

STAGE 3 - SECTION 32

CHAPTER 9

NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

APPENDIX 5 - HISTORIC HERITAGE - APPENDICES

## APPENDIX 5.1

### Appendix 5.1 - Historic Heritage Summary Data Analysis

#### General Comments:

1. The following analysis seeks to quantify the potential impact of key proposed changes in historic heritage policy direction for heritage items and settings, in particular where they may decrease or increase consent numbers for listed heritage items or settings. Data relating to Chapter 13 Central City is included here to provide context as it concerns policy shifts which apply across the district.
2. The summarised data is derived principally from analysis of Christchurch City Council land use resource consents and building consents for the period 2004-2014 sourced by Council Data Analysts, and analysis of the composition of and changes in the heritage schedules for Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula collated by Council Heritage Team staff in the period 2011-2015.
3. Two sources of consents data have been collated to assist in building the most accurate picture available of consents for heritage items and settings. Consents for all “heritage properties” – properties containing a heritage item as recorded on the Council’s mapping database, have been matched with all resource consents data containing heritage non-compliance codes. Both sources are known to contain imperfect data, so averages and percentages are more useful than raw consent figures in understanding the overall picture of consents processed in this 10 year period.
4. The figures provided are from 14 April 2015

#### Rating Units in the District Containing Heritage Items (Operative City Plan and BPDP)

- In the Central City, 139 of 5980 rating units contain heritage items (2% of Central City rating units).
- In the city (excluding Banks Peninsula), 340 of 156522 rating units contain heritage items (0.2% of city rating units excluding Banks Peninsula)
- In the city (excluding Central City and Banks Peninsula) 201 of 150542 rating units contain heritage items (0.1% city rating units excluding Central City and Banks Peninsula)
- In Banks Peninsula, 262 of 9770 rating units contain heritage items (3% Banks Peninsula rating units)
- Across the district, 602 of 166292 rating units contain heritage items (0.4% district rating units)

#### Comment:

Rating units containing heritage items constitute a very small percentage of properties.

#### Ownership

1. Christchurch City Council owns approximately 14% of heritage items.
2. The Department of Conservation owns approximately 2% of heritage items.
3. At least 80% of heritage items are in private ownership.

### Costs of Processing Resource Consents for Heritage Items and Settings

The average cost of a non-notified resource consent for a heritage property (based on the Council's consents database) was:

1. \$1827 (May 2004 - May 2014)
2. \$1962 prior to the earthquakes (May 2004 – Aug 2010)
3. \$1800 post-earthquakes (Sept 2010 – May 2014).
4. The average cost of a non-notified resource consent for a heritage item in the period 2013-2014 was \$1866.
5. The highest cost of a non-notified resource consent for a heritage item in same period was \$5112.
6. The average cost of processing a non-notified, non-heritage resource consent in 2013/2014 for a:
  - residential alteration was \$1140
  - non-residential application (excluding the Central City Business Zone) was \$2461
  - non-residential application in the Central City Business Zone was \$7127.
7. The highest cost for processing a non-notified, non-heritage resource consent in 2013/2014 for a:
  1. residential alteration was \$3004
  2. non-residential application (excluding the Central City Business zone) was \$13,902
  3. non- residential application in the Central City Business zone was \$24,632.

(Source: A guide to resource consent processing costs, Christchurch City Council, [http://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/Homeliving/buildingplanning/forms/P302\\_GuideToRCProcessingCosts-docs.pdf](http://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/Homeliving/buildingplanning/forms/P302_GuideToRCProcessingCosts-docs.pdf), accessed on 11/3/14.)

#### Comment:

Resource consent costs for heritage works have remained stable and are comparable with other types of applications, falling in the range between processing costs for residential alterations and non-residential applications.

#### Heritage Resource Consents as a Proportion of all Resource Consents

Resource consents for heritage properties make up 427 of 13400 total resource consents for the district (3% of all resource consents granted July 2005-June 2014).

#### Heritage Building Consents as a Proportion of all Building Consents

Building consents for heritage properties make up 820 of 52866 total building consents (less than 2% of all building consents granted 2004-2014).

#### Central City Heritage Resource Consents as a Proportion of all Heritage Resource Consents

Resource consents for heritage properties in the Central City make up 310 of 518 total resource consents for heritage properties in the district (60% of all resource consents granted for heritage properties in the April 2004 – Sep 2014).

Resource consents granted by activity 2004 - 2014 (534 total resource consents for heritage properties)

Demolitions 14 (3% of total resource consents)

Relocations 4 (1% of total resource consents)

Alterations 432 (81% of total resource consents)

- An average of 44 per year prior to the earthquakes (2004-2009)
- An average of 30 per year post-earthquakes (2011-2014)
- An average of 39 per year 2004-2014.

Additional buildings 84 (15% of total resource consents)

- An average of 8 per year prior to the earthquakes (2004-2009)
- An average of 7 per year post-earthquakes (2011-2014)
- An average of 8 per year 2004-2014.

Resource consents for signs associated with heritage items or settings account for 28 of the alteration and additional buildings consents (5% of total resource consents).

Repairs in the City (Outside the Central City)

Repairs are permitted in the Operative City Plan for Central City items, and in the Operative BPDP for all items.

It is proposed to remove the requirement for resource consent for Repairs in the remainder of the city. Resource consents data does not code repairs which are components of consents, and building consent data does not code repairs, so there is no readily extractable data available on the number of repairs granted consent.

Comments:

- There are 237 proposed items in the city (excluding the Central City and Banks Peninsula) which will all benefit from this reduction in consents – those who are yet to undertake earthquake repairs, and all owners who need to undertake routine, non-earthquake-related repairs in the future.
- While the Heritage team has advised on many repair projects associated with the Canterbury Earthquakes of 2010-11 which have already occurred, many have not yet been undertaken. Some heritage items have unresolved EQC/insurance claims, a proportion of which will eventually result in repair projects. The number requiring and intending to undertake repairs is unknown.

Settings

It is proposed to carry over the resource consent requirement in both the Operative City Plan and Operative BPDP for additional buildings and outdoor advertising relating to heritage items and settings.

To date these have made up a small proportion of resource consents for heritage properties. Note that some outdoor advertising is proposed to be permitted (whereas previously required resource consent)

Refer proposed provisions and the Section 32 report for detail on what activities in 'settings' are proposed to be controlled through a resource consent process and how this relates to the existing provisions for activities on the 'site' of a heritage building, place or objective.

### Building Code Upgrades in the Central City

- Building consent applications for the period 2004-2014 were analysed to identify the projects relating to building code upgrades for heritage items in the Central City, as these have not required resource consents since the CCRP introduced a permitted activity status for building code upgrades associated with repaired areas. Resource consent is proposed to be required for all building code upgrades across the district.

### Building consents granted for heritage properties:

- An average of 31 per year prior to the earthquakes 2004-2009 (approximately 10% of 309 Central City heritage items prior to the earthquakes obtained building consents)
- An average of 21 per year post-earthquakes 2011-2014 (approximately 12% of 175 Central City heritage items currently in the Operative City Plan obtained building consents).

To put these figures in the context of owners of Central City heritage items potentially affected by the reintroduced consent requirement for building code upgrades:

- Approximately half of these proposed items in the Central City are in Group 1 and 2, and half are in Group 3 and 4 in the Operative Plan.
- Proposed Central City heritage items total 184, of which 107 (58%) are proposed as Group 1- High Significance and 77 (42%) are proposed as Group 2 - Significant.

### Comments:

1. Building consents for heritage properties include a number of consents for temporary buildings for events and amendments to earlier consents, in addition to building code upgrades and repairs (including reconstruction) so this data is indicative.
2. The data shows that a small number of heritage building projects have been undertaken in the Central City (both prior to and post-earthquakes).
3. Note that among the majority of heritage items which have not obtained a building consent, many items would not have required building code upgrade (for example commercial buildings which already met the building code, or dwellings).

### Reconstruction in the Central City

Resource consents data does not code reconstruction (which is a component of consents), and building consents data does not provide details of projects which have included reconstruction.

### Comment:

A total of 184 items are proposed for listing in the Central City. Only a proportion of projects will require reconstruction work as part of the repair project. Details of projects for Central City heritage items which have included a reconstruction component are not able to be obtained from building consent data which is not coded by project components.

### Building Code Upgrades Banks Peninsula

Building code upgrades which are limited to the interiors of buildings are permitted in the Operative BPDP as internal alterations. Details of projects for Banks Peninsula heritage items which have included a building code upgrade restricted to the interior are not able to be obtained from building consent data.

Comment:

There are 252 proposed items in the Banks Peninsula area, but it is anticipated that the number of items affected by the proposed requirement for resource consent for building code upgrades limited to the interiors will be a small proportion of this figure, and are anticipated to be largely fire and access upgrades.

The reasons for this conclusion are:

- i. As noted below in relation to alterations, building code work of this nature is often undertaken as part of a larger project for external alterations which would require resource consent.
- ii. The majority of heritage items requiring building code upgrade will be commercial rather than residential (many items do not require building code upgrade).
- iii. Many structural building code upgrades affect the exterior of the building (so already require resource consent).

Internal Alteration Banks Peninsula

- Internal alterations are permitted in the BPDP. Resource consents data does not code internal alteration which is a component of consents, and building consents data does not provide details of projects which have included internal alteration.

Comments:

1. There are 252 proposed items in Banks Peninsula, but it is anticipated that the number of items affected by the proposed requirement for resource consent for internal alterations will be a small proportion of this figure. The reasons for this conclusion are:
  - Internal alterations are often undertaken as part of external alterations (so already require resource consent), and
  - The resource consent numbers for external alteration projects are low -
    - The total coded resource consents granted for alteration for Banks Peninsula heritage properties is 18 for the period 2004-2014. Of these:
      - A total of 9 were prior to the earthquakes (2004-2009) (3% of 334 items)
      - A total of 9 were post-earthquakes (2011-2014) (3% of 300 items following demolitions).

Akaroa Historic Area (AHA)

Resource consents data has not coded any non-compliances with the relevant rules for this area in the period 2004-2014.

In the Operative BPDP, 112 items are located in the Akaroa Historic Area (60 Notable and 52 Protected items, that is 37% of the 300 items in the Operative BPDP).

A total of 98 of the proposed heritage listings (heritage items) across the district through the DPR, would be located in the area that is currently covered by the AHA (This is based on those proposed listings which are within and/or overlap the AHA).

Comments:

1. While these operative controls are contained in the heritage chapter of the Plan, they are street scene controls. There are no heritage-specific controls for this area.
2. Anecdotal evidence from resource consent planners who have processed Banks Peninsula resource consents since notification of Banks Plan in 1997 confirms that very few consents have ever triggered these rules.
3. There is continued protection for individual heritage items in this area.

### Demolition and Relocation Statistics Prior to the Earthquakes

- a. A total of 23 heritage items were removed from the Operative City Plan in the period from notification of the Plan in 1995 until August 2010. Of these:
- b. A total of 18 were Demolitions: 4 (Group 2), 2 (Group 3), 12 (Group 4)
- c. A total of 5 were Relocations: 1 (Group 3), 4 (Group 4).

### Demolition Statistics Post-Earthquakes (from September 2010 to 10 March 2015)

- Of City Plan items (including Central City), 201 of 588 items have been demolished (34%)
- Of City Plan items in the Central City, 134 of 309 items have been demolished (43%)
- Of City Plan items (excluding Central City), 67 of 279 items have been demolished (24%)
- Of BPDP items (including Lyttelton), 34 of 334 items have been demolished (10%)
- Of BPDP items in Lyttelton, 30 of 126 items have been demolished (24%)
- Of items in the district, a total of 235 of 922 items (City Plan 199 and BPDP 34) have been demolished (25%).

### Comments:

- Approximately 9 heritage items were granted resource consent for demolition and 3 for relocation in the post-earthquakes period.
- All other removals from the schedule were demolitions approved by Civil Defence or CERA.

### Operative Schedules Following the Earthquakes

Following earthquake-related demolitions, the current number of listed heritage items (and some associated settings) in the operative plans is 687 items across the district, of which:

- 175 are located in the Central City: Group 1 - 42 (24%), Group 2 - 50 (28.5%), Group 3 - 50 (28.5%), Group 4 - 33 (19%)
- 212 are located in the city excluding the Central City (387 total in City Plan area): Group 1 - 19 (9%), Group 2 - 34 (16%), Group 3 - 81 (38%), Group 4 - 78 (37%)
- 300 are located in Banks Peninsula: Protected - 114 (38%), Notable - 186 (62%).

### Proposed Listings

- A total of 673 heritage items and associated settings are proposed for listing, of which:
- 184 items are located in the Central City: High Significance - 106 (58%), Significant - 78 (42%)
- 237 are located in the city outside the Central City (421 total City Plan area): High Significance - 86 (36%), Significant - 151 (64%)
- 252 are located in Banks Peninsula: High Significance - 55 (22%), Significant 197 (78%).

### Comment:

1. The difference between the number of operative and proposed listings is due to a range of factors (discussed in the Technical Report - Heritage). In addition, in some cases, items in the operative plans items have been combined to form one new, proposed item, and in others cases, items have been split into more than one item to align with the new threshold for heritage significance.

## APPENDIX 5.2

### Appendix 5.2 - Summary of Historic Heritage Non-regulatory Methods and Proposed Heritage Protection Activity Management Plan under the Local Government Act Appendix

Financial incentives, conservation advice and heritage promotion are non-regulatory methods used widely by the Council's Heritage team to support the District Plan provisions to deliver heritage protection. A Heritage Strategy is currently in development to provide an overarching framework to guide heritage protection work and heritage projects are identified and approved through Council's Long Term Plan.

#### Financial Incentives

##### Heritage Incentive Grants

The Council's Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund has an annual budget of \$763,000 to assist owners of listed heritage items with heritage conservation works. The fund may be allocated to repairs, maintenance, building code compliance upgrade and conservation works up to a total of 50% of the costs.

HIGs have funded works on a range of listed items, including gravestones, bridges, residential dwellings, churches, theatres, community venues and commercial buildings. Grants have ranged from \$1,000 to \$900,000, and can cover a multitude of scopes from repainting or new spouting to temporary stabilisation of fragile, earthquake-damaged buildings to full building code compliance upgrades. Some examples of HIG funding from 2011-2015 include:

- New Regent Street shops – multiple grants to individual units totalling \$245,000 for plasterwork repairs, re-roofing and repainting through to full seismic repairs and upgrades.
- Hagley Oval Umpire's Pavilion – \$7,500 for repainting.
- St John's Church, Little River – \$43,000 to stabilise and weather proof the building while decisions around its earthquake repair are made.
- St Saviour's Chapel – \$143,000 to facilitate the relocation of the building back to Lyttelton and the necessary building code compliance upgrades.
- 98-100 Chester Street East dwellings – \$133,000 to support earthquake repairs, structural upgrades and conservation works.
- Banksia Cottage, Akaroa – \$47,000 to support deferred remedial maintenance, re-roofing, electrical upgrades, repainting and re-piling.
- 290 Riverlaw Terrace: \$3,000 to undertake replacement of damaged ornate plasterwork, new spouting and electrical upgrades.
- 16 Canterbury Street, Lyttelton – The Loons/ Lyttelton Workingmen's Club received \$28,800 for replacement roofing and skylights and to support a replica façade to replace the one damaged beyond repair in the earthquakes.
- 25 Armagh Street – \$104,000 has been allocated to repair, upgrade and restore the remaining timber section of the listed building as part of a new development.

These examples show the broad range of HIG support provided to retain and protect heritage items, and emphasises the scope of the potential application and use of the funds in order to promote retention and ongoing use of heritage buildings.

#### Central City Landmark Heritage Grants

This is an earthquake recovery initiative to support the retention, repair and upgrade of key landmark heritage buildings within the Central City. The Landmark fund recognises the loss of heritage within the Central City, and the importance of proactively seeking opportunities to work in partnership with owners to retain, repair, strengthen and find appropriate uses for those remaining heritage buildings which hold a significant connection to the past. Originally \$2.7 million per year, currently \$1.75 million per year, and the fund supports the retention of heritage buildings that were significantly damaged by the earthquakes and might otherwise be demolished. Council staff have identified a list of key landmark buildings and are in discussion with the owners of these buildings about the potential for retention and grant funding. Grants are allocated to assist with repairs, seismic upgrades and building code compliance upgrades to facilitate ongoing use and appropriate adaptive re-use.

Grants have ranged from \$800,000 up to \$1.7 million:

- Christchurch Club – \$1.7 million
- Former Trinity Congregational Church – \$1 million
- West Avon Apartments – \$800,000
- Victoria Mansions – \$950,000
- Old Stone Building, St Michael's School – \$855,000
- Former Community of the Sacred Name – \$950,000

#### **Historic Places Fund**

A fund of \$750,000 is able to be used for direct purchase of heritage buildings by Council in the event that there are no other appropriate mechanisms to secure retention.

#### **Specialist advice on heritage conservation**

The Council's Heritage team provides advice free of charge to owners of listed heritage items, including Council asset owners, in response to specific requests for assistance, via the grants process, and through discussions prior to lodging resource consent applications. The team provides guidance on resource consent requirements and reviews preliminary plans, and supports owners to explore available options for undertaking works which balance the owners' needs for continued functional use of the building with appropriate conservation methodologies. The team has experience negotiating building code compliance issues with owners and Council Building Control to find less intrusive alternative solutions which are often less expensive than standard solutions for non-heritage buildings, but still meet building code requirements. They are able to draw on their experience of conservation approaches which have worked for buildings of similar construction and to link owners with specialist consultants and trades people.

#### **Heritage Week**

The Council coordinates an annual Heritage Week which celebrates the district's heritage through a wide variety of community events including talks, walks, exhibitions, open days and tours centred around selected historic themes and anniversaries.

#### ***Heritage Protection Activity Management Plan – Long Term Plan 2015-2025 (AMP)***

The following are among the heritage projects which have been included in the proposed AMP under the Council's Long Term Plan 2015-2025 (adopted by Council and due for public consultation in late March 2015). The approach is to identify and assess or update previous assessments and to undertake the preparatory work for listing of these types of heritage in the District Plan.

### Places of significance to Ngāi Tahu

The proposal involves working in partnership with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Papatipu Rūnanga and a multi-disciplinary team to identify and assess places and landscapes of significance to Ngāi Tahu for protection in the District Plan. The work will address the gaps identified in the Banks Peninsula Landscape Study and incorporate the work undertaken for the Banks Peninsula Historical overview.

### Cultural Landscapes

It is proposed to collaboratively identify cultural landscapes, in conjunction with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, Papatipu Rūnanga and stakeholders, and assess landscapes for protection in the District Plan. This involves developing criteria and a methodology and updating the landscape studies for the city and Banks Peninsula, and engagement with affected landowners and communities given the potential scale of the areas involved.

### New Listings

The proposal is a rolling programme of research to fill gaps in the thematic approach for the heritage schedule in the District Plan to achieve a more comprehensive coverage of heritage types supported by a rigorous assessment methodology. This involves research to identify and assess places of potential heritage significance that represent cultural and historic themes and activities of importance to the district and consultation with owners and key stakeholders including Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga and local interest groups. A target has been set to review 30-40 places a year.

### Heritage Areas

It is proposed to complete assessment of heritage areas for the city, Akaroa and Lyttelton and develop planning provisions for protection in the District Plan. This includes updating previous work on Residential Heritage Conservation Areas for Christchurch, the Akaroa Historic Area variation work, which was based on the Akaroa Historical Overview and a Heritage Conservation Areas Study, and taking into account Heritage New Zealand's Lyttelton Historic Area when developing a Lyttelton Heritage Area. This will involve engagement with a significant number of affected landowners and communities.

### Archaeology Post-1900

The proposal is to develop an approach to identify post-1900 archaeological sites for protection in the District Plan. This involves developing a methodology to identify and assess sites, employing an archaeologist to research sites, and widespread landowner consultation.