



RC8033 – LU0160/19
Gina Sweetman
gina.s@sweetmanplanning.co.nz
04 973 3714

21 January 2020

Porirua City Council – City Growth and Partnership
c/- Incite
11 Tory Street
Te Aro
Wellington 6011

Attn: Lindsay Daysh

Dear Lindsay,

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 your application, Council application RC8033, received 17 December 2019 for resource consent in the above regard.

Further information

Following an initial assessment of your application and a site visit, it has been determined that additional information is needed to process your application and proceed with public notification. Would you therefore please forward the following information:

1. The Initial Evaluation Procedure (IEP) and Detailed Seismic Assessment (DSA) (if any) or any other evidence of the seismic rating of the building. The Conservation Plan submitted with the application refers to an IEP prepared by Silvester Clark in August 2013 and the building has a NBS of approximately 16%, while there is also a statement made in the engineering reports that there is a current seismic rating of less than 10% NBS.
2. Confirmation that the BIG reports included:
 - a. an assessment of the likely works required to strengthen the building to achieve an acceptable seismic rating; and
 - b. the need to ensure that the floor levels meet current building code requirements.
3. In respect of the BIG report, a response to:
 - a. The feasibility of the retention and reuse of weatherboards and recycling or retention of the roof framing;
 - b. The need to replace the entire foundation wall; and
 - c. The renovation processes in respect to the critical heritage features that have been identified as being retained.
4. Evidence of the funding sources that have been approached or applied for, either by the Working Party or the Council. This may be included in the Business Case prepared by the TBRA Working Group, but this is not included in the application.
5. An explanation of whether the Council has evaluated the option of selling the site (and building) or building for relocation, and if not, why not? Or if so, why was this option not pursued ahead of demolition.

6. Details of the consultation with Heritage NZ, including any records of meetings, referred to in section 11 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE), and how this consultation has been responded to through the application.
7. Confirmation as to what the recording of the existing building referenced on page 34 of the AEE would cover, and whether this covers both the recording of the physical building and documenting its history.
8. An explanation of why the Council decided not to renew the building wrap protecting the roof (and therefore much of the interior) of the building in March 2017; and why once a decision was made to allow the TBRA Working Group the time to prepare a business case to repair the building, this decision was not reversed.
9. In respect of the Building Intelligence Group (BIG) options report (Report), please confirm:
 - a. Whether the Helfen scope of works included in the Report were independently peer reviewed.
 - b. Whether the Rider Levett Bucknall (RLB) costings included in the Report were independently peer reviewed.
 - c. The amount of replacement that has been allowed for in the Report;
 - d. The reasoning behind allowing “a new steel structure to support the roof and provide adequate bracing” and how this was costed without a design being proposed;
 - e. An explanation of why and for what specific reasons, in the opinion of RLB and BIG, the cost estimate to remediate the building escalated from \$993,000 in 2017/2018 to \$2.13m in 2019.
10. Clarification or confirmation as to the Council’s exact intention in respect to ‘remediating’ the site after demolition and the future use of the site.
11. Please provide an amended assessment of environmental effects to address any matters that may arise out of the preparation of the further information you provide to the Council.

BIG Report Review

Please also find attached a review of the BIG report, prepared by Miyamoto. While there are matters that have been addressed in the further information request, there are also a number of questions regarding the matters considered in the BIG report, which your client may wish to respond to at this point. Please advise if this is the case.

Reasons for request

The reasons for requesting this information are as follows:

1. To better understand the:
 - a. Estimated seismic rating of the building;
 - b. Different options for funding or saving the building investigated by the Council;
 - c. Intended future use of the site, should demolition be approved;
 - d. Response of Heritage NZ and how this has been addressed;
 - e. Offered offset mitigation referred to in the AEE;
 - f. Options for remediation considered in the BIG report and its robustness; and
 - g. The Council’s rationale for not renewing the building wrap protecting the roof and interior.

Pursuant to Section 92A(1) of the RMA, you must within 15 working days of this request, take one of the following options:

- (a) provide the information; or
- (b) tell the consent authority (this Council) in a written notice that you (the applicant or applicant's agent) agree to provide the information; or
- (c) tell the consent authority (this Council) in a written notice that you (the applicant or applicant's agent) refuse to provide the information and to proceed with public notification of the application.

If you advise the Council in a written notice that you intend to provide the information under (b) above, then the Council under Section 92A(2) of the RMA must in a written notice to you, set a reasonable time within which you must provide the information.

If the requested information is provided either within the initial 15 working days or within the longer timeframe specified by the Council then the statutory timeframes for processing this consent will be subject to calculation under Section 88C(2) of the RMA, meaning that the application will be placed on hold from the date of this letter until the date that all of the above requested information is received.

If you require any clarification, please contact Gina Sweetman who is processing this resource consent on behalf of the Porirua City Council at the above number.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Derek Vos', enclosed within a circular scribble.

Derek Vos
Manager, Resource Consents