

8123

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

Draft LTCCP 2009-19

- Received via Web

Submissions close on 16 April 2009

I wish to talk to the main points in my written submission at the hearings to be held between Monday 11 May 2009 and Monday 18 May 2009.

Are you completing this submission:	On behalf of a group or organisation
If you are representing, how many people do you represent?	7 + our work with the 150 heritage buildings in the CBD
Name:	Derek Anderson
Organisation Name:	Christchurch Heritage Trust
Organisation Role:	promoting the preservation of heritage buildings at risk
Contact Address:	A7-4/78 Park Tce Christchurch
Postcode:	8013
Daytime Phone:	3653560
Evening Phone:	3653560
Email:	derek.a@xtra.co.nz
Email Address for copy of submission:	derek.a@xtra.co.nz
Date:	14 April 2009
Your Submission:	<p>copies of our previous submissions are attached the content of which is even more relevant today as the Council agreed to action the strategic study outlined yet there has been no work done to impliment the Council decision.</p> <p>Frankly while the Heritage section of the Council do a good job with scarce resources the progress in strategic planning outlined in our earlier submission is grossly inadequate & pedestrian in its progress.</p>

Christchurch Heritage Trust
C/- A74/78 Park Tce
Christchurch

Our Submission

1. That the Council consider making the demolition of all Group and 2 buildings prohibited – the City either means to keep these buildings or not through offering protection under the City Plan – the matter should not be debatable.
2. The heritage research budget should be raised to a sufficient amount (say \$150K over two years) to allow research to be undertaken that will assist in developing a defensible list of those buildings which meet the top priority level and ultimately assist in the development of building condition reports to ensure the viable and financial sustainability of those for the future.
3. Alternatively the Council should consider having only one list of protected buildings, demolition prohibited, which it can financially assist in the asset management of and have a second category in which it has no regulatory function but has an advocacy role to raise the awareness of community heritage value. The proposed funding in year two (p.6 Vol 1) for the maintenance of character group houses could be targeted to assist as a financial incentive funding base for this group.
4. The Council has already undertaken a preliminary exercise to ascertain the priority buildings and their structural condition with respect on the most significant buildings in the City – it is advisable the work on this report continues and is peer reviewed by key stake holders and heritage professionals and considered in line with the comments above.

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

REPORT OF A COUNCIL SEMINAR

Held on Tuesday 21 August 2007 at 11.00 am
in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Christchurch

PRESENT: Councillor Carole Evans (Chairperson), Councillors Sally Buck, David Cox, Anna Crighton, Pat Harrow, Graham Condon, Bob Parker, Bob Shearing and Norm Withers. Community Board Yani Johansen.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Mayor Gary Moore and Councillor Sue Wells

1. EARTHQUAKE PRONE POLICY

Derek Anderson, Chairperson of the Christchurch Heritage Trust was present together with other members of the Trust to explain their submission on the potential impact of the Earthquake Prone Policy on Heritage Buildings in Christchurch.

Their submission was initially presented as part of the Annual Plan submission process, and was held over at the time, for separate consideration by the Council.

The following points were made:

- There is a 65% chance of an earthquake of magnitude 8 striking Christchurch.
- Many current buildings, while strengthened, would still be destroyed in an earthquake.
- It was not only heritage buildings that would collapse.
- The 2004 Building Act required strengthening to one third of code, which would save lives, but in order to protect the heritage fabric of the building, strengthening to two thirds of the code would be required.

Various photographs of buildings that would be lost to earthquake were shown.

Mr Anderson suggested that the main point of today's presentation is to seek Council willingness for better research on this issue to be carried out. Some work in this direction had been carried out by the heritage section of the Council but wider sampling was required.

The Trust itself had engaged John Hare to carry out some research and he would encourage the Council to join with this.

As a means of building owners being able to fund the strengthening required Mr Anderson suggested:

- Earthquake strengthening would amount to around 37% of current building Government valuations.

- There had over recent years been a 50% increase in value of buildings, and building owners had therefore an increase in equity.
- Building owners needed to be written to to get information on their respective buildings, such as rentals, problems, current use etc. The cost of strengthening buildings in Christchurch would be around \$500 million.
- The Government has allocated \$7 million to Universities to carry out research into this matter.
- \$100,000 is available by way of subsidy from the NZHPT.
- The Earthquake Commission should contribute some funds, given the benefits of this.

The questions and comments that followed, points were made in respect of:

- The City Council has adopted an earthquake policy.
- A large portion of Council's Heritage Fund goes into strengthening.
- It is a real issue for the Council.
- The biggest risk is destruction by neglect.
- There is opportunity to seek more research.

CONCLUSION

Mr Anderson concluded the Trust submissions by suggesting :

1. A fund be established of say an initial \$25,000 of which the Trust would contribute \$10,000 into strengthening of the CBD on a precinct by precinct basis.
2. The facts were needed on which to fully evaluate the situation.

It was decided that :

1. The Council would work with the Trust to implement its Earthquake Strengthening Policy.
2. The process for strengthening Christchurch's buildings be established and information on that be referred to the Council.
 - The first step is the collection of data on individual buildings.

After this is carried out, then the various agencies and parties should get together to determine the path forward.

The seminar concluded at 11.47 am.

Christchurch Heritage Trust

Supplementary submission on LTCCP

Recommendations for Council consideration

1. Fund, with some assistance from the Trust further research on the impact of the 2004 Building Act requirements on the private owners of listed heritage buildings including
 - A likely cost of upgrading each building including earthquake strengthening, fire rating, disabled access etc both to 33 & 66%
 - B The total cost as a % of the rating value
 - C An assessment of the owners ability to pay to be prepared by an independent party with the information presented in summary form across a range of properties to protect the confidentiality of the individuals information
 - D The likely disruption time to occupiers, and other relevant information
2. Following the receipt of the above report a think tank committee be set up, comprising Council and private sector staff to analyse the problems and recommend solutions for Council consideration

Derek Anderson

Chairman Christchurch Heritage Trust

21st August 2007

24 February 2006

Christchurch City Council
Box 237
CHRISTCHURCH

**SUBMISSION BY CHRISTCHURCH HERITAGE TRUST ON THE COUNCIL'S
PROPOSED EARTHQUAKE STRENGTHENING POLICY WITH PARTICULAR
REGARD TO HERITAGE BUILDINGS**

The Trust has studied the proposed Council policy for the Building Act 2004 and the regulations promulgated from that, as well as a report commissioned by the Heritage Section of the Council from Homes Consulting covering 372 heritage buildings in Christchurch, and advises as follows:

1. It is acknowledged that the council is required to have a draft policy out for submissions and finalised by May 2006, under the new 2004 Building Act.
2. The Trust is mindful that a large number of the heritage buildings in the city have not been strengthened or, if they have been strengthened, they have not been up to a sufficient level of Code to enable them to withstand a major earthquake not if, but when, it happens in Christchurch.
3. The Homes Consulting Report identifies a possible capital cost over the 372 buildings of \$250 million to upgrade some of the buildings, possibly a third, to two-thirds Code and the balance of two-thirds to one third Code. Further costs have to be added to this estimate to cover change of use matters such as egress, fire protection, disabled access and architectural fees. It would be fair to say that this balance therefore would be nearer \$300 million for that stock of buildings to be upgraded to a point where they could withstand an earthquake of a magnitude envisaged by the Act. Further, if all 372 buildings are strengthened to full Code, then a cost of approximately \$500 million is envisaged to ensure that they withstand a major earthquake, save lives and, as importantly, be in a position that, if damaged they can still be repaired and therefore preserve the heritage. At \$1344m per building this shows the major impact of requirement. Further research as to the govt. valuations of the 372 buildings would further illustrate the impact of the proposals on building owners.
4. It is regrettable that the Council has to wrestle with this problem, which is soon to become the community's problem, without any recognition by Government of the cost of these measures, nor any support suggested by way of tax relief to enable the owners of these properties to, where relevant, write off the cost of repairs as Repairs and Maintenance over, say, five years, which would at least give a tax relief, nor has the Council itself suggested any subsidy towards these costs by way of rate relief, remission from fees, or capital contributions of a scale and keeping with the \$500 million to enable the community to be assisted to bring about the preservation of the 372 listed buildings.

5. The city, without this support, will be faced with a large number of building owners, particularly Group 3 and 4, wishing to demolish their buildings rather than strengthen them. From discussions with various structural engineers, it is apparent that strengthening an unreinforced, mostly brick building to two-thirds Code is a major exercise of major cost, and a disruption to the occupants of the building. Regrettably, those buildings that have been most developed, e.g. put into apartments, have some strengthening and so on, will have to be vacated for up to six months while extensive work is being done, and one wonders whether the expense is worth-while compared with starting again.
6. It may be that this will lead the Council and heritage supporters to list their absolute priorities for buildings to be saved, rather than the extensive list we have, plus the suggestion that character houses also be added to the list.
7. Referring to the specific provisions of the draft policy, the Heritage Trust will support a minimum level of 30 years to achieve these changes, some moderation of the definitions, if possible, for change of use.
8. The major work required for multi-level unreinforced mostly brick buildings, would be less disruptive if the Council allowed, where the heritage fabric is not affected, e.g. on rear boundaries and side boundaries, for the strengthening to be carried on outside the building fabric, perhaps allowing even, in a side street, use of the footpath for footings and so on. This may be new ground for the Council, but if the heritage problem is to be addressed effectively, such concessions from the Council may be necessary to allow this policy to proceed.
9. It is essential that both central and local government, together with the community, work towards a solution to this problem but, frankly, the requirements of the new Building Act as they stand, without any support from either party in Government, is unrealistic in its requirements, and such support to work together to solve this problem should be sought at an early date.

The Christchurch Heritage Trust welcomes an opportunity to discuss this matter further with relevant Council officers.

Derek Anderson
Chairman
Christchurch Heritage Trust