COUNCIL 25. 06. 2015

COMMUNITIES, HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
4. 6. 2015

A meeting of the Communities Housing and Economic Development Committee was held in Committee Room 1 on 4 June 2015 at 1pm.

PRESENT: Councillor Andrew Turner (Chairperson).
Councillors Glenn Livingstone (Deputy Chairperson), Vicki Buck, Jimmy Chen, Jamie Gough, Yani Johanson, Ali Jones and Tim Scandrett.

APOLOGIES: Councillor Paul Lonsdale for absence.
Councillors Jamie Gough, Ali Jones, and Yani Johanson for early departure.

The Committee reports that:

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

1. REVIEW OF 2009 SMOKEFREE PUBLIC PLACES POLICY – BRIEFING PAPER

| Executive Leadership Team Member responsible: | Chief Planning Officer |
| Officer responsible: | Acting Unit Manager Strategic Policy |
| Author: | Senior Policy Analyst | Y | 8916 |

1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT

1.1 In February 2015 the Communities, Housing and Economic Development Committee decided to request that “the 2009 Smoke Free Policy come back to Communities, Housing and Economic Development Committee meeting in April 2015 as a briefing, with options to extend the policy as appropriate.”

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 There is considerable public support for extending the current Smokefree Public Places Policy.

2.2 Options for extending the Policy include provision of Smokefree signage at entry and exit points of Council facilities, outdoor dining areas in public spaces, and at bus passenger shelters and stops.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Smokefree Canterbury (SFC) is a collection of agencies dedicated to reducing tobacco-related harm in the community. SFC led the process of advocacy for smokefree playgrounds and parks in Christchurch. This work continues to be implemented through the new joint Christchurch City Council (CCC) / Community and Public Health (CPH) Smokefree Strategy Group in which future options for extending the current policy have also been discussed. Staff will continue to work with the Joint Smokefree Strategy Group.

3.2 A trial of three smokefree parks was run in the suburb of Hornby during May, June and July 2008. A community survey was carried out to gauge support for a city-wide Smokefree parks and playgrounds policy. One hundred and fifty people were surveyed with encouraging results; 93 per cent of those surveyed supported city wide Smokefree playgrounds and 75 per cent supported Smokefree parks. The results of the survey were presented to the Christchurch City Council (CCC).
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3.3 On 25 June 2009, CCC approved a policy to make all Council owned parks, playgrounds, sports fields and events smokefree (Attachment 1). The Council also adopted a Smokefree policy for its housing stock in January 2014. This policy is included in all new and re-negotiated lease agreements whereby residents are no longer able to smoke inside.

3.4 Over 2014-15 a joint working party (CDHB, CCC, Cancer Society) have been working toward the following objectives:

- To work together towards the goal of Smokefree 2025 within both organisations.
- To develop a framework to support the implementation of Smokefree strategies to help achieve this vision.
- To help ensure that current CCC Smokefree policies are effectively implemented and promoted.
- To investigate other smokefree initiatives that the CDHB and CCC can work together on.

3.5 The total number of smokers in Canterbury is the highest in New Zealand¹. The total number of regular smokers aged 15 and over in Christchurch City is 38,013² (13.5 per cent).

3.6 Data published by Cancer Research UK in 2012 show the majority of smokers and ex-smokers – 85 per cent – regret ever starting to smoke.³ A new study from the Australian National University found that two thirds of Australian smokers will be killed by their habit unless they are able to quit. The research, which was published in the international journal *BMC Medicine*, found smoking just 10 cigarettes a day doubled the risk of dying prematurely and that on average, smokers died 10 years earlier than non-smokers.⁴

3.7 The extension of the Smokefree policy will discourage smoking, reduce the incidence of ill-health, and reduce the amount of cleaning and tidying up required to keep public places attractive for users. Smokefree environments also reduce the visibility of smoking to children and youth, an important part of good role-modelling and responsible behaviour.⁵

3.8 Proposals to extend the policy have a small budget implication in the sense that signs should be purchased and erected to let people know an area is ‘smokefree’. As the policy is an educative one purchasing, erecting and maintaining signs are an important part of implementing it.

4. COMMENT

4.1 There are a number of options to extend the locations to which the policy applies. These may include making smokefree areas:

- On and around all Council properties including entrances;
- Within outdoor dining areas on public land; and
- At bus stops and public transport hubs.

---

² 2013 Census
4.2 All these options would be consistent with the purpose of the Smokefree Environments Act 1990 and would align with the Council's current Smokefree Public Places Policy, with only a slight amendment by Council resolution. They would also contribute to encouraging healthy lifestyles and achieving a Smokefree Aotearoa/New Zealand 2025.

4.3 In order to gain information on the level of public support for additional smokefree areas, Community and Public Health designed a telephone survey which was carried out by the Cancer Society during April and May 2014. 800 households were contacted and 445 completed the survey.

4.4 The results of the survey showed high public support for Smokefree community spaces:
- 94 per cent support Smokefree children's playgrounds.
- 86 per cent support Smokefree entrances to buildings.
- 81 per cent support Smokefree outdoor eating places at restaurants, pubs or cafés.
- 76 per cent support Smokefree bus stops and train stations.

4.5 Currently, the Cancer Society are analysing the results of a recent survey of outdoor dining venues to gauge the views of businesses regarding Smokefree dining areas and results are expected to be available soon. The Cancer Society notes that "Whilst Smokefree outdoor dining would have its challenges, given the results of the community survey and pending the results of the business survey, it would be prudent to consider options for outdoor dining at a later date." The Society suggest that this could be considered in a second stage of a policy extension and may request the opportunity to present the results of the outdoor business survey to this Committee as a deputation at a later date.

Council properties
4.6 A staff report written on 7 December 2010 discussed making entry and exit points to all Council facilities Smokefree. The report suggested Facility Managers could consider using their individual budgets for facility maintenance to erect small Smokefree signage (such as ‘Thank you for not smoking’) close to, or on, the entry/exit points of the individual facilities. Although there was some disruption caused by the earthquakes, in many cases Council facility managers have put smokefree signage in place.

4.7 The Health and Safety Advisor has the role to promote a Smokefree footprint in all council rebuild facilities such as the Town Hall, the Performing Arts building, Central Library and Halswell Library (which is well underway) and other community facilities and will undertake this advocacy role as the buildings come on stream.

Recreation and Sport Facilities and Libraries
4.8 All of the Council Recreation and Sport facilities have Smokefree signs at the entrances which say "Welcome to our Smokefree facility" and have the Smokefree logo in English and Māori. There are two 900 millimetre by 600 millimetre signs at each of these facilities.

4.9 There are 20 libraries in the Christchurch District. Of these, Central Manchester, Central Peterborough and Papanui have signs similar to those at the recreation facilities. Akaroa, Fendalton, Upper Riccarton, Spreydon, Aranui and Lyttelton libraries have free smokefree signage from Community and Public Health obtained by the Libraries' Assistant Facilities Manager, who is responsible for all internal and external Library signage. These signs are 200 millimetre by 60 millimetre stickers placed on the front entrances.

4.10 One option for the Committee to consider would be to recommend that the 17 libraries, which either have no signage or only small signs, use the free metal signs available from Smokefree NZ.

---

TRIM 10/667620 – Smokefree entry and exit points of Council facilities
Civic Offices
4.11 The Contract Manager of the Facilities Team is responsible for signage on the Civic Offices and has placed “No Smoking” signs on the east wall of the Civic Offices as this is where the fresh air intake for the building comes from. Provision has been made for smokers outside the Civic by placing receptacles for smokers to put their butts in. These receptacles are some distance from the main entrance on Worcester Street and on Hereford Street between the East staff door and the main entrance and the West staff door and the main entrance. While this discourages smoking at the entrances the activity does occur nearby (as staff prefer not to have to move too far from the building). Therefore it would be problematic to deem the entrances entirely Smokefree. The Committee could decide to make the entire ramp entrance on Worcester Street ‘smokefree’ and ask the Contract Manager of the Facilities Team to erect signage suitable for the area.

Outdoor dining areas
4.12 As shown by the community survey there is strong support for making outdoor eating areas Smokefree.
4.13 Council only licences outdoor areas if they are on a public place such as a footpath. Licensing is completed by the Leasing Agent of the Property Consultancy Team after Transport have approved the use of the public space.
4.14 Currently (March 2015) there are fewer Occupation Licences in the CBD than before the earthquakes (currently 33) although the number is slowly growing as the rebuild takes place. There are three in New Regent Street, four in Rotherham Street, three in Beach Road Akaroa, and none in ReStart Mall. The remaining licenses are scattered around the city.
4.15 Any consideration of making these areas Smokefree would require considerable consultation with the licence holders as each business would require a sign; and it may not be practicable to make the areas Smokefree as some businesses have commented that they apply for a Licence in order that their customers may smoke. The Cancer Society survey of businesses will be available soon and will be useful to help the Committee with a decision whether to expand the policy to include outdoor dining areas. Staff do not consider outdoor dining areas should be made Smokefree at this time.

Bus passenger shelters
4.16 The Council owns the bus stops and shelters and decides where they are to be placed. Discussion with the Assets and Network Unit’s Transport Planning team advised that placing Smokefree signs on bus passenger shelters at Riccarton has been under consideration for some time as a pilot scheme. It is planned that Smokefree signs at the new bus stops proposed for the new passenger waiting lounge are to be installed at 123/125 Riccarton Road on the corner of Division Street. The new lounge and bus stops should be ready by September 2015. There is no budget available for signs in other shelters.
4.17 Any addition or change to the design and attached signage for the Council bus passenger shelters must be approved by the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee. A report for that Committee’s consideration will be prepared in the next few months by the Assets and Network Unit’s Transport Planning team. Their report will consider the number and types of signs that may be used, and the associated costs, as well as which budget such costs would come from.
4.18 ECan supports promoting the provision of Smokefree bus stops and public transport customer facilities because it is important to provide safe and attractive facilities for public transport customers to encourage more people to use the network. Smokefree bus stops and customer facilities will create a healthier and more pleasant environment for waiting passengers and the wider community7.
4.19 Staff consider that bus shelters should be made Smokefree as budgets allow, but note that this decision rests with the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee.

Policy
4.20 In all cases the policy is voluntary, educative and not enforced. The intention is to de-normalise smoking and encourage a healthy lifestyle. If fewer people were smoking in these public places there would be a reduction in litter and hence cleaning costs.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The signs for Riccarton would be paid from the Riccarton Public Transport Corridor Capital Programme. There is currently no budget for signs for other shelters.

5.2 Free signs are available from Smokefree New Zealand but there will be costs incurred in the provision of any larger signage at Council facilities. Costs of various sized signs are provided in Attachment 2. The costs vary according to the size and number of signs ordered. Facilities may adopt signage as operating budgets permit.

6. STAFF AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

6.1 Resolve to work proactively with others towards the Smokefree Aotearoa New Zealand 2025 goals.

6.2 Resolve that outside all principal entrances and exits of Christchurch City Council buildings be smokefree by October 2015, including the Civic Offices, service centres, local board offices, libraries, community facilities, community halls, museums, leisure centres, recreational centres, and arts centres.

6.3 Note that it is the decision of the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee whether to recommend that the Council expand smokefree signage in bus passenger shelters.

6.4 Request that the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) directs staff to erect smokefree signage to support this policy.

6.5 Resolve that the no smoking sign and type will be at the discretion of the staff for the building.

6.6 Request that the CEO directs Health and Safety staff to communicate to Council staff that outside all entrances and exits of Council-owned buildings will be smokefree by October 2015.

6.7 Note that Smokefree Canterbury have offered to provide their signs for no cost.

Note: Refer to Clause 8.2 of this agenda, the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee decided to recommend that the Council adopt Option 2 and install adhesive smokefree labels in all bus shelters subject to costs of up to $20,500 being included in the Long Term Plan.
2. HERITAGE INCENTIVE GRANT APPROVAL FOR 88 CHESTER STREET EAST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>EA Diane Campbell, 8281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>PA Rochelle Spooner, 8812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHOTOGRAPH, 88 CHESTER STREET EAST, MAY 2014 (WITH 86 ON THE RIGHT)

1. PURPOSE AND ORIGIN OF REPORT

1.1 Council officers seek to obtain approval from the Council for a Heritage Incentive Grant for 88 Chester Street East.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 Number 88 Chester Street East is one of a pair of two storey, semi-detached residential buildings located on Chester Street East between Madras Street and Barbadoes Street. The buildings were designed and built by William Widdowson in 1892 as part of a development of 8 very similar townhouses. Following the earthquakes of 2010/11 only four of the townhouses now remain (refer to the Statement of Heritage Significance in Attachment 1).
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2.2 The building was significantly damaged in the 2010/11 series of earthquakes. The original owner chose not to repair the building and the new owner is applying for a Heritage Incentive Grant to add to their own funds in order to undertake heritage repair, restoration and conservation work. There is no insurance funding for the project.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The building at 88 Chester Street East is listed Group 2 in the Christchurch City Council’s City Plan. The building is also registered Category 2 by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) registration number 1881.

3.2 Council records show that the building has not been the subject of a previous heritage grant from Council.

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

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

4. COMMENT

4.1. The design of this series of buildings was unusual for Christchurch at the time. The sites are relatively slender and compact and the buildings are semi-detached dwellings. Plastered masonry firewalls were required between each of the separate dwellings and these projected up above the line of the roof, resulting in an unusual skyline. Apart from the fire walls and chimneys, the rest of the buildings were constructed in timber frame with weatherboard cladding. They have large two storey bay windows, leadlight fanlights, corbels under the eaves and the verandahs are trimmed with ornate iron lace work.

4.2 The use of the buildings has changed little over the life of the structures apart from conversion of some of the dwellings into flats. The conversions had little or no impact on the exterior appearance of the dwellings from the street apart from the addition of fire escape stairs above the verandahs of some of the units.

4.3 The series of eight similarly styled residential buildings on this section of Chester Street East resulted in a unique street-scene for Christchurch. It is hoped that all the four remaining dwellings can be retained and that new dwellings will be designed to be complementary to the original structures.

4.4 The earthquake damage to number 88 Chester Street East included collapse of masonry elements, the chimneys and the parapets of the party wall. The party wall is also likely to have been damaged below the parapets and will need to be replaced with a new lighter weight, timber framed, fire rated wall, possibly on new foundations. The building will require repair of damaged piles, repairs to the external concrete ring foundations; replaced/upgraded internal structural bracing; and repairs or replacement of the decorative plasterwork. On the exterior the building will require repairs to the weatherboards, rain ware, windows, doors, roofing and a complete repaint. With the completion of the works outlined, the building will meet the Building Code requirements and the owner is committed to the reuse and maintenance of the building.
4.5 The applicant for the grant is ‘Glenn Marc Jordan’. The work that the applicant is seeking grant support for will ensure the future protection and ongoing use of this significant heritage building. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines.

4.6 In summary the conservation and maintenance works include:

(a) demolition work including the removal of remaining masonry elements  
(b) new concrete footings and re-levelling of timber floors  
(c) new internal fire rated partition to replace the original brick party wall with number 86  
(d) removal and replacement of a proportion of the interior linings to allow for strengthening with wall and ceiling bracing  
(e) decorative plaster work repairs and replacement as required  
(f) electrical and plumbing repairs and replacement to current code requirements  
(g) applicable engineering, architectural, resource consent and quantity surveying fees

4.7 Costs for repairs, conservation and maintenance, including code compliance, works are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of heritage fabric (weatherboards, etc)</td>
<td>$165,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing and electrical repairs and upgrade</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party wall replacement</td>
<td>$92,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Upgrade</td>
<td>$128,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three new sash windows</td>
<td>$8,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of conservation and restoration related work</strong> <em>(this figure is exclusive of GST)</em></td>
<td><strong>$436,477</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to 50 per cent of the total heritage related costs. The project costs outlined above are substantial for a single private dwelling, largely due to the fact that the building was purchased after the damage was sustained and there is therefore no insurance contribution. The proposal is for a grant of 25 per cent to the heritage components of the project. This is a lower grant than normal on a percentage basis but is still a significant contribution to encourage the renovation of this heritage building. The other three remaining heritage buildings in this section of Chester Street East, 86, 98 and 100, each were the recipient of grants of between $65,000 and $75,000 each. The damage and scale of the project at Number 88 is similar but without insurance funds to help meet the costs of renovation.

| Proposed heritage grant (approx. 25 per cent of cost of works) | $109,120 |

4.9 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.

4.10 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. 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 Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the TYP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$763,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 25 Armagh Street</td>
<td>$104,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to St John the Evangelist Church, Little River</td>
<td>$43,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to The Umpires Pavilion, Hagley Oval</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 12 Reserve Terrace, Lyttelton</td>
<td>$21,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 74 Derby Street, St Albans</td>
<td>$15,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa</td>
<td>$81,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 6 Godley Quay, Lyttelton</td>
<td>$29,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 24 McDougall Avenue</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Grant to 88 Chester Street East</td>
<td>$109,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2014/2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,867</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

6. STAFF AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the Council approve:

6.1.1 A Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $109,120 for conservation and maintenance work for the protected heritage building at 88 Chester Street East subject to compliance with the agreed scope of works and certification of the works upon completion.

6.1.2 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. HERITAGE GRANT APPROVAL FOR 98 – 100 CHESTER STREET EAST, CHRISTCHURCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Planning Officer responsible:</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Planning Officer Strategy &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>EA Diane Campbell, 8281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer responsible:</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment and Heritage Unit Manager</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>PA Rochelle Spooner, 8812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brendan Smyth, Heritage Team Leader</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHOTOGRAPH, 98 – 100 CHESTER STREET EAST, DECEMBER 2014

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 Council officers seek to obtain Council approval for a Heritage Incentive Grant for 98–100 Chester Street East, Christchurch.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 Numbers 98–100 Chester Street East are a pair of two storey, semi-detached residential buildings located on Chester Street East between Madras Street and Barbadoes Street. The buildings were designed and built by William Widdowson in 1892 as part of a development of 8 very similar townhouses. Following the earthquakes of 2010/11 only four of the townhouses now remain (refer to the Statement of Heritage Significance in Attachment 1).
2.2 The building was significantly damaged in the 2010/11 series of earthquakes. The owner is applying for Heritage Incentive Grant funding following completion of the repairs and a significant cost increase over the initial cost estimate.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The buildings at 98–100 Chester Street East are listed Group 2 in the Christchurch City Council’s City Plan. The buildings are also registered Category 2 by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga (NZHPT) registration number 7323.

3.2 The building has been the subject of a previous Council Heritage Incentive Grant of $132,800 approved in December 2013. A twenty year Limited Conservation Covenant associated with this work was agreed and signed in June 2014.

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

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

4. COMMENT

4.1 The design of this series of buildings was unusual for Christchurch at the time. The sites are relatively slender and compact and the buildings are semi-detached rather than detached dwellings. Plastered masonry firewalls were required between each of the separate dwellings and these projected up above the line of the roof to result in an unusual skyline. Apart from the fire walls and chimneys, the rest of the buildings were constructed in timber frame with weatherboard cladding. They have large two storey bay windows, leadlight fanlights, corbels under the eaves and the verandahs are trimmed with ornate iron lace work.

4.2 The use of the buildings has changed little over the life of the structures apart from conversions of dwellings into flats. The conversions to flats had little or no impact on the exterior appearance of the dwellings from the street apart from the addition of fire escape stairs above the verandahs.

4.3 The series of eight similarly styled residential buildings on this section of Chester Street East resulted in a unique street-scene for Christchurch. It is hoped that all the four remaining dwellings can be retained and that new dwellings will be designed to be complementary to the original structures.

4.4 The earthquake damage included collapse of masonry elements, the chimneys and the parapets of the party wall. The party wall was also damaged below the parapets and needed to be replaced with a new lighter weight, timber framed, fire rated wall on the existing foundations. The building required repair of damaged piles, repairs to the external concrete strip foundations, replaced/upgraded internal structural bracing and replacement of the decorative internal plasterwork. On the exterior the building required repairs to the weatherboards, rain ware and roofing and a complete repaint. With the completion of the works outlined, the building meets the Building Code requirements and the owner is committed to the reuse and maintenance of the building.
4.5 The building is owned by the Baptist Union of New Zealand Incorporated. The work that the applicant is seeking grant support for will ensure the future protection and ongoing use of this significant heritage building. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines.

4.6 Although the building was recently the subject of Heritage Incentive Grant funding, the Operational Guidelines do allow for additional applications to be made within the normally restricted five year period when:

*Essential unforeseen maintenance identified as a consequence of other works being carried out on the building:*

and

*Essential works necessitated by events such as fire, earthquakes or natural events; additional grants may be approved within the five year period.*

(Terms & Conditions of Grant, Section 3, Multiple Grants).

*In some instances once the grant has been approved and work has begun, the full extent of the conservation and maintenance work is greater than anticipated. In such cases a further scope of work should be agreed and a revised grant application submitted for consideration.*

(Terms & Conditions of Grant Section 6, Extent of work underestimated).

4.7 All of the extra costs which have occurred over the duration of the works have been summarized by the architects and are now available and outlined below:

(a) re-instatement of original but inactive fireplace registers and timber surrounds
(b) new subfloor structure following the discovery of decayed timbers
(c) additional concrete infill was required to close gaps in the foundations of the inter-tenancy wall
(d) recladding of the laundry section of Number 98
(e) weatherboard replacement to south-east corner of Number 100
(f) new door hardware where original was unusable
(g) additional glazing

4.8 Costs for conservation, including code compliance and maintenance, works are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fireplace re-instatement</td>
<td>$4,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New subfloor structure</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional concrete for inter-tenancy wall foundations</td>
<td>$815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 98 recladding of laundry wall</td>
<td>$2,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherboard replacement to south-east corner Number 100</td>
<td>$445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and install new door hardware</td>
<td>$1,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional glazing</td>
<td>$1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of conservation and restoration related work</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,614</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to 50 percent of the total heritage related costs. The remaining funds for this year will be insufficient to cover the total of this grant but it is proposed to commit the shortfall of $1,440 from the 2015/2016 financial year.
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| Proposed heritage grant (50 per cent of cost of works) | $8,307 |

4.10 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.

4.11 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. As the grant will be below $15,000 there is no requirement for a conservation covenant on this property title in association with this grant. A twenty year limited conservation covenant has been registered in association with the previous grant of $132,800.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$763,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 25 Armagh Street</td>
<td>$104,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to St John the Evangelist Church, Little River</td>
<td>$43,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to The umpires Pavilion, Hagley Oval</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 12 Reserve Terrace, Lyttelton</td>
<td>$21,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 74 Derby Street, St Albans</td>
<td>$15,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 58 Rue Lavaud, Akaroa</td>
<td>$81,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 6 Godley Quay, Lyttelton</td>
<td>$29,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 24 McDougall Avenue</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Grant to 88 Chester Street East</td>
<td>$109,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Grant to 98-100 Chester Street East ($6,867 from 2014/2015 and commit $1,440 from 2015/2016)</td>
<td>$6,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2014/2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 The Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the TYP.

5.3 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.

5.4 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.

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

6. STAFF AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the Council approve a second Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $8,307 for conservation and maintenance work for the protected heritage building at 98–100 Chester Street East.
PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

5.1 COMMUNITY ENERGY ACTION

Jess Fiebig and Linelle Bell provided a presentation to the Committee about Community Energy Action and the costs associated with insulation for social housing.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Committee considered the information provided by the deputation and decided to request staff to identify potential sources for funding and appropriate housing stock for installation of insulation and that this information be presented by way of a Chairperson's report to the next Council meeting.

Note: due to time constraints and external input required for this report staff are preparing a report to the Committee for the 6 August meeting which will address the above request for information

5.2 YOUTH AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Anni Watkins addressed the Committee with a presentation on youth homelessness in Christchurch.

6. RESPONSE TO THE INTER-AGENCY NETWORK FOR REFUGEES AND MIGRANT'S DEPUTATION OF 7 MAY 2015

The Committee considered a report in response to a deputation made to the on 7 May 2015 Communities, Housing and Economic Development Committee meeting (CHED) by representatives of the Interagency Network for Refugees and Migrants (INFoRM).

The Committee decided on 7 May 2015 to request that staff:

'Prepare a stock take of strategies, plans, previous work and resolutions related to this issue including comment on the recommendations in the INFoRM deputation, so that that members of CHED Committee and staff can meet with INFoRM in June to discuss where to from here.'

STAFF AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Communities, Housing and Economic Development Committee decided to adopt the staff recommendation with the addition of 6.6 below:

The Committee decided to:

6.1 Establish and lead with members of the INFoRM network and other appropriate groups and individuals in the sector to develop further the ideas put to the CHED Committee on 7 May.

6.2 Request staff to develop a process for appointing representatives to the working party.

6.3 Request that staff convene the first working party meeting with Councillors and working party representatives by the end of June 2015.

6.4 Request that staff support the working party to establish a terms of reference and promote ongoing facilitation and support.
6 Cont'd

6.5 Request that the working party report back to the CHED Committee quarterly on progress.

6.6 Ask that as part of the Chief Executive submission to the Long Term Plan that the recommendations in attachment 3 be considered.

7. COMMUNITY FACILITIES REBUILD MONTHLY UPDATE

Staff spoke to the Committee with an update on the Council approved priority projects being delivered by the Community Facilities Rebuild Unit.

The Committee decided to receive the report and requested that updated information be brought to the July meeting of the Committee, containing all the information on Tranche 2 projects.

8. MAJOR FACILITIES REBUILD MONTHLY UPDATE

Staff updated the Committee on the Council’s major facilities rebuild.

The Committee decided to receive the information in the report.

9. ANCHOR PROJECTS MONTHLY UPDATE

Staff provided an update on the Council’s anchor projects.

The Committee decided to receive the information in the report and requested a report containing the total capital cost and operational costs of Hagley Oval, its current resource consent conditions and whether these are being met, who is able to use the venue and who is not, and also include any conditions on community use.

10. HOUSING OPERATIONS MONTHLY REPORT – MARCH AND APRIL 2015

Staff spoke to the Committee on key aspects of the Council’s Housing Unit operations for March and April 2015.

The Committee decided to receive the information in the report.

11. COMMITTEE RESOLUTION TABLE

The Committee decided to receive the information in the Committee resolution table.

PART C – DELEGATED DECISIONS

12. APOLOGIES

The Committee resolved to accept an apology for absence from Councillor Paul Lonsdale.

The Committee received and accepted an apology from Councillor Tim Scandrett who left the meeting at 1.50pm and returned at 2.40pm, and was absent for clauses 1, 2 and 3, and apologies for early departure from Councillors Jamie Gough who left at 2.35pm and was absent for clauses 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15, Ali Jones who left at 3.19pm and was absent for clauses 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15 and and Yani Johanson who left at 4.53pm and was absent for part of clause 15 and clause 16.
13. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

The Committee resolved that the resolution to exclude the public as set out on page 173 of the agenda be adopted.

The public were readmitted to the meeting at 5.45pm at which point the meeting closed.

CONSIDERED THIS 25TH DAY OF JUNE 2015

MAYOR
Attachment 1

Smokefree Public Places Policy 2009

Purpose
Christchurch City Council will be proactive and demonstrate leadership by promoting a smokefree lifestyle as being both desirable and the norm in Christchurch. By focusing on public outdoor locations, the Council will send a positive message that our children and young people’s health and the environment (i.e. litter and fires) should be protected from the effects of smoking.

Compliance with the policy would be voluntary and it would not be enforced by Council staff. The objective which the Council seeks to achieve would not unduly infringe the ability of others to smoke in outdoor public places should they want to.

Definitions and scope
There are around 580 neighbourhood parks that are generally small and provide places for informal recreation and small scale community events and facilities. They form part of a network of open space that includes walkways and cycle-ways. There are around 50 garden and heritage parks. These parks vary in size and have a significant place in our natural and cultural heritage. Garden and heritage parks also play a significant role in supporting the Garden City image of Christchurch. The Council manages around 70 regional parks that are large open spaces, mostly on the urban fringe, that protect and enhance scenic, cultural and environmental values. There are around 120 sports parks in the district. These parks, which are generally large, green areas, enable people to participate in organized sport and other forms of active and passive recreation. There are around 326 outdoor playgrounds that are generally small and provide places for recreation and play for children.

Alignment
The policy will contribute to Christchurch District Community Outcomes:

- A Healthy City
- A City of People who Value and Protect the Natural Environment.

Relevant legislation
The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA 2002) states that one of the purposes of councils is to promote the social, economic, environment and cultural well-being of communities, in the present and for the future. Section 11 of LGA 2002 provides that the role of councils is to give effect to their purpose, and perform the duties and exercise the rights conferred on them by, or under, LGA 2002. Section 23 of the Health Act 1956 also states that it is the duty of every council to improve, promote and protect public health within its district.

Policy details
The core objective of this policy is the reduction of smoking uptake by children and young people. This policy is an educational tool to discourage smoking in public outdoor places where people, particularly children and young people, gather.

Key Policy areas
Council-owned Parks, Playgrounds, Reserves, Sports Parks and Gardens

The public will be asked to refrain from smoking in Council-owned playgrounds and parks (including sports parks). Signage, as appropriate, will be displayed at parks and by playgrounds.

Council-owned events
Events owned by Council will be consistently promoted as smokefree events. The need for smokefree events would be promoted in the events team’s promotional material, public announcements at events and on screen at major events such as Classical Sparks.

Information and education
The Council will work with Smokefree Canterbury member organizations to ensure a robust communications plan is rolled out that promotes positive role modeling, will aim not to alienate smokers, and will be communicated over a long period of time to achieve a positive attitudinal and
behaviour change by smokers. The Council will work with Smokefree Canterbury members to ensure information relating to the new legislation and the health impacts of smoking and passive smoking are easily accessible to the community. Messages on signage and any communications will focus on the positive rather than the negative.

Smokefree signs will be integrated in the signs replacement/renewal programme where it is appropriate in parks, playgrounds and sports parks. For example, smokefree signs may not be appropriate in remote locations, where there is low usage and exposure of the area, or where there are other hazards which take priority over smokefree signage in the area (e.g. cliff dangers).

The policy is not a ban on smoking in a public place. No enforcement measures will be used against those who breach the policy. Introducing a policy where people can choose to comply is in the spirit of promoting health lifestyle choices.

Delegations
There are no delegated authorities to apply the policy.

Associated procedure
As partners of the investigation, development and implementation of the policy, Smokefree Canterbury member organizations will be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the policy.

Approval date
25 June 2009.

Date to be reconsidered
25 June 2012.

Owner
General Manager City Environment.

(1) That is, the reduction of smoking uptake by children and young persons by limiting their exposure to seeing others smoking.
Smoke free Signs
Digitally Printed Graphics with UV laminate mounted to 3mm ACM panels

900mm w x 600mm h
Similar size to ones at RSU centres
10 @ $74.00 each
15 @ $72.00 each
20 @ $69.00 each

350mm w x 100mm h
This size will be similar to library ones, if one Smokefree logo required on them
10 @ $6.00 each
15 @ $6.00 each
20 @ $6.00 each

350mm w x 250mm h
This will be similar to library ones, if two Smokefree logos required on them
10 @ $15.00 each
15 @ $14.00 each
20 @ $13.00 each

800mm w x 200mm h
Size and cost of green metal sign
10 @ $23.00 each
15 @ $21.50 each
20 @ $20.00 each

All prices are exclusive of GST (and freight if required).
DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
VICTORIA TOWNHOUSES AND SETTING – 86-88
CHESTER STREET EAST, CHRISTCHURCH

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 semi-detached townhouses at 86-88 Chester Street East are of social and historical significance as part of a development by architect, builder and landowner William Widdowson in the 1890s that remained in the ownership of his family for nearly 70 years and has remained in use for accommodation purposes until today. The townhouses are two dwellings from a development of eight very similar dwellings, of which four remain following the earthquakes of 2010 – 2011. Widdowson immigrated to Christchurch in the 1850s and undertook the development c. 1892. He was employed for a time by the Provincial Government of Canterbury as an Inspector of Works, as well as time on the North Canterbury Board of Education. Certificates of Title show he purchased the easternmost property of the four sites in 1879 and the further three sections in 1890. Widdowson lived at the property adjacent to the sections he developed from 1880 to 1914 and died a year later in 1915. The Victorian townhouses remained in the ownership of Widdowson’s family until 1961. They continue to be used for accommodation purposes today. Repair works following the earthquakes are being undertaken to no. 86 Chester Street East.

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

The Chester Street East townhouses have cultural significance as they represent a pattern of residential development in late 19th century inner city Christchurch, and the way of life of inner city residents at this time. Residential development in the area east of Madras Street up to Fitzgerald Avenue included a number of single storey Victorian and Edwardian era duplexes.

**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.

86-88 Chester Street East is of architectural and aesthetic significance because the two storey semi-detached houses are comparatively unusual in terms of residential development for the time in Christchurch and the matching form with 98-100 Chester Street East. The only comparable development was the group of two semi-detached two storey dwellings in Churchill Street which were constructed around three years later, and were simpler in form. However, these have been demolished following the Canterbury earthquakes leaving 86-88 and 98-100 Chester Street East as the only developments of this time and type. The Chester Street dwellings are designed in a plain Victorian Italianate style. An early plan shows that all the townhouses were identical in their footprint apart from 86 Chester Street East. This corner site differs by having two principle facades on the Madras Street and Chester Street East junction. The other dwellings have only one principal façade on Chester Street East and each section was separated by brick and plaster fire walls.

The main façades are symmetrical. The rounded bays with capped roofs, finials and eave brackets relate to the influence of Arts and Crafts inspired designs. 86 Chester Street East has semicircular bays on the north facade and square bays with gables on the west facade. The near identical form and scale of these semi-detached townhouses to the remaining pair at 98-100 Chester Street East affords aesthetic significance to these dwellings.

**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.

86-88 Chester Street East have technological and craftsmanship significance for their use of material typical of the time and for detailing such as leadlight fanlights, eaves corbelling and the iron lacework on the verandah. Previously the dwellings also had brick and plaster fire walls, an important safety feature for neighbouring timber dwellings, but these had to be replaced following the Canterbury earthquakes.

**CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE**

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

The setting for 86-88 Chester Street East consists of the immediate land parcel for both dwellings and is a long narrow area of land for the building. With the loss of two of the Chester Street East townhouses some of the contextual significance of 86-88 Chester Street East has been lost. However, the dwellings still have contextual significance for their streetscape in conjunction with the near identical semi-detached Victorian townhouses at 98-100 Chester Street East with the degree of consistency and scale being significant. The site of 86-88 Chester Street East on the corner of Madras Street is also relatively prominent and adds to its landmark significance. Grouped townhouses were uncommon in Christchurch during the late colonial era even with the loss of two of the buildings this increases their value.
The townhouses are in proximity to listed items including the Edmond’s Clock Tower, undergoing repairs following the Canterbury earthquakes, and telephone kiosk, as well as the avenue of Poplars along the Avon River between Madras and Manchester Streets.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

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

The buildings and settings are of archaeological significance as they have potential to hold evidence of human activity on the site, including construction methods and materials, and including evidence which pre-dates 1900.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

86-88 Chester Street East and its setting are of overall significance to Christchurch including Banks Peninsula. The semi-detached townhouses at 86-88 Chester Street East are of social and historical significance as part of a development by architect, builder and landowner William Widdowson in the 1890s that remained in the ownership of his family for nearly 70 years and has remained in use for accommodation purposes until today. The Chester Street East townhouses have cultural significance as they represent a pattern of residential development in late 19th century inner city Christchurch, and the way of life of inner city residents at this time. 86-88 Chester Street East is of architectural and aesthetic significance because the two storey semi-detached houses are comparatively unusual in terms of residential development for the time in Christchurch and for the matching form with 98-100 Chester Street East. The dwellings have technological and craftsmanship significance for their use of materials typical of the time, and for detailing such as leadlight fanlights, eaves corbelling and the iron lacework on the verandah. They have contextual significance for their streetscape in conjunction with the near identical semi-detached Victorian townhouses at 98-100 Chester Street East with the degree of consistency and scale being significant. The site of 86-88 Chester Street East on the corner of Madras Street is also relatively prominent and adds to its landmark significance.

REFERENCES:

Christchurch City Council, Heritage File, 86-100 Chester Street East

REPORT DATED: 19/11/2014

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.
DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE  
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE  
Dwellings and setting - 98-100 Chester Street East, Christchurch

PHOTOGRAPH: BRENDAN SMYTH, 2014

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

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

The semi-detached townhouses at 98-100 Chester Street East are of social and historical significance as part of a development by architect, builder and landowner William Widdowson in the 1890s that remained in the ownership of his family for nearly 70 years and has remained in use for accommodation purposes until today. The townhouses are two dwellings from a development of eight very similar dwellings, of which four remain following the earthquakes of 2010 – 2011. Widdowson immigrated to Christchurch in the 1850s and undertook the development c. 1892. He was employed for a time by the Provincial Government of Canterbury as an Inspector of Works, as well as time on the North Canterbury Board of Education. Certificates of Title show he purchased the easternmost property of the four sites in 1879 and the further three sections in 1890. Widdowson lived at the property adjacent to the sections he developed from 1880 to 1914 and died a year later in 1915. The Victorian townhouses remained in the ownership of Widdowson’s family until 1961. They have continued to be used for both accommodation, office and community purposes up until the 2010-2011 earthquakes. Repair works following the earthquakes are currently being undertaken to the dwellings.
CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE
Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

The Chester Street East townhouses have cultural significance as they represent a pattern of residential development in late 19th century inner city Christchurch, and the way of life of inner city residents at this time. Residential development in the area east of Madras Street up to Fitzgerald Avenue included a number of single storey Victorian and Edwardian era duplexes of which few survive today.

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.

98-100 Chester Street East is of architectural and aesthetic significance because the two storey semi-detached houses are comparatively unusual in terms of residential development for the time in Christchurch and for their matching form with 86-88 Chester Street East. The only comparable development was the group of two semi-detached two storey dwellings in Churchill Street which were constructed around three years later, and were simpler in form. However, these have been demolished following the Canterbury earthquakes leaving 86-88 and 98-100 Chester Street East as the only developments of this time and type. The Chester Street dwellings are designed in a plain Victorian Italianate style but show the influence of American pattern book architecture of this date particularly that of San Francisco. An early plan shows that all the townhouses were identical in their footprint apart from 86 Chester Street East, which, being on the corner, had two principle facades. The other dwellings have only one principal façade on Chester Street East and each section was separated by brick and plaster fire walls.

The main façades are symmetrical. The rounded bays with capped roofs, finials and eave brackets relate to the influence of Arts and Crafts inspired designs. The near identical form and scale of these semi-detached townhouses to the remaining pair at 86-88 Chester Street East affords aesthetic significance to these dwellings.

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.

98-100 Chester Street East have technological and craftsmanship significance for what they may reveal about the use of materials of the time and for detailing such as leadlight fanlights, eaves corbelling and the iron lacework on the verandah. The dwellings were built with internal brick and plaster fire walls, an important safety feature for neighbouring timber dwellings, but these have been damaged following the Canterbury earthquakes.

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

The setting for 98-100 Chester Street East consists of the immediate land parcel and is a long narrow area of land for the building. With the loss of two of the Chester Street East townhouses some of the contextual significance of 98-100 Chester Street East has been lost. However, the dwellings still have contextual significance for their streetscape in conjunction with the near identical semi-detached Victorian townhouses at 86-88 Chester Street East with the degree of consistency and scale being significant. Grouped townhouses were uncommon in Christchurch during the late colonial era and despite the loss of two of the buildings their heritage value remains. A row of brick terrace townhouses, Blackheath, still remains in Sydenham. The townhouses are in proximity to other listed items including the Edmond's Clock Tower, undergoing repairs following the Canterbury earthquakes, and telephone kiosk, as well as the avenue of Poplars along the Avon River between Madras and Manchester Streets.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

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

The buildings and settings are of archaeological significance as they have potential to hold evidence of human activity on the site, including construction methods and materials, and including evidence which pre-dates 1900.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

98-100 Chester Street East and its setting are of overall significance to the Christchurch District including Banks Peninsula. The semi-detached townhouses at 98-100 Chester Street East are of social and historical significance as part of a development by architect, builder and landowner William Widdowson in the 1890s that remained in the ownership of his family for nearly 70 years and has remained in use for accommodation purposes until today. The Chester Street East townhouses have cultural significance as they represent a pattern of residential development in late 19th century inner city Christchurch, and the way of life of inner city residents at this time. They are of architectural and aesthetic significance because the two storey semi-detached houses are comparatively unusual in terms of residential development for the time in Christchurch and for their matching form with 86-88 Chester Street East. The building has technological and craftsmanship significance for what it may reveal of materials used in construction of the time, and for detailing such as leadlight fanlights, eaves corbelling and internal features such as the stairs. The dwellings have contextual significance for their streetscape in conjunction with the near identical semi-detached Victorian townhouses at 86-88 Chester Street East with the degree of consistency and scale being significant. The buildings and settings are of archaeological significance as they have potential to hold evidence of human activity on the site, including construction methods and materials, and including evidence which pre-dates 1900.

REFERENCES:

Christchurch City Council, Heritage File, 86-100 Chester Street East

REPORT DATED: 19/11/2014

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.