

5 March 2020

Gina Sweetman  
Consultant Planner  
Porirua City Council  
PO Box 50218  
Porirua 5240



By e-mail [gina.s@sweetmanplanning.co.nz](mailto:gina.s@sweetmanplanning.co.nz)  
cc: [derek.vos@porirua.govt.nz](mailto:derek.vos@porirua.govt.nz)

Dear Gina

**RC8033 – LU0160/19 – FURTHER RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION RELATING TO AN APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT TO DEMOLISH THE FORMER US MARINES HALL, A GROUP B LISTED BUILDING UNDER THE DISTRICT PLAN, LOCATED AT 20 WHITEHOUSE ROAD, TITAHI BAY**

I refer to the request for further information dated 21 January 2020 and to my response dated 18 February 2020 in relation to the above application for resource consent. By e-mail on 25 February 2020 you have sought further clarification on certain matters and I provide a response to each of these in turn.

**Item 1:**

*Can you please confirm whether the Council has undertaken a DSA (Detailed Seismic Assessment) for the building or not? We note that the reference to seismic rating being the less than 10% NBS (New Building Standard) is contained in Appendix D (p78) of the Ordinary Council Meeting Agenda dated 23 May 2018 that the current seismic rating for the building is less than 10%NBS. In respect to the IEP (Initial Evaluation Procedure), given it was released to the authors of the Conservation Plan and used as part of their assessment, which is now part of this application, it would be useful to see it, especially if this is all that PCC has in the way of an assessment of %NBS for the building in the absence of a DSA.*

**Response**

A DSA has not been completed for the building as far as we know. An IEP was completed by Silvester Clark in 2013, this was done based on the damage being repaired and the building being in good condition. Therefore, it does not reflect the current condition of the structure. Please find attached the IEP from 2013.

**Item 2b:**

*This item was requested as any strengthening work would also need to comply with the Building Act, and in this regard, the query is whether the floor levels would meet building code requirement or whether additional cost would be incurred.*

**Response**

Based on the Helfen Ltd scope of works provided to address the observed issues with the current condition of Marines Hall, I am advised that any issues with floor levels at the property would be addressed. The scope of works allows a significant amount of timber framing to be replaced, including replacement of 60% exterior wall framing, 30% of flooring (likely to be flooring on the perimeter of the floor). I am also advised that the scope and replacement will be sufficient to deal with any floor level issues (although none were explicitly observed during the investigation).

**Item 4**

*In respect of the TBRA Working Group Business Case - while it was listed as Attachment One (not Appendix A as described here) on p83 of the Ordinary Council Meeting Agenda dated 23 May 2018 in Appendix D of the application - none of the attachments listed on this page were included in*

*Appendix D of the application. Thank you for providing them now. In respect of the funding options, can you advise if Lotteries was approached as a funding option?*

## **Response**

I am advised that Porirua City Council has not sought any Lotteries or any other sources of funding. The Council reports included in the application stated that all grants sought were from the Working Group.

## **Item 6**

*Engagement with Heritage New Zealand – do you have minutes of the second meeting with HNZ, or a record of their response to that meeting and the response the applicant has taken to the matters engaged on?*

No formal meeting minutes were taken. My notes were that there was no undertaking by Heritage NZ as to any position it may take on the application once it was notified. There was general discussion as to heritage mitigation including the matters to be covered in the offered condition relating to the process as outlined in part 7.5 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects.

## **Item 7**

*Can you please confirm whether there be a full physical record made of the building prior to its demolition. If it is unclear what is meant by a physical record, Ms Stevens can provide some further information regarding how such a recording might be carried out.*

Further to our e-mail discussion Porirua City Council would be agreeable to accepting a condition suggested by Ms Stevens along the lines of the following:-

*Prior to demolition the applicant will prepare a record of the building. This shall include:-*

- *Address or location of place*
- *The name and contact details of who prepared the report*
- *A short written description of the place (which can be taken from existing documents)*
- *A statement of significance of the place (which can be taken from existing documents)*
- *A written description of the reasons for undertaking the recording*
- *A description of the recording methodology*
- *Measured floor plans, ceiling plans, roof plans, and external elevations of the building in its current form*
- *Plans and sections (as necessary) to record the building structure and interaction of building elements and spaces (as necessary)*
- *Comprehensive written description of the structural elements*
- *Comprehensive written description of the exterior*
- *Comprehensive written description of each room*
- *Comprehensive written description of the building's /structure's development over time*
- *Comprehensive photography (see note below).*

## **Note**

*As a baseline, a digital SLR with good lenses and a high megapixel count (10+ MP) should be used for recording work so that high quality images are acquired. In addition to this the camera should be set to record using a raw file format which should not be modified (though jpgs can be taken at the same time). All images should have accompanying metadata specifying: photo ID, capture device, converting software, colour space, bit depth, resolution, date of capture, photographer, caption, and any alterations made to the image. A set of scale drawings accurately showing the subject and the location of each image or position and direction of each shooting position to scales suitable to convey the necessary information should accompany the drawings. The raw files are then provided in digital format in conjunction with the documentary record.*

**Item 8**

*Thank you for the information on how the wrap was damaged and removed. Please advise why the wrap was not renewed.*

I am advised that as per the previous response wrap renewal was not carried out as it was due to the timber structure being rotten. The existing wrap had been fixed with timber battens to the structure and with adverse wind weather conditions had ripped this off the top timber. This created a danger to the structure and the public, so was removed. Upon inspection PCC found that a lot of the fixings were not suitable for installing the wrap over the roof, as this would in time cause further structural damage.

I trust that this is sufficient for your purposes and that the application can now proceed to public notification.

Yours sincerely



Lindsay Daysh

**Director**

[lindsay@incite.co.nz](mailto:lindsay@incite.co.nz)

027 502 0779