacks.

The College will be holding community education sessions to provide training to multicultural communities, which will include a section on elections. Assistance was sought from the Christchurch City Council in promoting education on election processes.

Discussion was held at the conclusion of the Public Forum, and the following points were noted:

- Separated swimming sessions organised at Pioneer Swimming Pool are held on Sundays from 2-4pm.
- Literacy education programmes for young mums with pre-school children would be helpful.
- The use of major languages during the 2019 election process. The Subcommittee suggest that staff engage with Christchurch Multicultural Council and Hagley College on election processes and ensure that the Local Government election information is made available in major languages at the Council’s libraries and services centres.
- Liaison between the Council’s Community Development Advisors and Hagley College. The Council needs to continue to support community development outreach programmes.
- Support and enhance skilled migrants.

The Subcommittee members thanked Hagley College for opening the College as a welfare centre during the mosque attacks.

The Subcommittee agreed to provide a Chairperson’s report to the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee requesting:

1.1.1 That staff engage with Hagley College and the Christchurch Multicultural Council on election processes; and
1.1.2 That the Council ensures that 2019 local election information in major languages is made available at the Council’s libraries and service centres.

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.
An adjournment was taken from 10.14am to 10.22am.

7. Multicultural Report

Committee Comment

Claire updated the Subcommittee on the following matters:

1. **Refugee Resettlement** - On 21 June two refugee families will arrive in Christchurch, from Afghanistan and Eritrea. Claire will provide further details to Subcommittee members when they become available.

2. **Council welcoming signage project update** – Claire displayed the wayfinding welcoming signage. These will be located in the Civic Offices foyers. The information will be shared with community outreach. There will also be signage displayed electronically.

3. “**Our Future Together**” Te Kohao Pounamu – Claire tabled the “Our Future Together” collaborative work plan post the 15 March terror attacks. Community funding is a collaborative approach and is continually sought.

4. **Multicultural Strategy Implementation Plan – Priorities to 2021** – The Subcommittee members reviewed the draft Implementation Plan and suggested minor amendments to some of its content.

5. The Subcommittee members suggested requesting a brief update from the Christchurch City Council’s Ngāi Tahu Partnership Team to the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee on their activities following the 15 March mosque attacks.

Councillor Livingstone departed at 11.18am during the review of the Implementation Plan.

Committee Resolved MCSC/2019/00007

Part C

That the Multicultural Subcommittee:

1. Receive the update by staff on Multicultural activities as summarised in section 3 of the report.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Galloway

Carried

Committee Decided MCSC/2019/00008

Part A

The Multicultural Subcommittee recommended the following:

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

1. Request staff engage with Hagley College and the Christchurch Multicultural Council on election processes; and

2. Ensure that 2019 local election information in major languages is made available at the Council’s libraries and service centres.
Councillor Chen/Councillor Galloway

Meeting concluded at 12.08pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 9TH DAY OF AUGUST 2019

COUNCILLOR JIMMY CHEN
CHAIRPERSON
8. Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton

Reference: 19/545713
Presenter(s): Amanda Ohs, Senior Heritage Advisor

1. 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 for conservation, maintenance and upgrade work to the building at 1 Ticehurst Road, ‘Islay Cottage’.

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

2. Executive Summary
   2.1 This report proposes approval for a Heritage Incentive Grant for the conservation, maintenance and upgrade works currently underway at 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton. The dwelling is scheduled as ‘Significant’ in the Christchurch District Plan and its retention and repair is worthy of support.

   2.2 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs.

   2.3 The applicant has advised staff that works were underway at the time they submitted the application. However, due to limited funds in the last financial year, the application has been held over to the 2019/2020 year. The work includes essential and urgent foundation repair, maintenance and refurbishment work including roof and window repairs which could not be delayed for another winter. Council staff and the project conservation architect have been monitoring the works.

   2.4 The works undertaken have retained and restored the maximum possible heritage fabric and enhanced the heritage values by uncovering original fabric.


3. Staff Recommendations

   That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

   1. Approve a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $50,888 for conservation and maintenance work for the protected heritage building located at 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton.

   2. Note that payment of this grant is subject to the applicants entering a 20 year limited conservation covenant with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the property titles.
4. **Context/Background**

**Building Status**

4.1 The Building at 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton, ‘Islay Cottage’ is scheduled as a ‘Significant’ building in the Christchurch District Plan. The building is listed by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) as a Category 2 Historic Place registration number 3351. Refer to Attachment ‘A’ the ‘Statement of Significance’ for further information.

4.2 The current owners of the building and applicants for the grant are ‘Tony and Brenda Good’.

4.3 The dwelling is a detached, one and a half storey, timber framed structure with weatherboard cladding and a corrugated iron roof. The walls are packed with cob or earth as insulation. The building has a simple overall form with a pitched roof, two principal gable ends and a lean-to addition at the rear side. The date of construction is believed to be 1851. The first and ground floors are timber floor boards on timber joists, supported on timber bearers and piles. An early concrete foundation appears to support the original cob filled walls.

4.4 The building has been altered over time with the verandah being enclosed on the southern and northern elevations, the dormers replaced and the front door moved. In addition the walls of the gables and dormers have been covered in stucco. However, the dwelling retains its original form with the steep roof, dormer windows and verandah roof wrapping around three sides.

4.5 Situated on the corner of Bridle Path and Ticehurst Road, Islay Cottage has significance as a landmark within an area where there are a number of historic buildings that date from the mid-19th century.

4.6 The owners have obtained the necessary resource consent for the works, RMA/2019/323 and the permitted works have been overseen by the project Conservation Architect.

**Brief History**

4.7 The cottage has historical and social significance as a very early colonial cottage in Lyttelton, associated with its builder Thomas Kent and later owner Captain Hugh McLellan who was responsible for naming the house ‘Islay Cottage’ after his birthplace in Scotland and whose family retained ownership of it for seventy-two years. McLellan played a significant role in the port town, as Wharf Master, Harbour Master, founder of the Lyttelton Navals, a volunteer Naval Artillery group in 1880, and Deputy District Grand Master of the English Constitution in Canterbury.

**Earthquake Damage**

4.8 The entire building sustained damage in the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury earthquake sequence to the foundations, and also to a retaining wall on the property. The foundations of the verandah area of the house (Southeast corner in particular) were severely affected by the failure of the retaining wall allowing the ground to subside and drop away from the building. Other damage to the house included a significant separation of the timber weatherboard from the plastered wall on the south elevation. The house settled and moved horizontally towards the failed lower retaining walls (Southeast corner of the site). The house also had cracked linings, racked window and door frames and cracks between ceilings and walls.

4.9 The owners were not able to make repairs to the dwelling until the Council retaining wall had been rebuilt. It was temporarily propped and at risk of ongoing and further damage in the event of more seismic events. The foundation works to stabilise and secure the dwelling were urgently required once the retaining wall was completed.
Photograph: Simon Daisley, 2013

Application for Heritage Incentive Grant Funding

4.10 The Heritage Incentive Grant scheme is intended to assist owners of scheduled heritage places to achieve positive heritage outcomes when they undertake maintenance, conservation, repairs and code compliance works to their buildings.

4.11 The applicant is seeking a grant for repair, maintenance, upgrade and conservation works to the dwelling.

4.12 The insurance payout for the significant earthquake damage was less than the owners anticipated ($264,517.50) and the policy did not cover the cost of retaining walls ($119,000).

4.13 At the same time as undertaking necessary earthquake repairs, the owners are taking the opportunity to address deferred maintenance issues to prevent further deterioration of the heritage fabric.

4.14 They are also undertaking restoration works to reinstate or uncover original heritage fabric. This includes exposing timber tongue and groove with wallpaper fragments, retaining and reusing floorboards, and exposing the timber ceiling linings and linings of the historically partially enclosed verandah. The work has been guided by a conservation architect, and the works align with the ICOMOS NZ Charter, 2010.

4.15 The owners submitted a grant application in late 2018 for Council support for the considerable costs as outlined in the tables below (see 5.3).

4.16 There were some delays in processing the application to be able to prepare a report as staff needed to request further information, such as insurance payments received and details of the scope of works.

4.17 At the time the application was received there were limited grant funds remaining for allocation. Consequently the application has been held over to the 2019/2020 financial year. Council staff have monitored the works and the Committee Chair has been made aware of the situation.
4.18 The applicant is seeking a grant for works which have already commenced and are now largely completed. The terms and conditions for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy, Clause 5, provides as follows:

5. Retrospective Grant Approval

In some circumstances a Heritage Incentive Grant application for urgent work may be submitted on time but the processing of the application and hence of the grant approval may be delayed. If the scope of work has been agreed, the applicant may choose to continue the work. However the grant will only be paid if and when it is approved by the Committee (for grants up to $149,999) or the Council (for grants of $150,000 or over). Accordingly, as there is no guarantee that the grant will be approved the owner in commencing work before a grant is approved takes a risk as to the outcome of the approval process."

4.19 This application is made under Clause 5.

Strategic Alignment

4.20 The recommendations of this report align with the relevant strategies, plans and policies as listed below:

4.20.1 Our Heritage, Our Taonga Heritage Strategy 2019-2029
4.20.2 Christchurch District Plan
4.20.3 Heritage Conservation Policy
4.20.4 Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
4.20.5 New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
4.20.6 International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New Zealand Charter, 2010

4.21 The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes ‘The city’s heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations’ and ‘The central city has a distinctive character and identity’. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is a measure for these outcomes.

4.22 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

4.22.1 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.

Decision Making Authority

4.23 The Heritage Incentive Grants is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan. This established funding requires staff to present applications to the relevant Committee or Council for their approval and the delegated authority for these decisions has been confirmed to be with this Committee.

Assessment of Significance and Engagement

4.24 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

4.25 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than $500,000.
4.26 There are no engagement requirements in the Operational Guidelines or Policy for this grant scheme.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

4.27 It is noted that Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) hold mana whenua rights and interests in the area in which the building is located.

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

5. Options Analysis

**Options Considered**

5.1 The following reasonably practicable options were considered and are assessed in this report:

- Option 1 a grant of $50,888 for the works associated with the dwelling;
- Option 2 a grant of $42,407 for the works associated with the dwelling;

5.2 The following options were considered but ruled out:

- Option 3 no grant. The work complies with the Operational Guidelines and Policy in that the heritage outcome for the scheduled item is positive, with the retention, repair and maintenance of the dwelling. The works undertaken will retain and restore considerably more of the heritage fabric and values than the Resource Consent process would have achieved, including a significant amount of interior heritage fabric. Although the works are underway, they were urgent and the applicant did notify staff in November 2018 at the time of the application that the works were about to commence. A conservation architect has overseen the project, Council staff are monitoring the works and the necessary Resource Consents have been obtained.

**Options Descriptions**

5.3 Preferred Option: Option 1 - Heritage Incentive Grant of $50,888 (12%) of the cost of the repair and maintenance works.

5.3.1 Option Description: The building owner has submitted a breakdown of cost estimates for the works for as summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build cost including foundations and structural works</td>
<td>$370,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>$40,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Consent fees</td>
<td>$2,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joinery</td>
<td>$2,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior painting</td>
<td>$7,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of eligible repair and restoration work</strong></td>
<td><strong>$424,070</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 a significant heritage dwelling and a landmark in the Lyttelton township and its retention and repair is worthy of support. However, given the high total cost of the heritage repair and restoration work, the limited amount of funds available in the current financial year and the anticipated high demand, a percentage grant of twelve per cent is recommended in this case. This results in a grant sum comparable and consistent with other grants.
awarded in the 2018/2019 financial year, although at a lower percentage than for similar domestic buildings which ranged from below thirty to a maximum of fifty per cent of the cost of the eligible works.

| Proposed heritage grant (12%) | $50,888 |

**Financial Implications of this option.**

The cost of implementation of **preferred** options of all the grant applications presented at **this** Committee meeting and **NOT** awarding a grant to 58 Rue Lavaud:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 26 Canterbury St. Lyttelton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 158 High Street</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$128,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 159/161 High Street (22%)</td>
<td>$90,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa (40%)</td>
<td>$35,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton (12%)</td>
<td>$50,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>$222,011</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost of implementation of **preferred** options of all the grant applications presented at **this** Committee meeting and **approving** a grant to 58 Rue Lavaud:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 26 Canterbury St. Lyttelton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 158 High Street</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$128,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 159/161 High Street (22%)</td>
<td>$90,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa (40%)</td>
<td>$35,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton (12%)</td>
<td>$50,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa (20%)</td>
<td>$39,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182,476</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 **Option Advantages:**

- It supports the retention of a significant heritage building;
- The dwelling will continue to be a notable feature in the historic streetscape of Lyttelton;
- It supports the conservation of original heritage fabric and features, including deferred maintenance and urgent foundation upgrades to protect the dwelling;
- The heritage outcome for the scheduled item is very positive as the works undertaken have retained and restored the maximum possible heritage fabric and enhanced the heritage values by uncovering original fabric;
- The work when completed will ensure the protection and ongoing viable use of this significant heritage dwelling and although the works have begun, they needed to be undertaken urgently;
- The works have been undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010;
- The outcome achieved has retained significantly more heritage values and fabric than the Resource Consent process would have provided for;
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- Resource Consent has been obtained by the applicant and Council heritage staff have monitored the works;
- The grant sum would be comparable with previous grants for similar domestic dwellings in the 2018/19 financial year, but at a lower percentage.

5.3.3 **Option Disadvantages:**
- It is a small grant in relation to the overall costs of the work.

5.4 **Option 2 - A lower level of funding of ten per cent $42,407 (10%).**

5.4.1 **Option Description:** This option is for a lower level of funding of ten percent of the cost of the eligible works. This lower level of grant funding would still have some of the advantages of Option 1.

5.4.2 **Financial Implications of this option.**

The cost of implementation of the lower options of all the grant applications presented at this Committee meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 26 Canterbury St. Lyttelton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 158 High Street</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$128,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 159/161 High Street (15%)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa (30%)</td>
<td>$26,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton (10%)</td>
<td>$42,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>$270,070</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.3 **Option Advantages:**
- As for Option 1 above;
- The lower grant would leave more funds for other applications but would still provide some financial support to the building owner.

5.4.4 **Option Disadvantages:**
- It would be a lower level of support to a building owner who has undertaken significant repair, conservation and maintenance works to ensure the retention of an important heritage building;
- It would not acknowledge the enhanced heritage fabric visibility and values resulting from these works;
- It would not provide as much support to the retention and maintenance of a very early, landmark heritage building in an important area of similar era buildings with similar street-scene and heritage values.

**Options Considerations**

5.4 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. It recognises heritage as contributing to the identity and wellbeing of our communities and the district.
5.5 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.

5.6 The Heritage Protection activity includes the provision of advice, the heritage grants schemes, and heritage education and advocacy. Other relevant considerations include the overall aims for heritage retention and promotion in the city.

5.7 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide opportunities to achieve positive heritage outcomes. These include the retention and protection of more heritage fabric and values than the Resource Consent process requires, and alignment with the conservation principles of the ICOMOS NZ Charter.

5.8 Additional considerations which the Committee may take into account are: the level of financial input from the owner; the overall percentage of funding support being still relatively low, and the comparable levels of grant support to similar dwellings.

5.9 Other factors include that the works are being monitored by Council staff; have been undertaken in alignment with the conservation principles of the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010 and have retained the maximum possible heritage fabric and enhanced heritage values.

6. Legal Implications

6.1 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide financial assistance for the maintenance and enhancement of heritage areas and buildings.

6.2 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.

6.3 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 20 year limited conservation covenant will be required in association with this grant.

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

7. Risks

7.1 The grant scheme only allows funds to be paid out upon completion of the works; certification by Council staff that the works have been undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010; presentation of receipts and confirmation of the conservation covenant (if required) having been registered against the property title. This ensures that the grant scheme is effective and that funds are not diverted or lost. Covenants also act as a protective mechanism, ensuring the building is retained once the work is undertaken.

7.2 In this case the works have been partially completed and the relevant receipts received. Staff are also able to certify the works and have monitored them partly through the Resource Consent process for the roof component of the work.

8. Next Steps

8.1 In non-retrospective grant applications, once approval has been gained the applicant would have a period of eighteen months to complete the scope of works outlined in the grant application and the grant recipient would be expected to acquire all resource, building and other consents required for the works. In this case the consents have been obtained; the works are underway and completion should be within the timeframes. A covenant would need to be registered and formal certification made before any funds could be released.
## 9. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 – 12%</th>
<th>Option 2 – 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Implement</td>
<td>$50,888</td>
<td>$42,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Ongoing</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>LTP Heritage Incentive Grants</td>
<td>LTP Heritage Incentive Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Rates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 1 Climate Change Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Positive, the works have been</td>
<td>Positive, the works have been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partially completed and building</td>
<td>partially completed and building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fabric with embodied energy has</td>
<td>fabric with embodied energy has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>been retained. Waste minimised.</td>
<td>been retained. Waste minimised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 2 Accessibility Impacts</strong></td>
<td>No public access but visible</td>
<td>No public access but visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from the street. The owner has</td>
<td>from the street. The owner has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expressed a desire to open the</td>
<td>expressed a desire to open the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>building as part of cruise ship</td>
<td>building as part of cruise ship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heritage tours of Lyttelton.</td>
<td>heritage tours of Lyttelton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 3 Social &amp; Community Impacts</strong></td>
<td>An important part of the</td>
<td>An important part of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>townscape is preserved to retain the</td>
<td>townscape is preserved to retain the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unique sense of place.</td>
<td>unique sense of place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 4 Future Generation Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Heritage has been preserved for</td>
<td>Heritage has been preserved for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future generations.</td>
<td>future generations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Mana Whenua</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Council Plans &amp; Policies</td>
<td>Yes, particularly Our Heritage,</td>
<td>Yes, particularly Our Heritage,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our Taonga, Heritage Strategy</td>
<td>Our Taonga, Heritage Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2029</td>
<td>2019-2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with other grants of a similar nature</td>
<td>Grant is consistent with the level of funding recently provided to other dwellings.</td>
<td>Grant is inconsistent with funding support recently provided to other dwellings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 741

DWELLING AND SETTING, ISLAY COTTAGE – 1 TICEHURST ROAD, 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 cottage has historical and social significance as an for its association with Thomas Kent, Augustus Edward White and one time Lyttelton Harbour Master Captain Hugh McLellan and later generations of the McLellan family. 1 Ticehurst Road was constructed in 1851 Thomas Kent, a builder who bought the section from Reverend Benjamin Woolley Dudley who was the first incumbent for the Lyttelton Anglican church. The cottage has historical and social significance as an early colonial cottage in Lyttelton, associated with Thomas Kent and Captain Hugh McLellan who was responsible for naming the house ‘Islay Cottage’ after his birthplace in Scotland and whose family retained ownership of it for 72 years.

Kent, who built the cottage was one of the founding members of the Oddfellow Lodge in Lyttelton and was the Provincial Grand Master in 1859, officiating at the ceremonial laying of the foundation stone for the new lodge building in that year. After completing the cottage in 1851 he sold the building to George Duncan Lockhart and Augustus Edward White. White
was a businessman and politician who went on to represent Akaroa District as a Member of Parliament. White sold his share to Lockhart in 1852.

After passing through another owner the property was sold to Captain Hugh McLellan in 1870. In 1873 he was appointed the Wharf Master at Lyttelton and by 1877 he was second Harbour Master to be appointed in Lyttelton, a position he retained until 1885. He founded the Lyttelton Navals, a volunteer Naval Artillery in 1880. He was a member of the Masonic Lodge, being Deputy District Grand Master of the English Constitution in Canterbury. The dwelling remained in the ownership of his family for 72 years. Since then it has had a number of owners and 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.

1 Ticehurst Road has cultural significance for its ability to demonstrate the way of life of colonial settlers and for the cultural habit of many early settler families who often retained homes generationally.

**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.

It has architectural and aesthetic significance as an early colonial dwelling which retains original features. Islay Cottage is an early colonial, one-and-a-half storey cottage constructed of pit sawn timber with a ‘cat slide’ roof over a lean-to at the rear. It has architectural and aesthetic significance as an early colonial dwelling which retains original features. The walls are filled with mud/earth, which was an early insulation method and is a feature often found in other colonial cottages for example Stoddart’s Cottage in Diamond Harbour. The building has been altered over time with the verandah being enclosed on the southern and northern elevations, the dormers replaced and the front door moved. In addition the walls of the gables and dormers have been covered in stucco. However, it still retains much of its original form with the steep roof, dormer windows and verandah roof wrapping around three sides.

**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.

1 Ticehurst Road has technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate colonial construction methods such as pit sawn timber, timber frame and weatherboard construction and the use of mud or earth filled walls for insulation.

**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.
Situated on the corner of Bridle Path and Ticehurst Road, Islay Cottage has contextual significance as a landmark and as part of an area where there are a number of historic buildings in the area that date from the mid-19th century.

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.

1 Ticehurst Road and its setting have archaeological significance because they have 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

Islay Cottage at 1 Ticehurst Road has heritage significance and value to Christchurch and Banks Peninsula as an example of a cottage owned and one that was owned for a number of generations by the same family. The cottage has historical and social significance as an for its association with Thomas Kent, Augustus Edward White and one time Lyttelton Harbour Master Captain Hugh McLellan and later generations of the McLellan family. It has architectural and aesthetic significance as an early colonial dwelling which retains original features. 1 Ticehurst Road has technological and craftsmanship significance for its demonstration of early carpentry with its pit sawn timber construction and mud filled walls. Situated on the corner of Bridle Path and Ticehurst Road, Islay Cottage has contextual and landmark significance as part of an area where there are a number of historic buildings in the area that date from the mid-19th century. It has the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site.

REFERENCES:

Daisley, Simon, Background Information Listed Heritage Item, 1 Ticehurst Road – 2013

REPORT DATED: 27/06/2014

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.
9. Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 159/161 High Street, part of the Duncan's Building

Reference: 19/591099
Presenter(s): Victoria Bliss, Heritage Conservation Projects Planner

1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee to consider a request for a Heritage Incentive Grant for work to restore the façade of the building at 159/161 High Street, Christchurch, also known as the Duncan’s Building. This grant approval request is for two units of the total of sixteen units of the Duncan’s Building.
   1.2 This report is staff generated in response to an application for Heritage Incentive Grant funding from the owner of the two units of the building.

2. Executive Summary
   2.1 This report proposes approval for a retrospective Heritage Incentive Grant for the work completed to the street façade of two of the units which make up the Duncan’s Building on High Street between St Asaph Street and Tuam Street.
   2.3 Clause 5 of the Terms and Conditions states that decisions to make retrospective grants are “…at the specific discretion of the Committee or the Council having regard to any special circumstances which may apply”.
   2.4 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. The building’s façade has high historical and architectural value and retention and repair is worthy of support.
   2.5 While the decision to make a retrospective grant rests with the Committee, staff are making a recommendation for a grant of up to $90,668 for the two units ($45,334 per unit). The preferred option would be a grant comparable and consistent with previously approved Council grants for eight other units of the Duncan’s Building. This reflects the positive heritage outcomes achieved by the works, noting the retention of heritage fabric and values.

3. Staff Recommendations
   That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:
   1. Approve a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $90,668 for conservation and maintenance work to the façade of the protected heritage building located at 159/161 High Street, Christchurch.
   2. Note that payment of this grant is subject to the applicants entering a 20 year limited conservation covenant with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the property titles.
4. Context/Background

Building Status

4.1 The entire Duncan's Building between 135 and 165 High Street is scheduled as a ‘Significant' building in the Christchurch District Plan. The building is also registered Category II by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) registration number 1864. Refer to Attachment ‘A’ the ‘Statement of Significance’ for further information.

4.2 The current owner of the two units of the building at 159/161 and applicant for the grant is ‘David Collins Consulting Limited’. These two units were the subject of a previous Council Heritage Incentive Grant of $25,000 in 2000. The work undertaken in 2000 included structural upgrades which contributed to the survival of the building during the Canterbury earthquakes.

Brief History of the Duncan's Building, High Street

4.3 The building occupies the south-western side of High Street between St Asaph Street and Tuam Street. It is made up of what initially were sixteen individual commercial and residential units. Each unit was two storeys high and consisted of a ground floor retail/workshop space with a storage space, office or living space above. The substantial ground floor to ceiling heights resulted in unusually long timber staircases. Over the years the original sixteen units have been altered, with some being amalgamated and most being extended at the rear. The shop front areas have all been modified to suit the changing needs of small commercial operations, including cafés, restaurants and retail spaces. The first floor brick street façade was largely intact prior to the earthquakes with only limited and reversible changes having been made.

4.4 The construction of the sixteen unit building was from simple unreinforced brickwork for the structural walls and timber for floors and roof structure. The main street façade was formed with a continuous line of brickwork punctuated with grand arched sash windows and topped with a parapet which included decorated pediments. This part of the façade also includes decorated bands of plastered brickwork: this brickwork façade has high heritage and architectural value. Over time the basic structure had been enhanced in some units with seismic upgrades which generally consisted of internal steel columns bolted to the solid brick party walls and the external walls. Diaphragms were installed on some units and floor, roof and wall connections were strengthened. Ownership of the units by different parties has resulted in piecemeal structural upgrade across the building without a coherent upgrade strategy for the building in its entirety.
Earthquake Damage

4.5 The entire Duncan’s building sustained significant damage in the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury earthquake sequence. Numbers 163-165 in particular were very badly damaged as a result of the upper levels of the adjacent four storey ‘Billen’s Building’ collapsing onto them and were demolished. This resulted in 161 becoming the end unit rather than a mid-terrace unit. At the other end of the terrace, the façade of 135 also collapsed and following demolition a new contemporary building is now under construction here. The units at 137-139 have been repaired as have the units at 159/161. It appears that these units performed better in the earthquakes than some of the other units due to significant seismic upgrade works having been completed prior to the earthquakes.

4.6 The eight units from 143-157 were purchased by the Crown and later on-sold to a developer. These units were then partially demolished, with only the original continuous façade to High Street being retained. This work to retain the façade was the subject of a Council Heritage Incentive Grant, approved by Council on 22 June 2017 (CNCL/2017/00181). This grant was for a total of $362,675 or $45,334 per unit façade.

4.7 The two units seeking grant support at 159/161 sustained significant structural damage in the earthquakes but did not collapse. The High Street façade developed a tilt and had to be partially dismantled and rebuilt using the original materials. The pediment at parapet level also required careful deconstruction and rebuilding, although the plasterwork had to be recreated in new material. In addition to the façade repairs subject to this application, the owner undertook extensive strengthening work to repair, retain and upgrade the entire original units, including new steel frames and structural ties. Other works to repair and upgrade the units included electrical and plumbing components, a new roof cladding to match the original and extensive code compliance upgrades.

4.8 The owner obtained the necessary Building and Resource Consents for the works.
Application for Heritage Incentive Grant Funding

4.9 The Heritage Incentive Grant scheme is intended to assist owners of scheduled heritage places to achieve positive heritage outcomes when they undertake maintenance, conservation, repairs and code compliance works to their buildings.

4.10 The applicant is seeking a retrospective grant for works associated with the principle High Street façades only, rather than for the entire scope of works to repair and upgrade the units. The upgrade, conservation and code compliance works, and associated professional fees, would all have been eligible for grant funding. However the applicant has only provided the invoices relating to the façade works for this application.

4.11 The scope of works for the façades is comparable with the grant previously approved for the eight units from 143-157. Details of the cost of the façade repairs to 159/161 totalled $411,063 as shown on the table below (5.3).

4.12 The actual whole cost of the full repair and upgrade of the two units is $1,634,852, with an insurance payment of only $500,000 made to the owner.

4.13 The applicant has provided documentary and background evidence to support their application. This includes an analysis of the works against the Operational Guidelines “Scope of Eligible Works” and documentation relating to correspondence with CERA.

4.14 The applicant obtained a Resource Consent for the works, granted on 3/3/2016, RMA920331918.

4.15 The applicant is seeking a retrospective grant for works associated with the conservation and restoration of the buildings’ façades. The terms and conditions for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provides as follows:

5. Retrospective Grant Approval

Where works have been undertaken without consultation with Council with regard to a grant approval and where there has been no prior written agreement as to the scope of works applicable to the project for consideration of a grant, then no grant application will be accepted for the work other than at the specific discretion of the Committee or the Council having regard to any special circumstances which may apply.

In some circumstances a Heritage Incentive Grant application for urgent work may be submitted on time but the processing of the application and hence of the grant approval may be delayed. If the scope of work has been agreed, the applicant may choose to continue the work. However the grant will only be paid if and when it is approved by the Committee (for grants up to $149,999) or the Council (for grants of $150,000 or over). Accordingly, as there is no guarantee that the grant will be approved the owner in commencing work before a grant is approved takes a risk as to the outcome of the approval process.”

4.16 This application has been made under clause 5. The applicant has set out the special circumstances as follows:

Urgency of the work

“It was urgent to partly deconstruct and retain the High Street façade of my building because there was a real risk of it falling onto the street if there was another big earthquake. It was also urgent to get repair underway because Crown agencies were intent on demolition and because vandalism was rife in the central area. The historic Billen’s Building two doors from my building was destroyed by fire and fires were lit in the McKenzie and Willis Building.”
Retrospective Application:

“In hindsight I should have consulted the Council’s heritage team before doing anything, but as discussed above I believed it was imperative to secure the building without delay. Apart from the attached quote for the bulk of the structural steel (which was based on Barry Knowle’s detailed specifications), it would have been impossible to provide descriptions and firm quotes for things like excavations under the perimeter walls and installation of reinforced concrete ring foundations, re-roofing, and the re-construction of the High Street façade pediment because the extent of the necessary repairs could not be ascertained at that time.

I was also unaware that the Council would treat such a major repair and restoration as effectively a new building and require systems such as the 10 year old fire alarms to be replaced.

It is common, even with a normal restoration, that as the work progresses things are uncovered that have to be addressed. In the case of 159/161 High Street, installation of the structural steel caused more damage than I anticipated, and consequent reinstatement of things like wiring, plumbing and affected external joinery was expensive…

I note that heritage assistance grants are paid only when work is completed and a conservation covenant has been registered against the title. The work at 159/161 has only recently been completed, apart from some minor repairs of damage caused by the Duncan’s Lane Ltd construction next door.”
Strategic Alignment

4.17 The recommendations of this report align with the relevant strategies, plans and policies as listed below:

4.17.1 Our Heritage, Our Taonga Heritage Strategy 2019-2029
4.17.2 Christchurch District Plan
4.17.3 Heritage Conservation Policy
4.17.4 Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
4.17.5 New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
4.17.6 International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New Zealand Charter 2010

4.18 The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes ‘The city’s heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations’ and ‘The central city has a distinctive character and identity’. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is a measure for these outcomes.

4.19 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

4.19.1 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.

Decision Making Authority

4.20 The Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan. This established funding source requires staff to present applications to the relevant Committee or Council for their approval and the delegated authority for these decisions has been confirmed to be with this Committee.

Assessment of Significance and Engagement

4.21 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

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

4.23 There are no engagement requirements in the Operational Guidelines or Policy for this grant scheme.

Impact on Mana Whenua

4.24 It is noted that Tūāhuriri Rūnanga are the Tangata Whenua in this location.

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

5. Options Analysis

Options Considered

5.1 The following options were considered and are assessed in this report:

- Option 1 a grant of $90,668 for the works associated to the High Street façades;
- Option 2 a grant of $60,000 for the works associated to the High Street façades.
5.2 The following option was considered but ruled out:

- **Option 3 - no grant.** The work complies with the Operational Guidelines and Policy and although retrospective, the applicant did liaise with Council heritage staff during the resource consent process and staff were able to monitor the actual works. The heritage outcome for the scheduled item is positive, with the retention, repair and upgrade of the entire units, not just the façades to which this application relates. The works undertaken have retained and restored significantly more of the heritage fabric and values of the two units than the Resource Consent process would have achieved. This includes the retention of the original staircase. Works to the façade are of a high quality and achieve positive heritage outcomes comparable to the works undertaken in adjacent units of the Duncan’s Building which received grant funding. The Council has demonstrated its recognition of the heritage significance and value to the city of the façade of the Duncan’s Building through its provision of grant funding to other units.

**Options Descriptions**

5.3 **Option 1 - Heritage Incentive Grant of $90,668 to support the façade retention (22%). The preferred option.**

5.3.1 The building owner has submitted a breakdown of cost estimates for the stabilisation and rebuild works for the High Street façades of units 159 and 161 as summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brickwork repairs, scaffolding, fitting of new steel frame and general works associated with the repairs of the High Street façades</td>
<td>$411,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of restoration work to the High Street façades</strong></td>
<td><strong>$411,063</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 façade has high historical and architectural value and retention and repair is worthy of support. It is proposed that a grant of $90,668 would be appropriate for this project ($45,334 per unit and approximately 22 percent of the total expenditure on the façade retention). This sum would be consistent and comparable with the previous grants to retain the façades of the eight units of 143-157 High Street noted above.

| Proposed heritage grant (22 per cent of façade works) | $90,668 |

The cost of Implementation of preferred options of all the grant applications presented at this Committee meeting, and NOT awarding a grant to 58 Rue Lavaud:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 26 Canterbury St. Lyttelton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 158 High Street</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$128,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 159/161 High Street (22%)</td>
<td>$90,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa (40%)</td>
<td>$35,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton (12%)</td>
<td>$50,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>$222,011</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The cost of implementation of preferred options of all the grant applications presented at this Committee meeting and approving a grant to 58 Rue Lavaud:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 26 Canterbury St. Lyttelton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 158 High Street</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$128,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 159/161 High Street (22%)</td>
<td>$90,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa (40%)</td>
<td>$35,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton (12%)</td>
<td>$50,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa (20%)</td>
<td>$39,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182,476</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Option Advantages

- The work completed ensures the protection and ongoing use of this significant heritage building and retention of the wider street façade.

- Although retrospective, this application meets the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines. The scope of works detailed in the application is eligible for funding; repair of the façade contributes to the High Street streetscape, and the works were undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010 and maintained the maximum possible heritage fabric and values.

- The grant quantum is comparable with previous grants for similar work, although the outcome retains the whole of the two units have been retained and not just the High Street façades.

- The building will continue to be a notable feature in the street scene and townscape of Christchurch.

- Resource consent for the works was obtained by the applicant and Council heritage staff have monitored the works.

- The works have been undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010.

- The outcome achieved has retained more heritage values and fabric than the Resource Consent process would have provided for.

5.3.3 Option Disadvantages

- The grant is retrospective.

5.4 Option 2 – A lower level of funding of $60,000 (approximately 15%).

The lower level of funding would be approximately fifteen per cent or two thirds of the higher Option 1, but would still provide a degree of support to the owner.

The cost of implementation of the lower options of all the grant applications presented at this Committee meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 26 Canterbury St. Lyttelton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 158 High Street</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$128,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 159/161 High Street (15%)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Options Considerations

5.5 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. It recognises heritage as contributing to the identity and wellbeing of our communities and the district.

5.6 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.

5.7 The Heritage Protection activity includes the provision of advice, the heritage grants schemes, and heritage education and advocacy. Other relevant considerations include the overall aims for heritage retention and promotion in the city.

5.8 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide opportunities to achieve positive heritage outcomes. These include the retention and protection of more heritage fabric and values than the resource consent process requires, and alignment with the conservation principles of the ICOMOS NZ Charter.

5.9 In deciding whether to approve a grant, the Committee needs to have regard to any special circumstances which may apply. It is up to the Committee to assess those special circumstances and determine whether or not they justify a grant being approved.

5.10 Additional considerations which the Committee may take into account are: the level of financial input from the owner; the overall percentage of funding support being still relatively low, and the comparable levels of grant support to similar building units.

5.11 Other factors include that the works were monitored by Council staff; have been undertaken in alignment with the conservation principles of the ICOMOS NZ 2010 NZ Charter and retained the maximum possible heritage fabric and values.

### 6. Community Views and Preferences

6.1 The applicant has identified that while the Operational Guidelines provide for a grant of up to 50% of the total eligible work, and although his full scope of works would have been eligible for grant funding, he is not seeking that quantum. He has only submitted invoices relating to...
the façade retention for consideration in the application. He references the work to retain the façades of eight other units in the building which received a Council Heritage Incentive grant for a total of $362,675 or $45,334 per unit façade, which represented a grant of 50% of the façade retention per unit.

7. Legal Implications
   7.1 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.
   7.2 This report has been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.
   7.3 The legal consideration specifically relates to applying clause 5 of the Terms and Conditions of the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy Guidelines. This report sets out the various matters the Committee needs to take into account in exercising its discretion to determine whether to approve a grant.
   7.4 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide financial assistance for the maintenance and enhancement of heritage areas and buildings.
   7.5 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.
   7.6 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 minimum of a limited conservation covenant will be required in association with this grant for each of the property titles and it is suggested it be for twenty years.

8. Risks
   8.1 The grant scheme only allows funds to be paid out upon completion of the works; certification by Council staff that the works have been undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010; presentation of receipts and confirmation of the conservation covenant (if required) having been registered against the property title. This ensures that the grant scheme is effective and that funds are not diverted or lost. Covenants also act as a protective mechanism, ensuring the building is retained once the work is undertaken.
   8.2 In this case the works have been completed and the relevant receipts received. Staff are also able to certify the works, including certifying that they were undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010. The works have been monitored through the Resource Consent process.

9. Next Steps
   9.1 In non-retrospective grant applications, once approval has been gained the applicant would have a period of eighteen months to complete the scope of works outlined in the grant application and the grant recipient would be expected to acquire all resource, building and other consents required for the works. In this case the works have already been completed, the required consents obtained and the building is occupied and contributing to the economic vitality and well-being of the Central City. Receipts have been provided. A covenant would need to be registered and formal certification made before any funds could be released.
### 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost to Implement</strong></td>
<td>$90,668</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance/Ongoing</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Source</strong></td>
<td>LTP Heritage Incentive Grants</td>
<td>LTP Heritage Incentive Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on Rates</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 1 Climate Change Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Positive, the work has been</td>
<td>Positive, the work has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completed and building fabric</td>
<td>completed and building fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with embodied energy has been</td>
<td>with embodied energy has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retained. Waste has been</td>
<td>retained. Waste has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minimised.</td>
<td>minimised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 2 Accessibility Impacts</strong></td>
<td>The building is accessible to the</td>
<td>The building is accessible to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public via the restaurant.</td>
<td>public via the restaurant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 3 Social &amp; Community impacts</strong></td>
<td>The street façade and unique</td>
<td>The street façade and unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sense of place is retained.</td>
<td>sense of place is retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 4 Future Generation Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Heritage has been preserved</td>
<td>Heritage has been preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for future generations.</td>
<td>for future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on Mana Whenua</strong></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment to Council Plans &amp; Policies</strong></td>
<td>Yes, particularly 'Our Heritage,</td>
<td>Yes, particularly 'Our Heritage,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our Taonga, Heritage Strategy</td>
<td>Our Taonga, Heritage Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2029’</td>
<td>2019-2029’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistency with other grants of a similar nature</strong></td>
<td>Grant is consistent with the level of funding provided to the other 8 units within the Duncan's Building.</td>
<td>Grant is inconsistent with funding support to the other 8 units being at a significantly lower level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 274

COMMERCIAL BUILDING AND SETTING, DUNCAN’S BUILDINGS—135, 139, 141, 143, 145, 153, 155, 157, 159, 161, 163, 165 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.

Duncan’s Buildings has historical significance as an Edwardian dual-function terrace built for Miss E R Duncan, who also resided here and conducted a stationery and fancy goods store in one of the shops. The 1905 building contained 16 individual shops and first floor dwellings and therefore offered retailing on a smaller scale to the larger neighbouring High Street stores such as Butterfields, A J Whites, Strange’s building and Para Rubber. The shops hosted a variety of businesses throughout the early years, including confectioners, fruiterers,
butchers, furniture dealers and hairdressers and the building is now in a series of individual ownerships.

The High Street was an important commercial area in early Christchurch, which developed significantly in the second half of the 19th century. This commercial and business area has both historical and social significance for its association with the development of the central city and the establishment of many well-known Canterbury businesses. Duncan’s Buildings continued to be used as an integrated block of retail and restaurants with office/living space above until the Canterbury earthquakes of 2010-2011. The block was severely damaged in the earthquakes and remains a cordoned off area where a repair and structural upgrade programme is to be developed.

**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.*

Duncan’s Buildings has cultural significance as a demonstration of a way of life in which small-scale retailers and other business operators would typically live above their business premises.

**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.*

Duncan’s Buildings has architectural significance for its commercial classical design by Alfred (1865-1924) and Sidney (1872-1932) Lutrell. The Lutrell Brothers settled in the city in 1902 and became particularly known for their commercial architecture, racing grandstands and Catholic churches. The Lutrells’ chief contribution to New Zealand architecture was the introduction of the ‘Chicago Skyscraper’ style with the Lyttelton Times building in Cathedral Square (1902, demolished), and the New Zealand Express Company buildings in Manchester Street (1905-7, demolished) and Dunedin (1908-10).

Duncan’s Buildings is a continuous two-storey terrace on the western side of High Street, north of its intersection with St Asaph Street. The building’s façade features the constructional polychromy of brick and Oamaru stone and each bay has a pair of round-headed windows on the first floor beneath a unifying entablature and parapet. Three pediments are interspersed along the length of the parapet, with the stone inscription reading ‘Duncan’s - AD 1905 - Buildings’. Suspended verandahs shelter the ground floor and various alterations have been made to individual shops over the years. Severely damaged in the earthquakes the buildings have yet to have a repair and structural upgrade programme developed.

**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.*
Duncan's Buildings have technological and craftsmanship significance for what they may reveal of early twentieth century construction methodologies, materials, fixtures and fittings. It has craftsmanship significance for its brick masonry construction and for the execution of features such as the arched windows, frieze, pediments and parapet.

**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.*

Duncan’s Buildings and its setting has contextual significance for the contribution it makes to the High Street streetscape, much of which has been lost since the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury earthquakes. The length of Duncan’s Buildings is impressive in its scale and the consistent repetition of materials and architectural motifs. Duncan’s Buildings define and maintain the heritage character of High Street between Tuam and St Asaph Streets.

The setting consists of the same footprint as the listed building which takes in the shop fronts along High Street as well as the associated outbuildings to 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.*

Duncan’s Buildings 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 prior to 1900. Although the building was erected after 1900, both the 1862 and 1877 maps of the central city indicate that there was development on this site and those adjacent to it in the 19th century.

**ASSESSMENT STATEMENT**

Duncan’s Buildings and its setting has overall significance to Christchurch, including Banks Peninsula as an Edwardian dual-function (commercial and residential) terrace. The building has historical and social significance for its association with Miss E R Duncan who built it in 1905. It contained 16 individual shops and first floor dwellings which have continued with the same function for over a century. Duncan’s Buildings has cultural significance as a demonstration of a way of life in which small-scale retailers and other business operators would typically live above their business premises. Duncan’s Buildings has architectural significance as an early work designed by the Luttrell Brothers settled in the city in 1902 and became particularly known for their commercial architecture, racing grandstands and Catholic churches. It has particular aesthetic significance as a continuous two-storey masonry terrace.

Duncan’s Buildings have technological and craftsmanship significance for what they may reveal of early twentieth century construction methodologies, materials, fixtures and fittings. It has contextual significance as its lengthy brick facade makes a major contribution to the surviving historic character of High Street. Duncan’s Buildings 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 prior to 1900.

REFERENCES:

CCC Heritage files – Duncan’s buildings

Historic place # 1864 – Heritage NZ List
http://www.heritage.org.nz/the-list/details/1864

http://www.highstreetstories.co.nz/stories/88-duncan’s-building


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

Press 17 December 1904, p. 5.

REPORT DATED: 2 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.
10. Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa

Reference: 19/608255
Presenter(s): Victoria Bliss, Heritage Conservation Projects Planner

1. 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 for conservation and maintenance work to the dwelling at 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa.

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

2. Executive Summary

2.1 This report proposes approval for a Heritage Incentive Grant for conservation and maintenance works currently underway at 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa. The dwelling is scheduled as ‘Significant’ in the Christchurch District Plan and its retention and repair is worthy of support.

2.2 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs.

2.3 The applicant advised staff and members of the Committee that works were due to commence at the time they submitted the grant application. However, due to limited funds in the last financial year, the application has been held over to the 2019/2020 year. The works include essential and urgent maintenance including roof and wall repairs which could not be delayed for another winter. Council staff have been monitoring the works.


3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

1. Approve a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $35,642 for conservation and maintenance work for the protected heritage building located at 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa.

2. Note that payment of this grant is subject to the applicants entering a 20 year limited conservation covenant with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the property title.

4. Context/Background

Building Status

4.1 The Building at 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa is scheduled as a ‘Significant’ building in the Christchurch District Plan. The building is not registered by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT). Refer to Attachment ‘A’ the ‘Statement of Significance’ for further information.
4.2 The current owner of the building and applicant for the grant is ‘Carla A. McGraw’.

4.3 The dwelling is a detached, single storey, timber framed structure with weatherboard cladding and a corrugated iron roof. The date of construction is believed to be 1877. The building has a simple overall form with a pitched roof, two principal gable ends and a lean-to addition to the rear. There is a small gable facing towards the road (obscured by trees in the photos) and the building included a later, small extension at the rear and a separate out building. The extension and outbuilding have deteriorated to the point where they cannot be repaired and will be completely replaced in a similar form. To the front, street elevation a verandah forms a porch for the main entrance.

4.4 The dwelling is located at the corner of Rue Jolie and Selwyn Avenue within the Akaroa Historic Area.

4.5 The owner obtained the necessary Resource Consents for the works, RMA/2017/2331 and RMA/2019/313.

Application for Heritage Incentive Grant Funding

4.6 The Heritage Incentive Grant scheme is intended to assist owners of scheduled heritage places to achieve positive heritage outcomes when they undertake maintenance, conservation, repairs and code compliance works to their buildings.

4.7 The dwelling has received very little maintenance in recent years and was in need of significant repair works to prevent further deterioration and loss of heritage fabric. These works were urgent as the building was no longer weather-tight and was at risk of severe water ingress if left another winter. The owner submitted a grant application in January 2019 seeking support for the substantial costs of the repairs. These are outlined in the tables below.

4.8 At the time the application was received there were limited grant funds remaining for allocation. Consequently the application has been held over to the 2019/2020 financial year.
Council staff have monitored the works and the Committee Chair has been made aware of the situation.

4.9 The applicant is seeking a grant for works which have already commenced. The terms and conditions for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy, Clause 5, provides as follows:

5. Retrospective Grant Approval

In some circumstances a Heritage Incentive Grant application for urgent work may be submitted on time but the processing of the application and hence of the grant approval may be delayed. If the scope of work has been agreed, the applicant may choose to continue the work. However the grant will only be paid if and when it is approved by the Committee (for grants up to $149,999) or the Council (for grants of $150,000 or over). Accordingly, as there is no guarantee that the grant will be approved the owner in commencing work before a grant is approved takes a risk as to the outcome of the approval process.”

4.10 This application is made under Clause 5.

Strategic Alignment

4.11 The recommendations of this report align with the relevant strategies, plans and policies as listed below:

4.11.1 Our Heritage, Our Taonga Heritage Strategy 2019-2029
4.11.2 Christchurch District Plan
4.11.3 Heritage Conservation Policy
4.11.4 Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
4.11.5 New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
4.11.6 International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New Zealand Charter 2010

4.12 The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes ‘The city’s heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations’ and ‘The central city has a distinctive character and identity’. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is a measure for these outcomes.

4.13 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

4.13.1 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.

Decision Making Authority

4.14 The Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan. This established funding source requires staff to present applications to the relevant Committee or Council for their approval and the delegated authority for these decisions has been confirmed to be with this Committee.

Assessment of Significance and Engagement

4.15 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

4.16 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than $500,000.
4.17 There are no engagement requirements in the Operational Guidelines or Policy for this grant scheme.

Impact on Mana Whenua

4.18 It is noted that Ōnuku Rūnanga are the Tangata Whenua in this location.

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

5. Options Analysis

Options Considered

5.1 The following options were considered and are assessed in this report:
- Option 1 a grant of $35,642 for the works associated with the dwelling;
- Option 2 a grant of $26,732 for the works associated with the dwelling;

5.2 The following options were considered but ruled out:
- Option 3 - no grant. The work complies with the Operational Guidelines and Policy in that the heritage outcome for the scheduled item is positive, with the retention, repair and maintenance of the dwelling. The works undertaken will retain and restore more of the heritage fabric and values than the Resource Consent process would have achieved. Although the works are underway, they were urgent and the applicant did notify staff in January 2019 at the time of the application that the works were about to commence. The chair of the Committee was alerted to the application and that it would have to be considered later in the year due to the timing of the next quarterly allocation of funds and the likely full allocation of the funds remaining at that meeting. Council staff are monitoring of the works and the necessary Resource Consents have been obtained.

Options Descriptions

5.3 Option 1 - Heritage Incentive Grant of $35,642 to support the cost of the repair and maintenance works (40%). The preferred option.

5.3.1 Option Description: The building owner has submitted a breakdown of cost estimates for the works for as summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Roof</td>
<td>$21,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement windows &amp; doors includes installation</td>
<td>$31,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacing/ Repairing weatherboards</td>
<td>$6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>$14,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstatement of the chimney to the original form using brick slips</td>
<td>$14,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of restoration work</strong></td>
<td><strong>$89,105</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 a significant heritage dwelling in the Akaroa Historic Area and its retention and repair is worthy of support. However, given the limited amount of funds available in the current financial year and the anticipated high demand, a percentage grant of forty per cent is recommended in this case. This is comparable and consistent with other grants.
awarded in the 2018/2019 financial year where grants for similar domestic buildings ranged from thirty to fifty per cent of the cost of the eligible works.

| Proposed heritage grant (40%) | $35,642 |

The cost of implementation of preferred options of all the grant applications presented at this Committee meeting and NOT awarding a grant to 58 Rue Lavaud:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 26 Canterbury St. Lyttelton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 158 High Street</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$128,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 159/161 High Street (22%)</td>
<td>$90,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa (40%)</td>
<td>$35,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton (12%)</td>
<td>$50,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>$222,011</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost of implementation of preferred options of all the grant applications presented at this Committee meeting and approving a grant to 58 Rue Lavaud:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 26 Canterbury St. Lyttelton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 158 High Street</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$128,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 159/161 High Street (22%)</td>
<td>$90,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa (40%)</td>
<td>$35,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton (12%)</td>
<td>$50,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa (20%)</td>
<td>$39,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182,476</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 **Option Advantages**

- It supports the retention of a significant heritage building.
- The dwelling will continue to be a notable feature in the historic streetscape of Akaroa.
- It supports the conservation of original heritage fabric and features, including deferred maintenance to protect the exterior envelope of the dwelling.
- The work when completed ensures the protection and ongoing viable use of this significant heritage dwelling. Although the works have begun, they needed to be undertaken urgently.
- The grant would be comparable with previous grants for similar work awarded in the 2018/2019 financial year; grants for similar domestic buildings have ranged from thirty to fifty per cent of the cost of the eligible works.
- Resource consent has been obtained by the applicant and Council heritage staff have monitored the works.
- The works have been undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010.
- The outcome achieved has retained more heritage values and fabric than the Resource Consent process would have provided for.
5.3.3 **Option Disadvantages**

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

5.4 **Option 2 - A lower level of funding of $26,732 (30%).**

5.4.1 **Option Description:** This option is for a lower level of funding of thirty percent of the cost of the eligible works. This option would still provide a degree of support to the owner.

Cost of Implementation of the lower options of all the grant applications presented at this Committee meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 26 Canterbury St. Lyttelton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 158 High Street</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$128,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 159/161 High Street (15%)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa (30%)</td>
<td>$26,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton (10%)</td>
<td>$42,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>$270,070</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.2 **Option Advantages**

- As for Option 1 above.
- The lower grant would leave more funds for other applications but would still provide some financial support to the building owner.

5.4.3 **Option Disadvantages**

- It would be a lower level of support to a building owner who has undertaken significant repair and maintenance works to ensure the retention of a heritage building.
- It would not provide as much support for the retention and maintenance of a significant heritage building in an important cluster of similar era buildings with similar street-scene and heritage values.

**Options Considerations**

5.5 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. It recognises heritage as contributing to the identity and wellbeing of our communities and the district.

5.6 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.

5.7 The Heritage Protection activity includes the provision of advice, the heritage grants schemes, and heritage education and advocacy. Other relevant considerations include the overall aims for heritage retention and promotion in the city.

5.8 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide opportunities to achieve positive heritage outcomes. These include the retention and protection of more heritage
fabric and values than the resource consent process requires, and alignment with the conservation principles of the ICOMOS NZ Charter.

5.9 Additional considerations which the Committee may take into account are: the level of financial input from the owner; the overall percentage of funding support being still relatively low, and the comparable levels of grant support to similar dwellings.

5.10 Other factors include that the works are being monitored by Council staff; have been undertaken in alignment with the conservation principles of the ICOMOS NZ 2010 NZ Charter and retained the maximum possible heritage fabric and values.

6. Legal Implications

6.1 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide financial assistance for the maintenance and enhancement of heritage areas and buildings.

6.2 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.

6.3 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 limited conservation covenant will be required in association with this grant and it is suggested that the length of time be twenty years.

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

7. Risks

7.1 The grant scheme only allows funds to be paid out upon completion of the works; certification by Council staff that the works have been undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010; presentation of receipts and confirmation of the conservation covenant (if required) having been registered against the property title. This ensures that the grant scheme is effective and that funds are not diverted or lost. Covenants also act as a protective mechanism, ensuring the building is retained once the work is undertaken.

8. Next Steps

8.1 In non-retrospective grant applications, once approval has been gained the applicant would have a period of eighteen months to complete the scope of works outlined in the grant application and the grant recipient would be expected to acquire all resource, building and other consents required for the works. In this case the consents have been obtained; the works have already begun and completion should be within the timeframes. A covenant would need to be registered, receipts provided and formal certification made before any funds could be released.
9. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Implement</td>
<td>$35,642</td>
<td>$26,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Ongoing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>LTP Heritage Incentive Grants</td>
<td>LTP Heritage Incentive Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Rates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Impacts</td>
<td>Positive, the building fabric with</td>
<td>Positive, the building fabric with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>embodied energy has been retained.</td>
<td>embodied energy has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste minimised.</td>
<td>Waste minimised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Impacts</td>
<td>No public access but visible from the street.</td>
<td>No public access but visible from the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Community Impacts</td>
<td>An important part of the townscape is preserved to retain the unique sense of place.</td>
<td>An important part of the townscape is preserved to retain the unique sense of place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Generation Impacts</td>
<td>Heritage has been preserved for future generations.</td>
<td>Heritage has been preserved for future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Mana Whenua</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with other grants of a similar nature</td>
<td>Grant is consistent with the level of funding provided to the other similar domestic dwellings.</td>
<td>Grant is consistent with the level of funding provided to the other similar domestic dwellings, but at the lower level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 1028

DWELLING AND SETTING - 117 RUE JOLIE, AKAROA

PHOTOGRAPH: J. WILSON, 2010

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.

117 Rue Jolie has historical and social significance for its association with early Canterbury settler Esther Munns and members of the large Watkins and Narbey families, both of whom figure prominently in the history and development of Rue Jolie and Akaroa.

Esther and Henry Munns arrived in Canterbury aboard the Sir George Seymour in 1850. After working on up-country runs and establishing an aerated water factory in Lyttelton, they settled on a property in German Bay (Takamatua). After Henry’s death in 1874, Esther made preparations to retire to Akaroa. In December 1876 she leased (and later bought) Lot 22 (now 117 Rue Jolie) in a subdivision carried out by Dr Daniel Watkins that year. The German Bay property was offered for sale or rent in late 1877, so presumably the Rue Jolie cottage had been completed by this time. Esther died in 1882, and both 117 Rue Jolie and the German Bay property were subsequently auctioned. They were both purchased by French settler Francois Narbey, a farmer at Otanarito/Long Bay, who utilized the cottage as his Akaroa base.

Many Peninsula farmers had Akaroa townhouses, often purchased to enable their children to attend school. Narbey had 18 children and consequently purchased the much larger house next door at 115 Rue Jolie from Dr Watkins’s son Stephen when the latter retired to Christchurch in 1889. 117 was then sold to Stephen’s bachelor brother William. Later in 1899, the house was sold back to Francois Narbey. After Francois’ death in 1914, the cottage passed to his daughter Ciara, who married Harold Porter in 1921. Older sister Rose
inherited the old family home at 115 Rue Jolie at the same time, and also owned 113. Collectively the three properties were known as the ‘Narbey houses’. Clara died in 1964; in 1966 her cottage was transmitted to her nephew Ellinore Peter Narbey. The cottage was finally sold out of the Narbey family in 1995 after more than a century of ownership.

**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.*

117 Rue Jolie has cultural significance as a demonstration of the way of life of some colonial Banks Peninsula farmers who either retired to or kept a townhouse in Akaroa. Its ownership history also reflects a characteristic feature of Akaroa life, whereby properties were commonly retained in and passed down through families from the late-19th to the mid-20th centuries. The lengthy periods of single-family ownership often ensured that properties such as this maintained much of their integrity.

**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.*

117 Rue Jolie has architectural and aesthetic significance as a largely original Victorian vernacular cottage dating from c.1877. It provides an interesting contrast with the pair of neighbouring Carpenter Gothic style villas at 115 and 113 Rue Jolie, which were built at the same time and with the same basic form, but larger in scale and with greater attention to ornamentation. Cottages such as 117 Rue Jolie are numerous in Akaroa and play a large part in defining the town’s colonial identity. Taken together the dwellings of Rue Jolie present a wider survey of domestic architecture in New Zealand between 1860 and 1940. The designer/builder of this dwelling is currently unknown.

**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.*

117 Rue Jolie has technological and craftsmanship significance for its physical integrity, through which it provides a particularly good example of mid-19th century construction and decoration.

**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.*

117 Rue Jolie and setting has contextual significance for the contribution it makes to the historic streetscape of Rue Jolie. It is located towards the front of a standard suburban section at the corner of Rue Jolie and Selwyn Avenue. This corner location gives the home some prominence within the streetscape. The house relates particularly to the two other
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former 'Narbey houses' at 115 and 113 Rue Jolie, and is also a contributor to the key Akaroa heritage precinct of Rue Jolie, which illustrates the development of domestic architecture in New Zealand between 1860 and 1940. The setting consists of the immediate land parcel which includes an out-building which may be contemporary with the house. The property has a small setback from the road and a picket fence fronts the dwelling on its Rue Jolie boundary.

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.

117 Rue Jolie and its setting are of archaeological significance because they have 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 dwelling and its setting at 117 Rue Jolie is of overall significance to Banks Peninsula and Christchurch. The cottage has historical and social significance for its association with early settler Esther Munns, and members of the Watkins and Narbey families, both of whom figure prominently in the history and development of Rue Jolie. The cottage has cultural significance as a demonstration of the way of life of Banks Peninsula farmers who acquired residences in Akaroa for various reasons. The cottage has architectural and aesthetic significance as a largely original colonial vernacular cottage and technological and craftsmanship significance for its physical integrity, through which it provides a notable example of mid-19th construction and decoration. 117 Rue Jolie has contextual significance as one of a number of listed heritage buildings in Rue Jolie that together form a key heritage precinct in Akaroa. 117 Rue Jolie and its setting are of archaeological significance because they have 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.

REFERENCES:

CCC Heritage File: 117 Rue Jolie Dwelling

http://www.akaroacivictrust.co.nz/fastpage/fpengine.php/templateid/57/menuid/1/tempidx/6/link/1

REPORT DATED: 9 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 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa
Reference: 19/666232
Presenter(s): Victoria Bliss, Heritage Conservation Projects Planner

1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee to either:
      • Not approve a retrospective Heritage Incentive Grant to the protected heritage building located at 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa.
      OR
      • Approve a retrospective Heritage Incentive Grant of $39,535 for the upgrade works to the protected heritage building located at 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa.
   1.2 This report is staff generated in response to an application for a Heritage Incentive Grant from the owner.
   1.3 This report re-submits the application made to the Committee on 6 March 2019.

2. Executive Summary
   2.1 This report provides the Committee with supplementary information which was not included in the original report of 6 March 2019 when the Committee resolved not to approve a Heritage Incentive Grant to the protected heritage building located at 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa.
   2.2 Having received correspondence from the applicant and sought further advice, staff have reviewed the report and determined that there are grounds for resubmitting the application to the Committee for their reconsideration.
   2.4 Clause 5 of the Terms and Conditions states that decisions to make retrospective grants are “…at the specific discretion of the Committee or the Council having regard to any special circumstances which may apply”.
   2.5 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs.
   2.6 The building is scheduled as ‘Significant’ in the Christchurch District Plan, and its retention is worthy of support. The works include structural upgrade works, upgrades to the fire protection, accessibility upgrades and associated fees and on site costs.
   2.7 In this case, if the Committee were of the opinion that it wishes to make a grant, a grant of 20% of the eligible works would be comparable and consistent with previously approved Council grants for other buildings in the 2018/2019 financial year.
   2.8 This report does not include a staff recommendations but sets out two options for the Committee to consider.
3. **Staff Recommendations**

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee, noting the previous resolution of the Committee dated 6 March 2019 to not approve a Heritage Incentive Grant for 58 Rue Lavaud, and having regard to the special circumstances of this application:

1. Confirms its 6 March 2019 decision to not approve a retrospective Heritage Incentive Grant to the protected heritage building located at 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa.

   OR

2. Approve a Heritage Incentive Grant of $39,535 for the upgrade works to the protected heritage building located at 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa.

3. Note that payment of this grant (if resolution 2 applies) is subject to the applicants entering a 20 year limited conservation covenant with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the title.

4. **Context/Background**

   **Building History**

   4.1 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. Refer to Attachment ‘A’, the ‘Statement of Significance’ for full details.

   4.2 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.

   4.3 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.

   4.4 The building is owned by the applicant, Richard Stewart.

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

   4.5 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. A fuller history is contained in the report of 6 March 2019, see Attachment ‘B’, ‘Heritage Incentive Grant for 58 Rue Lavaud’ and the previous report of 31 March, 2015, see Attachment ‘C’, ‘Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for 58 Rue Lavaud’.

   4.6 Documentary and background evidence to support this application has been supplied by the applicant. The volume of documentation makes it too large to include as an attachment with this report. The original, hard copy is available to the Committee prior to and at the meeting for their consideration.
4.7 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.

4.8 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 outlined in the ICOMOS NZ Charter had been applied as required by the operational guidelines.

4.9 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.

4.10 On 20 September 2017 a letter was received from the applicant’s lawyer objecting to the withdrawal of the grant. Staff replied to the applicant’s lawyer addressing the matters raised but also providing a way forward which included the option for the applicant to make a further application for Council to consider.

4.11 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 and a copy of that application is attached, see Attachment ‘D’.

4.12 Staff prepared a report (the report to the Committee dated 6 March 2019) which recommended that no grant be awarded. The report cited that the application did not align with the Operational Guidelines in that it was retrospective, had not been monitored by Council staff and that the manner in which the works were undertaken resulted in a loss of heritage fabric and values.

4.13 The Committee determined on 6 March 2019 not to approve a grant.

4.14 The applicant’s lawyer subsequently objected to the 6 March 2019 report. Staff sought legal advice which recommended that a new report should be prepared.
Current application for Heritage Incentive Grant Funding

4.15 The Heritage Incentive Grant scheme is intended to assist owners of scheduled heritage places to achieve positive heritage outcomes when they undertake maintenance, conservation, repairs and code compliance works to their buildings. As this is a rates funded grant, a positive heritage outcome relates to maintaining more heritage fabric and values than would otherwise have been retained under the Resource Consent process.

4.16 The applicant is seeking a retrospective grant for works associated with the upgrades undertaken at the building - structural, fire and accessibility. The terms and conditions for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provides as follows:

**5. Retrospective Grant Approval**

Where works have been undertaken without consultation with Council with regard to a grant approval and where there has been no prior written agreement as to the scope of works applicable to the project for consideration of a grant, then no grant application will be accepted for the work other than at the specific discretion of the Committee or the Council having regard to any special circumstances which may apply.

In some circumstances a Heritage Incentive Grant application for urgent work may be submitted on time but the processing of the application and hence the grant approval may be delayed. If the scope of work has been agreed, the applicant may choose to continue the work. However the grant will only be paid if and when it is approved by the Committee (for grants up to $149,999) or the Council (for grants of $150,000 or over). Accordingly, as there is no guarantee that the grant will be approved the owner in commencing work before a grant is approved takes a risk as to the outcome of the approval process.”
4.17 This application has been made under clause 5. The applicant set out the special circumstances in their application as follows:

“Although it is regrettable that this application for grant approval is being made retrospectively, this has occurred due to inadvertent lapsing of the previous grant before the work was completed and the funds requested. It is only the second part of the application that is truly retrospective in nature and that concerns work to facilitate disabled access and facilities and additional structural and fire upgrades, which was a flow on effect of the work approved under the previous grant but required as a condition of the Building Consent. The applicant has done valuable work at considerable personal expense to upgrade and protect the building for future generations. …”

4.18 This matter is a complex one because of the history of the property, previously awarded a Heritage Incentive Grant in 2015, which was not claimed within the policy timeframes. However, in considering any retrospective grant application, the Committee needs to have regard to any special circumstances that may apply and then determine whether or not to approve a grant.

4.19 As noted above, the applicant has provided documentary and background evidence to support their application. Council staff have told the applicant that this information would be provided to the Committee for their consideration. The volume of documentation makes it too large to include as an attachment with this report. The original, hard copy has been made available to the Committee prior to and at the 3 July 2019 meeting for their consideration.

4.20 Council staff have reviewed this information and note it has been sufficient to enable the granting of a retrospective resource consent for the works. It has not been demonstrated that the works were undertaken to align with the conservation principles of the ICOMOS NZ Charter.

4.21 The applicant did not obtain resource consent at the time of these works, although these have since been granted retrospectively. Council staff did not monitor the works associated with this grant application.

**Strategic Alignment**

4.22 Heritage Incentive grants support positive heritage outcomes and the retention of scheduled heritage places. This aligns with the relevant strategies, plans and policies as listed below:

- Our Heritage, Our Taonga Heritage Strategy 2019-2029
- Christchurch District Plan
- Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
- New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
- It should be noted that the application does not demonstrate alignment with the Council’s Heritage Conservation Policy or the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New Zealand Charter 2010.

4.23 The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes ‘The city’s heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations’ and ‘The central city has a distinctive character and identity’. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is a measure for these outcomes.

4.24 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

- Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy
4.25 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.

Decision Making Authority
4.26 The Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan. This established funding source requires staff to present applications to the relevant Committee or Council for their approval and the delegated authority for these decisions has been confirmed to be with this Committee.

Assessment of Significance and Engagement
4.27 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
4.28 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than $500,000.
4.29 There are no engagement requirements in the Policy Operational Guidelines for this grant scheme.

Impact on Mana Whenua
4.30 It is noted that Ōnuku Rūnanga are the Tangata Whenua in this location.
4.31 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Māori, their culture and traditions.

5. Options Analysis

Options Considered
5.1 The following reasonably practicable options were considered and are assessed in this report:
   - Option 1 - no grant.
   - Option 2 - a grant of $39,535 for the updated scope of works submitted in October 2018.

5.2 The following option was considered but ruled out as not being reasonably practicable:
   - A grant of 50% of the updated scope of works and costs submitted in October 2018. While the original grant of 2015 was at a level of 50% of the eligible works, and the Operational Guidelines provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs, this is not a reasonably practicable option in the current financial year. There is already a high demand for the grant funds this financial year and where works are of a higher value, grants are generally awarded at less than 30% of eligible costs. The quantum of grant awarded to any applicant remains at the Committee’s discretion.

Options Descriptions
5.3 Option 1 – no grant awarded.
   5.3.1 Option Description: This option does not provide for a retrospective grant to be awarded to the applicant and confirms the Committee’s decision of 6 March 2019 not to approve a retrospective application.
   5.3.2 Heritage Incentive Grants are intended to achieve positive heritage outcomes, which include the protection of heritage values. Because staff were not able to monitor the works, they are not able to determine the extent to which the maximum possible
heritage fabric and values were retained. The heritage comments in the retrospective resource consent RMA92028678 (granted 23 May 2016) noted that while the works have ensured the long term protection and retention of the building, some elements of the scope of works undertaken had had an adverse effect on the heritage values and fabric of the building.

5.3.3 The eligible works would have been required to be undertaken in a manner consistent with the conservation principles and practice of the ICOMOS (NZ) Charter. The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grant state under Terms and Conditions, 4, ‘Changes to the Agreed Scope of Works’ that:

“...if the work done does not comply to the scope of works, or the resource consent or conservation principles outlined in the ICOMOS NZ Charter, the Council reserves the right to reduce the amount of the grant paid or to withdraw the grant entirely.”

5.3.4 As noted above, staff are unable to determine if conservation principles were applied and the works were undertaken in alignment with ICOMOS NZ Charter as they were unable to monitor the works and the documentation supplied has not been able to evidence conservation best practice.

5.3.5 The cost of implementation of preferred options of all the grant applications presented at this Committee meeting and NOT awarding a grant to 58 Rue Lavaud:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 26 Canterbury St. Lyttelton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 158 High Street</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$128,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 159/161 High Street (22%)</td>
<td>$90,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa (40%)</td>
<td>$35,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton (12%)</td>
<td>$50,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>$222,011</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1 **Option Advantages**
- By not awarding a grant, funds remain available to provide support for other projects;
- It is not possible for staff to confirm that the works have been undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010, or maintained the maximum possible heritage fabric and values;
- The outcome achieved has not been demonstrated to have retained more heritage values and fabric than the Resource Consent process would have provided for, as noted in paragraph 4.15.

5.3.2 **Option Disadvantages**
- The Council would not be providing financial support to works which have ensured the retention and ongoing use of this significant heritage building.
- The building is a notable feature in the Akaroa street scene and townscape and it could be perceived that the Council have not supported its retention.
- The applicant may feel that the Council are not taking into consideration the special circumstances and evidence provided to support this retrospective application.
5.4 **Option 2 - Heritage Incentive Grant of $39,535 of the works in the 2018 application (20%).**

5.4.1 **Option Description:** the applicant has submitted a breakdown of costs for the original and additional upgrade works as summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled access</td>
<td>$15,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>$11,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional engineering</td>
<td>$12,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource consent fees</td>
<td>$261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of conservation and restoration related works</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,596</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous eligible costs</td>
<td>$158,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of conservation and restoration related works</strong></td>
<td><strong>$197,677</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.2 This includes the works that were the subject of the 2015 grant:
- 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.

5.4.3 It also includes installation of:
- Disabled toilet;
- Disabled access;
- Fire alarm;
- Additional engineering;
- Council fees.

5.4.4 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. It is proposed that a grant of $39,535 would be appropriate for this project. This represents 20% of the eligible works and would be consistent and comparable with other grants of a similar scale.

| Proposed heritage grant (20%) | $39,535 |

5.4.5 The cost of implementation of preferred options of all the grant applications presented at this Committee meeting and approving a grant to 58 Rue Lavaud:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 26 Canterbury St. Lyttelton</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 158 High Street</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from the 2018/19 financial year for 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$128,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 159/161 High Street (22%)</td>
<td>$90,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 117 Rue Jolie, Akaroa (40%)</td>
<td>$35,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 1 Ticehurst Road, Lyttelton (12%)</td>
<td>$50,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa (20%)</td>
<td>$39,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182,476</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.6 **Option Advantages**
- The work completed ensures the protection and ongoing use of this significant heritage building.
- The building will continue to be a notable feature in the Akaroa street scene and townscape.
- The grant would be comparable with previous grants for similar work.

5.4.7 **Option Disadvantages**
- Resource consent for the works was not obtained until after they were completed by the applicant and Council heritage staff were unable to monitor the works.
- The applicants have not been able to demonstrate that the works were undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010, or maintained the maximum possible heritage fabric and values.
- The outcome achieved has not been demonstrated to have retained more heritage values and fabric than the Resource Consent process would have provided for.

5.5 **Options Considerations**

5.5.1 The Council promotes heritage as a valuable educational and interpretation resource which also contributes to the visitor industry and provides an economic benefit to the city. It recognises heritage as contributing to the identity and wellbeing of our communities and the district.

5.5.2 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.

5.5.3 The Heritage Protection activity includes the provision of advice, the heritage grants schemes, and heritage education and advocacy. Other relevant considerations include the overall aims for heritage retention and promotion in the city.

5.5.4 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide opportunities to achieve positive heritage outcomes. These include the retention and protection of more heritage fabric and values than the resource consent process requires, and alignment with the conservation principles of the ICOMOS NZ Charter.

5.5.5 In deciding whether to approve a grant, the Committee needs to have regard to any special circumstances which may apply. It is up to the Committee to assess those special circumstances and determine whether or not they justify a grant being approved.

5.5.6 Additional considerations which the Committee may take into account are the level of financial input from the owner; the overall percentage of funding support being still relatively low; and the comparable levels of grant support to similar projects. Other factors include that the works were not monitored by Council staff, and have not been demonstrated to have been in alignment with the conservation principles of the ICOMOS NZ 2010 NZ Charter.

6. **Community Views and Preferences**

6.1 The applicant’s lawyer has set out a summary of the matters on which they have views and preferences, and explains their views on various matters. Their starting position is that a grant of 50% of the total eligible work should be approved.
6.2 As noted above, the applicant has asked that a copy of this letter be provided to the Committee.

7. Legal Implications

7.1 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.

7.2 This report has been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

7.3 The legal consideration specifically relates to applying Clause 5 of the Terms and Conditions of the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy Operational Guidelines. This report sets out the various matters the Committee needs to take into account in exercising its discretion to determine whether or not to approve a grant.

7.4 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide financial assistance for the maintenance and enhancement of heritage areas and buildings.

7.5 If the Committee decides to adopt Option 2, a limited conservation covenant will be required. The Heritage Conservation Operational Guidelines require a limited conservation covenant for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of $15,000 to $149,999. A full covenant is required for grants of $150,000 or more.

7.6 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 limited conservation covenant will be required in association with this grant and it is suggested that the length of time be twenty years.

8. Risks

8.1 The grant scheme only allows funds to be paid out upon completion of the works; certification by Council staff that the works have been undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010; presentation of receipts and confirmation of the conservation covenant (if required) having been registered against the property title. This ensures that the grant scheme is effective and that funds are not diverted or lost. Covenants also act as a protective mechanism, ensuring the building is retained once the work is undertaken.

8.2 In this case the evidence supplied with the application demonstrates that the works have been completed and receipts have been presented. Staff are able to certify the works, although they are not able to certify that they were undertaken in alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010. The conservation covenant to be registered against the property title will provide further protection of the building.

8.3 There is a risk that this could set a precedent for other retrospective grant applications. This includes non-compliance with Operational Guidelines around staff monitoring, positive heritage outcomes and alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter 2010.

9. Next Steps

9.1 In non-retrospective grant applications, once approval has been gained the applicant would have a period of eighteen months to complete the scope of works outlined in the grant application and the grant recipient would be expected to acquire all resource, building and other consents required for the works.

9.2 However, in this case the works have already been completed, the required consents obtained retrospectively and the building is occupied and contributing to the economic vitality and well-being of Akaroa. Receipts have been provided and staff are able to certify the works,
noting that they cannot certify alignment with the ICOMOS NZ Charter. A covenant would need to be registered and formal certification made before any funds could be released.
## 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to Implement</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$39,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Ongoing</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>LTP Heritage Incentive Grants</td>
<td>LTP Heritage Incentive Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Rates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 1 Climate Change Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive, the work has been completed and building fabric with embodied energy has been retained. Waste has been minimised.</td>
<td>Positive, the work has been completed and building fabric with embodied energy has been retained. Waste has been minimised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 2 Accessibility Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive, accessible access has been provided and the building is accessible to the public as a retail outlet.</td>
<td>Positive, accessible access has been provided and the building is accessible to the public as a retail outlet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 3 Social and Community Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The street façade and unique sense of place is retained. More funding is available to support other grant applications which may achieve more positive heritage outcomes.</td>
<td>The street façade and unique sense of place is retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 4 Future Generation Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage has been preserved for future generations. There has been a loss of heritage fabric and values through the way in which the works were undertaken.</td>
<td>Heritage has been preserved for future generations. There has been a loss of heritage fabric and values through the way in which the works were undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on Mana Whenua</strong></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment to Council Plans &amp; Policies</strong></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Partial. Note that the manner in which the works were undertaken has not been demonstrated to align with the ICOMOS NZ Charter, the Council's Conservation Policy and that the Resource Consent was retrospective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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District Plan – Listed Heritage Place
Heritage Assessment – Statement of Significance

Akaroa 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 Fawcet 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
http://www.akaroa civictrust.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.**
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

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural upgrade work</td>
<td>$94,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade to fire linings</td>
<td>$52,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural engineer’s fees</td>
<td>$1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management, P &amp; G, service charges and travel costs</td>
<td>$14,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of conservation and restoration related works</strong></td>
<td><strong>$162,964</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled access</td>
<td>$15,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>$11,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional engineering</td>
<td>$12,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource consent fees</td>
<td>$261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of conservation and restoration related works</td>
<td>$39,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous eligible costs</td>
<td>$158,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of conservation and restoration related works</td>
<td>$197,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2018/2019</th>
<th>$697,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 41 Ranfurly Street, Christchurch (30%)</td>
<td>$76,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 201 High Street, Christchurch (30%)</td>
<td>$88,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 1 Charteris Bay Road, Diamond Harbour (50%)</td>
<td>$12,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 23 Mandeville Street, Riccarton (50%)</td>
<td>$5,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 9A Aubrey Street, Akaroa (50%)</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 204 St Asaph Street, Christchurch (30%)</td>
<td>$63,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 53 Oxford Street, Lyttelton (30%)</td>
<td>$21,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total grants approved to date $274,668

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total grant funding available for allocation $423,032</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 26 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton (21% in total over 2 years*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 158 High Street (29% in total over 2 years*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 226 Kilmore Street, Christchurch (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 3 Winchester Street (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 30 Hackthorne Road, Cashmere (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural upgrade work</td>
<td>$94,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade to fire linings</td>
<td>$52,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural engineer’s fees</td>
<td>$1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management, P &amp; G, service charges and travel costs</td>
<td>$14,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of conservation and restoration related works</strong></td>
<td><strong>$162,964</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of conservation and restoration related works</td>
<td>$158,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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):

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

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;
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)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled access</td>
<td>$15,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>$11,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional engineering</td>
<td>$12,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource consent fees</td>
<td>$261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of conservation and restoration related works</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,596</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous eligible costs</td>
<td>$158,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of conservation and restoration related works</strong></td>
<td><strong>$197,677</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**  

| 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**  

| 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  
*Proposed commitment from the 2019/20 financial year for 158 High Street
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.
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PHOTOGRAPHS, 58 RUE LAVAUD (2012)
1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT

1.1 Council staff seeks to obtain an approval from the Community Committee for a Heritage Incentive Grant for 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 The building at 58 Rue Lavaud is located in the town centre of Akaroa, at the junction with Cross Street (refer to the Statement of Significance in Attachment 1).

2.2 The building sustained damage in the 2010/11 series of earthquakes but has been stabilised and is being repaired. The earthquake repair work is being funded by the Earthquake Commission and private insurance. The building requires further conservation and maintenance work.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The building at 58 Rue Lavaud is a Protected Building in the Banks Peninsula District Plan. The building is registered Category II by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, registration number 5287.

3.2 The building has not previously been the subject of a Council Heritage Incentive Grant.

3.3 The recommendations of this report align with the relevant strategies and policies as listed below:

(a) Christchurch Recovery Strategy
(b) Banks Peninsula District Plan
(c) Heritage Conservation Policy
(d) Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
(e) New Zealand Urban Design Protocol

3.4 The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes ‘The city’s heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations’ and ‘The central city has a distinctive character and identity’. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects.

3.5 The Heritage Protection activity includes the provision of advice, the heritage grants schemes, heritage recovery policy, and heritage education and advocacy. 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.

3.6 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide financial assistance for the maintenance and enhancement of heritage areas and buildings.

4. COMMENT

4.1 The detached two storey dwelling at 58 Rue Lavaud was constructed in 1883 as a pharmacy for Henri Citron. The architect was Thomas Cane and unusually the building has retained the original use throughout its entire existence and is still functioning as the Akaroa Pharmacy. The building has been owned by the same family since 1935. On the exterior 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 changes to the shop front and entrance on the street corner. There is also an extension at the back of the property facing the harbour. This extension includes a first floor deck and there is a staircase providing independent access to the first floor which has been turned into a separate flat. Internally the alterations have been more substantial to accommodate the changing requirements of the retail outlet and particularly the creation of the separate first floor flat.
4.2 The building is owned by the applicant for the grant, Richard Stewart.

4.3 The recent earthquakes damaged the masonry chimneys and the bricks have been removed from the upper parts of the building. The owner proposes not only to repair the building but to have it structurally upgraded to 100 per cent of current building code and to add new fire protection measures. These changes are subject to resource consent and building code approval.

4.4 The applicant is seeking grant support for structural upgrade work conservation and maintenance works. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines.

4.5 The conservation and maintenance works include:

(a) Replacement of damaged ceilings with new structural diaphragms
(b) Replacement of selected wall linings with structural bracing
(c) Seismic upgrade to ground floor and sub-structure and installation of new floor
(d) New fire rated linings as required
(e) Removal of remaining brick chimneys.

4.6 Costs for conservation works, including code compliance and maintenance, are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Upgrade Work</td>
<td>$94,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade to fire linings</td>
<td>$52,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Engineers fees</td>
<td>$1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management, P and G, service charges and travel costs</td>
<td>$14,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of conservation and restoration related work</strong></td>
<td><strong>$162,964</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Heritage Incentive Grants Policy. The Operational Guidelines for the Policy provide for a grant of up to 50 percent of the total heritage related costs for a 'Protected' heritage structure.

   Proposed heritage grant (50 percent ) $81,482

4.8 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.

4.9 Covenants generally 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. As the grant will be above $15,000 but less than $150,000 there is a requirement for a limited conservation covenant on this property title.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The Heritage Incentive Grants are provided for in the TYP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 25 Armagh Street</td>
<td>$763,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to St John the Evangelist Church, Little River</td>
<td>$104,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to The Umpires Pavilion, Hagley Oval</td>
<td>$43,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 12 Reserve Terrace, Lyttelton</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 74 Derby Street, St Albans</td>
<td>$21,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa</td>
<td>$15,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa</td>
<td>$81,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2014/2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>$490,586</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Funds are available in the budget for 2014/15.
6. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

6.1 That the Committee approve:

(a) A Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $81,482 for conservation and maintenance work for the Protected heritage building at 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa, subject to compliance with the agreed scope of works and certification of the works upon completion.

(b) That payment of this grant is subject to the applicants entering a 20 year limited conservation covenant with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the property title.
3 October 2018

Christchurch City Council Heritage Team
53 Hereford Street
Christchurch Central
Christchurch 8154

Dear Heritage Team

58 RUE LAVAUD, AKAROA – APPLICATION FOR HERITAGE INCENTIVE GRANT

Please find enclosed the Application of Richard Stewart for a Retrospective Heritage Incentive Grant in respect of conservation work carried out to the building at 58 Rue Lavaud in Akaroa.

The Application comprises:

1. Application form.
2. Heritage Grant Application Summary report dated 1 October 2018.
3. Folder of supporting documentation.

Please note that in circumstances where there is an existing conservation covenant on the title which relates to the work which is the subject of the Application, our client has not completed an Application for a Heritage Conservation Covenant Consent.

We would be grateful if our client’s Application could be placed before the next sitting of the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee for consideration.

Yours faithfully
CORCORAN FRENCH

GERALDINE BIGGS
Associate
Email: geraldine@corcoranfrench.co.nz
106213.002 : TFO

Effective Solutions | Peace of Mind

Level 1, 166 Moorhouse Ave, PO Box 13001, Christchurch 8141, New Zealand. Tel (03) 379 4660 | Fax (03) 379 4614
Cnr Williams and Hilton Streets, PO Box 15, Kaiapoi 7644, New Zealand. Tel (03) 327 8159 | Fax (03) 327 5061

www.corcoranfrench.co.nz
NZ LAW Member (An Association of Independent Legal Practitioners)
### Contact Details

**Address of Heritage Property**  
58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa

**Owner's Name**  
Richard Stewart

**Owner's Address**  
91 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa 7570

**Owner's phone numbers**  
0272770692, (03) 384-7060

**Owner's email**  
akaroapharmacy@xtra.co.nz

### Description of heritage conservation works

*Note: Please attach itemised details of quotations or estimates for the works to this application*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$98,893.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and seismic engineering work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility and facilities upgrade</td>
<td>$42,496.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Fees</td>
<td>$5,563.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees</td>
<td>$29,564.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total conservation cost</td>
<td>$233,045.53 (including GST)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Date

11/08/18

### Signature
HERITAGE GRANT APPLICATION SUMMARY

58 RUE LAVAUD

AKAROA
NEW ZEALAND
To Christchurch City Council Heritage Team

Application for Heritage Incentive Grant Approval

The Applicant, Richard Stewart, applies for retrospective grant approval for conservation works carried out to his building located at 58 Rue Lavaud in Akaroa. Maxim 1 Ltd ("Maxim") were the Project Managers for the work. I provide this report in support of his application and in my capacity as the Project Manager for the work.

Previous Heritage Incentive Grant

I am aware that a previous Heritage Incentive Grant ("the Previous Grant") was approved on 1 April 2015 for $81,482.00 for structural and fire protection upgrades to the building.

The Previous Grant was made on the basis of estimated costs and an estimated scope of work, (prior to Building Consent approval) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural upgrade work</td>
<td>94,542.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade to fire linings</td>
<td>52,822.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Engineer’s fees</td>
<td>1,352.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management, P&amp;G, service charges and travel costs</td>
<td>14,268.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of conservation and restoration related works</strong></td>
<td>$162,964.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Grant (50%)</td>
<td>$81,482.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work was carried out (together with additional work, as explained below) but unfortunately no grant funds were ever paid to the Applicant because the Previous Grant lapsed before the work was completed and payment was requested. This arose due to some misunderstanding and miscommunication between the Applicant, the Council and Maxim as to the terms of the Previous Grant.

Additional work required as a condition of Building Consent

Around the same time as the application for the Previous Grant was made, a Building Consent application was submitted to the Building Consent Authority (i.e. the Council) on 10 February 2015, supported by detailed documentation to cover the proposed work being structural upgrades, fire protection upgrades and general cosmetic earthquake repair work. The Previous Grant application was based on the estimated cost and scope of work envisaged at the time of the application for a Building Consent.

On 25 February 2015, the Council issued a Request for Information notifying the Applicant of additional work needed to meet the Intent of the Building Act. This included additional:

- Structural upgrades;
- Fire protection upgrades;
- Accessibility route upgrades;
- Accessible facilities upgrades; and
- Signage upgrades.

Additionally, the Council confirmed that a Resource Consent would also be required given that the work involved a protected building (Category 2) and was a restricted discretionary activity.
The scope of works was therefore modified to meet the additional requirements for Building Consent (however the Previous Grant did not take account of such additional requirements).

Building Consent was subsequently granted on 16 July 2015. Resource Consent was also granted on 23 May 2016.

Retrospective Grant Application

This application for retrospective grant approval therefore comprises two parts.

The first part is for the same scope of work that was the subject of the Previous Grant (and which subsequently lapsed) i.e. structural and fire upgrades at a cost of $158,081.15. This is slightly less than the total estimated cost of $162,964.00 which formed the basis of Previous Grant as the then estimated site management, P&G service charges and travel costs of $14,268.00 were superseded by actual invoices at a lesser cost.

The second part of this application is for the additional eligible work which was required as a condition of Building Consent, but only became known after the original grant application was made. This was for disabled access and toilet facilities and the installation of a new fire alarm system. This additional eligible work costed $74,563.88 including GST.

The total cost of the eligible work (i.e. Parts 1 and 2) is therefore $233,645.03 including GST. It may be noted that the total cost of the construction work to the Applicant was far in excess of this (i.e. $382,989.59 including GST).

Only the work that I believe fits within the Heritage criteria for eligibility, has been referenced in this application. This Retrospective Grant application is therefore for a total of $116,822.52 (i.e. 50% of $233,645.03).

Supporting Documentation

In support of this application for retrospective grant approval, the following documents are provided:

1. 58 Rue Lavaud – Heritage Application Financial Summary (Excel Spreadsheet)

   This spreadsheet details all of the eligible work that was carried out, its cost and references the relevant proof of completion contained in various invoices, receipts/correspondence acknowledging payment, photographs, Producer Statements by the relevant professionals and Compliance documents. The primary form of evidence is the Code Compliance Certificate which issued on 17 August 2017, and when read in conjunction with the applicable Building Consent and Request for Information, is evidence that all of the work required by the Council as a condition of Building Consent, was in fact carried out.

2. Post-Earthquake Resource Consent Report

   The spreadsheet also references extracts from a Post-Earthquake Resource Consent report which was prepared as part of the application for Resource Consent in February 2016. This contains extensive photographs of the work together with an explanation of the building work carried out.

3. Additional Photographs

   Additional photographs of the disabled access ramp and bathroom facilities are also provided (taken by the Applicant).
4. **Compliance Documents**

These comprise:

(b) Inspection Site Notice dated 13 July 2017.
(c) Building Consent 16 July 2015.
(d) Consent plans.
(e) Approved Building Consent documents.
(f) Request for Information 25 February 2015.

5. **Producer Statements and Correspondence**

This comprises:

(a) Airey Consultants letter of completion dated 23 October 2015.
(b) Airey Consultants Producer Statement — PS4 dated 30 June 2017.
(c) Airey Consultants Producer Statement — PS4 dated 12 November 2015.
(d) Airey Consultants Producer Statement — PS1 design dated 17 February 2015 (in respect of fire safety).
(e) Airey Consultants Producer Statement — PS1 design dated 17 February 2015 (in respect of seismic strengthening to 67% NBS).
(f) FPIS Certificate of Completion (re fire alarm system) dated 14 December 2016.
(g) FFP Producer Statement (PS3) as to fire alarm system dated 14 December 2016.
(l) Evan A’Court Producer Statement (PS3) in respect of repair to fire rated ceiling diaphragm dated 29 June 2017.
(m) Anton Sutherland Producer Statement (PS3) in respect of fire doors dated 7 August 2017.
(n) South Island Gib Fixers Producer Statement (PS3) in respect of gib fire line, fire resistant plasterboard dated 6 November 2015.
(o) Mattson Joinery Hardware Declaration List (fire doors) undated.

6. **Invoices and Receipts**

Copies of all invoices, as set out on the Financial Summary excel spreadsheet are provided. All of the contractors’ invoices were made out to Maxim (as Project Manager), with the exception of those noted below. The Applicant paid for the work under invoices from Maxim and I confirm that the Applicant has paid all such invoices. An email from Maxim’s Chief Financial Officer dated 10 August 2018 is also provided confirming this.

The following invoices were paid directly by the Applicant to the consultants, and receipts confirming payment are also provided:

(i) Airey Consultants’ Invoices 106418, 107063, 107286 and 107653 (see also receipt numbers 1049, 1050, 1051 and 1052).

(ii) FFP invoice 308614 (see also receipt under email dated 6 September 2018).
7. **Previous Grant Approval Report dated 9 March 2015**

A copy of the Previous Grant approval report is provided, together with the Maxim Estimating and Pricing form upon which the Previous Grant application was based.

**Heritage Value**

The building is a protected building in the Banks Peninsula District Plan, registered as Category 2 by Heritage New Zealand (Registration No. 5287). Its heritage nature is summarised at paragraph 4.1 of the Previous Grant Approval Report.

The work carried out by the Applicant has resulted in significant improvements from a structural, safety and access point of view. Its structural strength has been upgraded to no less than 67% of the NBS, its fire rating has been upgraded to meet all current requirements of the Building Code, the brick chimneys have been removed and a new disabled ramp access and bathroom facilities have been built. This will ensure the longevity and safety of the building that was at significant risk from earthquakes so that it is no longer classified as earthquake prone and will facilitate access and use of the building by those with disabilities.

**Special Circumstances**

Although it is regrettable that this application for grant approval is being made retrospectively, this has occurred due to the inadvertent lapsing of the Previous Grant before the work was completed and the funds requested. It is only the second part of this application that is truly retrospective in nature and that concerns work to facilitate disabled access and facilities and additional structural and fire upgrades, which was a flow on effect of the work approved under the Previous Grant but required as a condition of the Building Consent.

Regards
Ben Johnson
Homes by Maxim

1 October 2018
12. Installation of Public Artwork - "The Godwits"

Reference: 19/720790

Presenter(s): Brent Smith – Acting General Manager, Citizens and Community

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee for the permanent installation and maintenance of “The Godwits” public artwork, to be installed on Council road reserve adjacent to the South Brighton Bridge.

2. Executive Summary

2.1 “The Godwits” public artwork will be gifted to Christchurch by the South Brighton Residents Association.

2.2 Council is being requested to approve the permanent installation and maintenance of “The Godwits” public artwork on Council road reserve adjacent to the South Brighton Bridge.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee recommend to Council:

1. Agree to the permanent installation of “The Godwits” public artwork on Council road reserve adjacent to the South Brighton Bridge subject to the following:
   a. All necessary consents and approvals are obtained and provided.
   b. Long term maintenance and engineering plans are provided.
   c. As there is no formal commissioning agreement, Council’s requirements are to be addressed in an agreement between all parties.

4. Key Points

4.1 Council is being requested to approve the permanent installation and maintenance of “The Godwits” public artwork on Council road reserve adjacent to the South Brighton Bridge.

4.2 The artworks is an initiative of the South Brighton Residents Association.

4.3 The artwork is consistent with the Council’s Artworks in Public Places Policy.

4.4 Community Outcomes: Supports Strong Communities: Celebration of our identity through arts, culture, heritage and sport.

4.5 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 – 2028):
   • Activity: Recreation, Sports, Community Arts & Events
   • Level of Service: Support community based organisations to develop, promote and deliver community events and arts in Christchurch
   • Activity: Heritage
   • Level of Service: To manage and maintain Public Monuments, Sculptures, Artworks and Parks Heritage Buildings of significance.
5. **Context/Background**

**The Artwork**

5.1 A new artwork is proposed to be located next to the South Brighton Bridge as a beautification project and to identify South New Brighton as an area of natural beauty and a place where the Godwits come and go from each year.

5.2 The South Brighton Residents Association commissioned sculptor Bon Suter to design the artwork.

5.3 In the absence of a formal commissioning agreement, an agreement between all parties is required to satisfy Council’s requirements.

5.4 The artwork consists of 7 painted stainless steel godwits which are on poles and the birds will rotate in the wind.

5.5 The height ranges from 5.3m to 6.6m tall.

5.6 The birds have been manufactured under Bon Suter’s supervision by Mecca Engineering and the supporting poles were manufactured by Windsor Urban.

**The Artist**

5.7 Bon Suter is a professional sculptor and tutor with 30 years’ experience. She has attended over twenty sculpture symposiums, both nationally and internationally, and more recently, has represented Christchurch City Council at the Festival of Arts in Adelaide. Bon’s work is held in public and private collections around the world.

5.8 As well as exhibiting her work widely throughout New Zealand, Bon has been at the forefront of teaching sculpture, in both stone and clay.

5.9 Her work is a reflection of the human experience. Each piece is exquisitely carved offering a personal insight into the artist’s journey through life. Her wide and varied works capture the essence of hand carved pieces that speak directly from her heart to yours.

*Photo montage of the proposed artwork at the proposed site*

![Photo montage of the proposed artwork at the proposed site](image)

**Site considerations**

5.10 The proposed location is adjacent to the South Brighton Bridge on road reserve
This location is approximately 90 metres east of the South Brighton Bridge eastern abutment on the southern side of the road reserve.

**Strategic Alignment**

5.11 The site was not identified in the Artwork in Public Places Five Year Plan 2004.

5.12 The artwork is consistent with the Council’s Artworks in Public Places Policy.
Engagement and support


5.14 The local Community Board are supportive of this project.

5.15 A staff assessment has been carried out by a staff working party as per the Artworks in Public Places – Operational procedures (ATTACHMENT A)

5.16 This assessment outlines the criteria for assessment, issues, maintenance requirements and finance implications. Also included was an engineering design and assessment for the installation of the sections.

5.17 The Transport Unit has been involved in the project, including reviewing the location of the sculpture on road reserve.

5.18 The necessary sign off from consents and CCC Structural Engineers have been completed.

Financial implications

5.19 Council has contributed to funding for this artwork through contributions from the Coastal (formerly Burwood Pegasus) Community Board Discretionary Fund. The total contribution from the CCC was $12,737.67. The balance was raised through community events and donations.

5.20 The value of the artwork is approximately $89,000.

5.21 Parks have confirmed that they have funding to carry out the on-going maintenance of the artwork which will involve an annual wash-down, any required graffiti removal and an annual engineering check.

5.22 Maintenance has been estimated at $1880 annually

- Annual: clean/wash $700
- Engineer check and report - $180
- Traffic management estimate - $1000

6. Recommendations

6.1 That Council agree to the permanent installation of “The Godwits” public artworks on Council road reserve adjacent to the South Brighton Bridge subject to the following:

1. All necessary consents and approvals are obtained and provided.
2. Long term maintenance and engineering plans are provided.
3. As there is no formal commissioning agreement, Council’s requirements are to be addressed in an agreement between all parties.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Brent Smith - Acting General Manager Citizens &amp; Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Andrew Rutledge - Head of Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brent Smith - Acting General Manager Citizens &amp; Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROJECT WORKING PARTY REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Tuesday 18th June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Godwits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artist</strong></td>
<td>Bon Suter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montage</strong></td>
<td>![Montage Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Ross Herrett, Senior Project Manager Transport and South Brighton Residents’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date submitted</td>
<td>8 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Board</td>
<td>Coastal-Burwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Working Party Membership</td>
<td>Arts Advisor – Kiri Jarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rep of Asset - Maria Adamski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rep of land owner – Richard Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Board Staff rep – Heather Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineer - Paul Ferguson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

A new artwork is proposed to be located next to the South Brighton Bridge as a beautification project and to identify South New Brighton as an area of natural beauty and a place where the Godwits come and go from each year.

### Proposal

The artwork consists of seven painted stainless steel Godwits that rotate in the wind on poles.

## PROJECT WORKING PARTY SUMMARY

The artwork is a community initiative to celebrate the migration of the Godwits to and from the South Brighton Spit. The artwork is made of robust materials with appropriate separations of metals. It is expected to have a life of approx. 50 years and cost approx. $1,800 for an annual wash down and engineering check of the swivel mechanisms.

The following is recommended if the artwork is to become permanent and owned by Council:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approvals</th>
<th>All necessary approvals are obtained and provided by South Brighton Residence Association (SBRA).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>A maintenance plan is provided by the artist and the engineer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Council approve annual funding of $1,880 to maintain the artwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements</td>
<td>There is no commissioning agreement. Council’s requirements are to be addressed in an agreement between all parties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Bon Suter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bon Suter is a professional sculptor and tutor with 30 years’ experience. Her work is mainly in stone and clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artwork Description</td>
<td>Seven painted, aluminium fabricated godwits on stainless steel rods atop galvanised poles. The height ranges from 5.3m to 6.6m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location(s) Proposed</td>
<td>Road margin, adjacent the Ihutai Estuary and South Shore Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Stainless steel, Aluminium, paint, galvanised steel, nylon plates where metals meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricators</td>
<td>Mecca Engineering and Windsor Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Total value approx. $89,091.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,500 Community Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community events and donations raised by SBRA, CCC engineering, Fulton Hogan in kind gift to install.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of Artwork</td>
<td>50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement and Support</td>
<td>SBRA has consulted with - Ngai Tahu, Ihutai Trust, Southshore Residents Assn. We understand there is support for the artwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consents</td>
<td>None as it is classified as artwork and it sited on road reserve it is exempt from both a Building and Resource consent. Archaeological Authority: No the site has been disturbed and reconstructed following the replacement of the Bridge St bridge after the 2011 Earthquake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>The structural support structures (poles) has been designed by Structural Engineer Paul Ferguson from Council’s Technical Services and Design Unit and City Services Group. The birds have been designed by sculptor Bon Suter and manufactured under her supervision by Mecca Engineering and the supporting poles were manufactured by Windsor Urban.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Location
Approx. 90m east of the Bridge St Bridge eastern abutment on the southern side of the road reserve.

### Art in Public Places Policy considerations for Project Working Party:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Consultation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Designer</td>
<td>Not consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and/or Transport planners</td>
<td>Road Reserve: The location of the Godwits artworks is on road reserve and has been agreed with Richard Osborne Head of Transport City Services 19/692983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
<td>Not consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect or Landscape Architect</td>
<td>Not consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner Environmental Services</td>
<td>Not consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Youth or Community Advocate</td>
<td>Not consulted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Art in Public Places Policy Appendix 11 considerations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practicalities</th>
<th>The artwork can be accessed from the estuary side by a cherry picker avoiding the need to work from the road and traffic management.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Surrounding Spaces</td>
<td>The artwork relates to the estuary and the surrounding habitat of the Godwits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>There are no potential health and safety issues identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy and Strategy Considerations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artworks in Public Places Five Year Plan November 2004</th>
<th>Not an identified site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Plans or Conservation Plans</td>
<td>There are no Management or Conservation plans for this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Board Plan 2017-19**: Board have expressed enthusiasm to have more artwork in the area.

**Technical**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation/Plinth</th>
<th>Detailed by Council engineer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Condition</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind loading</td>
<td>The birds are designed to move in the wind. Prototypes were made and tested in the wind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural engineering</td>
<td>Producer Statement 1 supplied 19/675377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards/Risks</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance plan</th>
<th>No plan received it is envisaged an annual clean and engineering check is required. The birds are coated in vehicle paint colour to match as close as possible to the Godwits. The birds have drainage holes to allow water to drain. It is possible birds will</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
sit on them and possibly nest. These will be removed annually. If nesting becomes an issue maintenance visits would be increased at approx. $700 (staff and cherry picker hire).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance costs</th>
<th>Estimated at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual: clean/wash $700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineer check and report - $180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic management est - $1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>annual cost approx. <strong>$1880.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement of nylon sleeves $560 bush kit, labour approx. $400 (4 hours, two people at $50). Not sure how often annual or five yearly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Images: Godwit poles photos complete in the workshop