



10. HERITAGE REINSTATEMENT PROGRAMME – AVEBURY PARK EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Corporate Services, DDI: 941-8528
Officer responsible:	Property Asset Manager
Author:	Rachel Shaw – Heritage Reinstatement Programme Manager

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To seek approval to move forward with the post-earthquake permanent repair at Avebury House (also known as Avebury Park Residence).



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Avebury House is a non-listed but valued Heritage Building located in the midst of Avebury Park, Eveleyn Couzins Avenue, Richmond. Though Avebury House is not currently listed in the City Plan it has been assessed as having metropolitan heritage significance. It sits within the Council’s Restricted Assets portfolio.
3. The building suffered moderate damage in the September earthquake and additional damage was sustained following the 6.3 magnitude earthquake on 22 February.
4. Damage is typical of a weatherboard construction. This included general cracking of plaster to walls and ceilings, damage to foundation walls, movement of building on foundation and the collapse of brick chimneys.
5. The building is insured for \$1,030,397, the total repair budget is \$930,000 designed to 100 percent of code.
6. The total cost exposure for the Council is \$43,174. This sum includes \$600 of repair costs from the 23 December earthquake and \$42,574 to strengthen the building from 34 percent to 100 percent NBS. This shortfall is available from the existing Restricted Assets 2011/12 Capex Budget.
7. The difference between the cost of strengthening to 67 percent and 100 percent is negligible (\$21,294 or approximately 2.3 percent of total budget).

GEOTECH SUMMARY & ENGINEERING ASSESSMENT

8. A geotechnical assessment was completed given the slumping to the south east corner of the building. The geotechnical recommendations have been incorporated into the design and repair solution.
9. The Qualitative Assessment completed in September calculated the building’s strength at 45 percent NBS. The recommended repair solution involves increasing the building’s strength to 100 percent of NBS.

COUNCIL 15. 3. 2012

10 Cont'd

INSURANCE & STRENGTHENING COSTS

10. Tim Stephenson (Loss Adjuster for Cunningham & Lindsey) has provided the following statement:

“Insurers accept the specification and scope (with strengthening to 34%, and without consideration of recent damage) as a fair and accurate reflection of insured damage and can support reinstatement as per the supported specification. The cost of this is presently estimated at \$887,426 however this may fluctuate as repairs progress. We observe that specific sums insured apply in every case”.

11. This results in a shortfall of between \$21,280 and \$42,574 subject to the strengthening solution agreed by the Council.

Proposed Building Strength:	Cost of Strengthening:	Cost Exposure to Council
NBS 100%	\$107,174	-\$42,574
NBS 67%	\$85,894	-\$21,280
NBS 34%	\$64,600	\$0

12. The building has not been insured since 1 July 2011. A further shortfall of \$600 has been calculated following the Q4 23/12/2011 event. It is recommended that this work is carried out during the repair programme.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

13. The total cost exposure to the Council ranges from \$21,880 to \$43,174. This incorporates damage following the 23 December earthquake and the shortfall from strengthening work.
14. It is recommended that existing funding within the Restricted Assets 2011/12 Capex Budget be allocated to cover this shortfall.

Option 1: TO REPAIR TO 100% NBS

Repair Elements:	Insurer to Pay:	Council to Pay:
Repairs to NBS 34%	\$887,426	\$0
Repairs to NBS 100%	\$0	\$42,574
Other Betterment	\$0	\$0
Q4 Repairs	\$0	\$600
TOTAL:	\$887,426	\$43,174

Option 2: TO REPAIR TO 67% NBS

Repair Elements:	Insurer to Pay:	Council to Pay:
Repairs to NBS 34%	\$887,426	\$0
Repairs to NBS 67%	\$0	\$21,280
Other Betterment	\$0	\$0
Q4 Repairs	\$0	\$600
TOTAL:	\$887,426	\$21,880

15. We strongly recommend repairing to 100 percent NBS. This involves removing the plywood and patching the existing damaged areas with either brackline or plaster. There is no negative impact on the existing heritage fabric as this will have been removed in any case.
16. It is estimated that the additional work for achieving 100 percent NBS will add an extra one-week to the project timeline.

10 Cont'd

BENEFIT OF REPAIR

17. The repaired asset will serve as a reminder and evidence of our past history. This includes association with the early development of the area, the youth hostel movement and the gifting of early estates to local government for community use.
18. It will allow continued use of the building as a vital meeting place for community and voluntary sector networks as well as being a local resource centre.
19. It hosts a commercial kitchen which could be widely utilised for functions and other formal events, e.g. weddings.
20. With the loss of Shirley Community Centre, which is close by, this building will become more important in providing a centre for the community groups displaced from there.

RISK OF DOING NOTHING

21. The asset will continue to deteriorate and the risk of vandalism will increase.
22. Displaced community groups will have nowhere to go and communities will continue to struggle to find suitable meeting venues.

HERITAGE SUMMARY

23. The house is of historical and social significance due to its association with the early development of Richmond, and with pioneer Dr Gundry, the original owner of the land, and the Flesher family, who played a significant part in municipal matters and within the local communities of Richmond, Avonside and New Brighton.
24. The house is of cultural significance on account of its present use as a community centre, and on account of it being a landmark in the community consciousness. The setting and grounds of the house have been used as a public park in council ownership for 56 years.
25. Architecturally the house is significant as a good example of the domestic architecture of local architect James Glanville, an architect who designed a number of buildings in Christchurch and Canterbury in the late 19th century and the first decade of the 20th century, few examples of which remain.
26. The house is of some technological and landmark significance, and archaeological significance. The attractive setting of the house is notable in relation to the house on account of its expansive lawn areas, planted borders, and established trees.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with LTCCP budgets?

27. No. The purpose of this report is to gain approval for permanent repair / reinstatement works on heritage buildings as per Council policy.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

28. Not applicable.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

29. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

30. No. The purpose of this report is to gain approval for permanent repair / reinstatement works on heritage buildings as per Council policy.

10 Cont'd

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the LTCCP?

31. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

32. Yes. The purpose of this report supports the facilities rebuild strategy and assists with the rebuild of Christchurch.
33. The repair of Avebury House supports the Strengthening Communities Strategy by providing an opportunity for communities to be involved in the use and management of Council facilities to enhance community connectedness.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

34. Yes, refer above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

35. Not applicable. Communication and consultation will be a project workstream.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

36. It is recommended that the Council:
- (a) Approve the insurance reinstatement / repairs for Avebury House.
 - (b) Approve the cost of \$42,574 for increasing the overall building strength to 100 percent NBS (from the existing Restricted Assets Capex Budget).
 - (c) Approve the betterment cost of \$600 for the repairs to the men's toilets (from the existing Restricted Assets Capex Budget).

Appendix 1: Avebury Park Heritage Assessment

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT LISTED HERITAGE PLACE AVEBURY HOUSE

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.

Avebury House is of historical and social significance as a substantial, early Richmond dwelling built c.1885 for the prominent Flesher family. The house is part of the wider historical landscape in that it is part of the early development of the Avonside and Richmond area, which became popular due to its access to the river, and the proposed canal, which never eventuated.

The property also has some historical significance due to its association with the original owner of the rural section Dr Gundry.

William Flesher took a great interest in, and played an active part in public and church matters, particularly in the Richmond community. His son James Arthur Flesher was also actively involved in public life, and served on numerous municipal and local bodies (including from 1923 to 1925, Mayor of Christchurch) and was a member of a number of organisations concerned with the welfare of the community.

The transfer in 1951 of the property to the Mayor, Councillors, and Citizens of Christchurch for recreational purposes is of historical and social significance as it reflects a phase in town planning when there was a move towards providing for adequate numbers of recreation or neighbourhood parks in residential areas. It also reflects the common occurrence in Christchurch - the purchase by Council of large homesteads with substantial grounds for recreation purposes once they passed out of family ownership due to their becoming beyond most modern families' needs.

The house is of historical and social significance for its connection with the Youth Hostel Association, as the Cora Wilding Youth Hostel for 32 years.

Historical and Social Significance Statement

Avebury House has been assessed as being of high historical and social significance within Christchurch.

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 house and setting reflects the way of life of a large moderately wealthy and socially and politically prominent family from 1885-1945. It also reflects the nature of budget travellers' accommodation in the 1960s – late 1990s. The house is of cultural significance on account of its present use as a Community centre, and as a landmark in the Richmond community consciousness.

Cultural and Spiritual Significance Statement

Avebury House has been assessed as having high cultural and spiritual significance within Christchurch.

ARCHITECTURAL AND AESTHETIC SIGNIFICANCE

Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place;

The house dates from c.1885, with alterations in c.1907 resulting in its present design aesthetic, and is of architectural significance as a rare surviving example of the work of little-known Christchurch architect James Glanville.

The house has undergone a number of alterations which have had some effect on its architectural integrity, namely the glazing of the first floor verandah.

Glanville's designs of note include the Richmond Methodist Church Sunday School (1886), two 2 storey houses in Gloucester Street/Latimer Square (1896) (demolished), a two storey residence on the corner of Papanui Road and Leinster Street (1899) – Leinster House (relocated). He was also responsible for a number of domestic buildings in and around Christchurch. The Latimer Square houses and Leinster House shared characteristics of the c1907 alterations to Avebury House and which were typical of Glanville's work, namely a corner turret and ground and first floor verandahs

Architectural and Aesthetic Significance Statement

Avebury House has been assessed as having moderate architectural and aesthetic significance within Christchurch.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE

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

The technology and craftsmanship in the house is of a good standard typical of its time. Of note is the elegant stairway and balustrade, plaster cornices, ceiling roses, leadlight windows, hall archway and corbels, and timberwork throughout (doors, architraves, timber panelling)

Technological and Craftsmanship Significance Statement

Avebury House has been assessed as having moderate technological and craftsmanship significance, within Christchurch.

CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural) setting, a group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detailing in relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), setting, a group, precinct or streetscape; a physical or visible landmark; a contribution to the character of the environment (constructed and natural) setting, a group, precinct or streetscape.

The house and setting are a landmark in the area, and their physical presence is a strong feature of Eveleyn Couzins Avenue. The first stretch of the Avenue was the former driveway to the house, and this is physically evident in the avenue of trees and wide footpath leading towards the house.

The large house and substantial grounds now in public/ community or educational use are a common feature which characterises Christchurch suburbs – other examples include Mona Vale, Abberley Park, Elmwood Park, Te Koraha and Strowan.

Contextual Significance Statement

Avebury House has been assessed as having moderate contextual significance, within Christchurch.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Archaeological values that demonstrate or are associated with: potential to provide archaeological information through physical evidence; an understanding about social historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values or past events, activities, people or phases?

As an early cottage is believed to have been on site prior to 1885, the foundations of which remain, and the main part of the present house built in 1885, the house and property have potential to hold archaeological evidence of human activity pre-1900.

Archaeological Significance Statement

Avebury House has been assessed as having moderate archaeological significance within Christchurch.

STATEMENT OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

The house is of historical and social significance due to its association with the early development of Richmond, and with pioneer Dr Gundry, the original owner of the land, and the Flesher family, who played a significant part in Municipal matters and within the local communities of Richmond, Avonside and New Brighton. The history of the house is connected with the youth hostel movement, being used as the Cora Wilding Youth Hostel for 32 years. In a wider historical context, the house and grounds illustrate the manner in which large houses and properties outgrow their suitability as family homes and are often gifted to or purchased by local governments or the Crown for community use

The house is of cultural significance on account of its present use as a community centre, and on account of it being a landmark in the community consciousness. The setting and grounds of the house have been used as a public park in council ownership for 56 years. Architecturally the house is significant as a good example of the domestic architecture of local architect James Glanville, an architect who designed a number of buildings in Christchurch and Canterbury in the late 19th century and the first decade of the 20th century, few examples of which remain.

The house is of some technological and landmark significance, and archaeological significance. The attractive setting of the house is notable in relation to the house on account of its expansive lawn areas, planted borders, and established trees.

Avebury House is considered to be of metropolitan heritage significance.

REFERENCES:

CCC Background Information

ASSESSMENT COMPLETED: 13.4.2007 **AUTHOR:** Amanda Ohs