

18 February 2020



Derek Vos
Manager, Resource Consents
Porirua City Council
PO Box 50218
Porirua 5240

By e-mail derek.vos@poriruacity.govt.nz;
cc: gina.s@sweetmanplanning.co.nz

Dear Derek

RC8033 – LU0160/19 - 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 in relation to the above application for resource consent. In relation to the matters raised the following is our response which has been informed by answers from The Building Intelligence Group, Silvester Clark, Rider Levett Bucknall and Porirua City Council Property.

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.

Response: Silvester Clark state:-

We have reviewed and could not find the reference to “less than 10%” in the documentation.

It must be noted that our IEP assessment dated 24 May 2013 does not take into account the poor condition of the building. Unfortunately this is not spelled out explicitly in words on the IEP and this may have led to the confusion.

We have not assessed the %NBS seismic capacity of the building in its deteriorated state, but we would expect the capacity to be less than the results of the 24 May 2013 IEP, as many water damaged components are parts of the lateral load resisting structure of the building.

Our understanding was that the 2013 IEP assessment was done for internal use by Porirua City Council only, to help PCC understand what the seismic performance of the building would be, in the event that all of the weather and water damage was repaired. This was done to assist PCC in assessing the full cost of returning the building to service, which would include seismic strengthening work in addition to repairing the weather damage.

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.

Response a: A summary of the scope of works that are likely to be required to bring the building to an acceptable standard are listed in RLB report Appendix 3. No further design process has been completed to specifically look at the works to achieve an acceptable seismic rating.

Response b: TBIG state that they are unsure what this is in relation to.

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.

Response a: A feasibility study into reuse or recycle of timber elements has not been completed to date. Council is open to the principle that feasible reuse of parts of the building could occur.

Response b: No structural design has been completed to confirm the requirement of the entire foundation wall. This is the initial opinion of the technical consultants that reviewed the condition of the building.

Response c: The RLB Estimate 5076-1 15.02.19 was based on the Helfen High Level scope of works report 16.01.2019.

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.

Response: As Appendix A to the Council report on 28 May 2018 the TBRA Working Group Business Case dated 28 September 2017 was attached. This is further attached as requested and summarises the efforts the Working Group had gone to secure funding. Also, as Appendix B to the same Council report is a letter to the TBRA dated 7 November 2017 from the Chief Executive of Porirua City Council outlining concerns that there was with the Business Case around methods to source additional funding.

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.

Response: PCC has not evaluated the option of selling the site or the building. The site is gazetted as a Reserve for Local Purpose (Community Buildings) and is held as part of the wider reserve that includes the other community buildings in this location. Council has also not considered selling the building for relocation due to its structural condition and in any event resource consent for relocation would still be required. To my knowledge there have been no approaches to Council that have offered to relocate the building nor has there been any active consideration by Council of a relocation option.

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.

Response: As stated in the Assessment of Environmental Effects two more recent meetings were held with Heritage NZ. While no formal meeting minutes were taken the first on 30 October 2018 was to inform Heritage NZ of the recent history of the Marines Hall including the May 2018 Council resolutions that agreed to proceed with preparation of a resource consent to demolish the building. We were also able to give Heritage NZ a final copy of the 2016 Conservation Plan.

The second meeting on 18 June 2019 was to further discuss the application including the up to date condition and costings reports co-ordinated through the BIG overarching report. The application was prepared knowing that there has been active consideration of options for building retention.

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.

Response: As would normally be the case for an application involving the removal of a heritage building recording the history and condition of the building is required. The base documents for this are the Conservation Plan and the most recent building condition surveys but would be further enhanced by community consultation as offered by the condition offered by Council (s7.5 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects).

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.

Response: Councils property manager has advised that the reason that the building roof covering wrap was removed is that it had become a Health and Safety issue. The wrap had become dangerous due to being vandalised and ripped and this allowed the wind to get in under the wrap. This ripped the wrapping and also pulled off the timber and fixings, which were badly rotten causing damage to the existing structure.

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.

Response a: Helfens scope of works was not peer reviewed.

Response b: RLB’s costings were not peer reviewed.

Response c: Refer to Appendix 3 of Helfen Report which states percentage of replacement for building elements (pg 71 of full PDF report).

Response d: RLB use rates based on historical costs to provide a budget estimate for this work. In this case RLB determined the approximate kg/m² required to support the roof. A market rate was applied to supply and install the steel, then converted to a rate per m² of roof area. It is a practice that RLB use when design information is not provided.

Response e: RLB have previously provided 3799-1 was dated 25 October 2012 \$700,000. This was based on a Silvester Clark Report at that time. The escalation in cost could be attributed to the building deteriorating further over time. Therefore, more of the structure would need to be replaced. The \$993,000 estimate was is from another Quantity Surveyor. It is not possible to assume all the differing assumptions and rates between the estimates.

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.

Response: The current plan once the building was removed is to reinstate the area in grass. However Council is open to other options to consider the future use of the area and the process for this is outlined in part 7.5 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects.

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.

Response: It is not considered necessary to amend the Assessment of Environmental Effects. It is suggested that the s92 request and this response be included in the material to be included through the public notification.

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.

Response: It is not considered that the above answers adequately respond to any significant matters raised in the Miyamoto report.

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

Yours sincerely



Lindsay Daysh
Director
lindsay@incite.co.nz
027 502 0779