

18 May 2020

Job No. 140450.64

Lana Gooderham  
Planner  
Hamilton City Council  
Private Bag 3010  
Hamilton 3240

Dear Lana,

### The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (application 010.2019.00010774.001) – Response to request for further information

Thank you for your letter dated 11 February requesting further information in relation to the application to remove the Block plant, a Category B Heritage Building located at Temple View.

I respond below to the questions you have raised as follows:

Question 1 & 2: We have instructed Beca to update their Seismic Assessment report including another site visit (completed in late February 2020) and attach this updated report as Attachment 1. This updated report also includes a cost estimate to bring the building up to 67% of NBS for the office option and 100%NBS for the apartment option.

Question 3: We have undertaken an assessment of alternative uses for the Block Plant building. By way of context, we have not considered retail, community or industrial uses for the Block Plant for the following reasons:

- a) Retail uses: These are already provided for in Temple View through the Temple View masterplan where a retail precinct was consented through the CDP1 consent process (HCC consent 10.2016.00009082.001). This retail precinct consisted of a small (approximately 500 m<sup>2</sup>) Neighbourhood Centre shown as large retail blocks to provide clarity on bulk, location and connectivity while leaving the detailed design to subsequent consent processes. In addition, Plan Change 3 – Temple View, introduced a Community Focal Point into Figure 4-5 Temple View Precinct Plan Areas. The purpose of a Community Focal Point is to ensure the correct linkage is achieved between the consented CDP1, Rule 5.5.11 b) (ii) and the Business Zone 6 rules. In summary, the presence of a Community Focal Point means that the neighbourhood centre in CDP1 is governed by the rules for Business Zone 6 with appropriate guidance on consent status and matters of discretion. The Temple View masterplan provides a comprehensive approach to landuse within the Temple View Zone and focusses retail uses around the Community Focal Point. This will enable a well-designed retail node with good connectivity to both Tuhikaramea Road and the new internal roads along with appropriate buffers to the surrounding residential houses. In my view, retail use in the Block Plant would weaken the already consented retail area adjacent to Tuhikaramea Road in addition to bringing additional traffic and parking demand along with reduced amenity for the future residential houses that will be built around the Block Plant location. For these reasons it was not considered appropriate to investigate retail uses for the Block Plant building.



- b) Community uses: These are already provided for through the refurbishment of a number of other B Ranked heritage buildings in Temple View. Specifically, the GRB building, the Kai Hall and the Mendenhall building have all been upgraded and have been in regular use since mid-2017. The GRB Building and Kai Hall are both available for hire to the community and are often used for weddings, birthdays and other social gatherings. The Mendenhall building now houses the Matthew Cowley Pacific Church History Museum along with the Church Distribution Centre and an area of historical exhibits dedicated to the memory of the former Church College of New Zealand. All of these facilities are available for community use and are located in an area dedicated to church/community uses with easy vehicle connections to Tuhikaramea Road along with ample parking provision. Consideration of community uses for the Block Plant would risk reducing the residential amenity for surrounding houses along with introducing additional traffic, increased parking demand and the prospect of regular evening and weekend uses. In my view there is no need for additional community buildings to be provided within the Temple View Zone as this is already well catered for with existing facilities.
- c) Industrial uses: The Temple View project has carefully developed a masterplan for the site which has provided the overarching guidance for the development of the Stage One works (now completed) which include the refurbished Kai Hall, GRB Building, Stake Centre and the Mendenhall Church History Museum along with the Legacy Park area and the Tuhikaramea Road upgrade. The masterplan also sets out the layout for the residential area which sees approximately 300 house lots being developed around the central and northern parts of the site. The Church has also developed its own Temple View Design Code to guide all future residential development across the Temple View project and ensure a high standard of house and landscaping design.

The Block Plant is located in the middle of the residential part of the site where the layout of the masterplan has been carefully designed to enhance the residential amenity of the area. The refurbishment of the Block Plant for industrial purposes would cut across the residential development aspirations sought by the Church as expressed through the masterplan and Design Code. Generally industrial activities generate a level of effects in terms of noise, traffic movements and intensity of activity that is not compatible with residential activities without significant buffer treatments such as physical distance or screen planting and bunding. The operation of an industrial activity in the middle of the residential area would also bring additional traffic movements into the heart of the area, further eroding the amenity experienced by the residents. It is for these reasons that the option of refurbishing the Block Plant for industrial purposes was not considered.

We have undertaken a further assessment of the options of either converting the Block Plant building to a set of Offices or a set of Residential Apartments. We have prepared a set of relevant and appropriate technical documents which cover the following issues:

- explain the nature of the expected changes arising from each use option (Walker Architects plans),
- the seismic upgrade requirements associated with each option (Beca Consultants),
- the costs associated with further developing each option (CJM Consultants),
- the economic feasibility associated with each option (Telfer Young Valuers); and
- the impacts on the heritage fabric of the Block Plant building arising from each option.

Office use: Walker Community Architects have prepared a plan set in Attachment 2 demonstrating how the Block Plant building could be adapted and refurbished for use as a set of 3 offices between 210 m<sup>2</sup> and 382 m<sup>2</sup> in size. A set of floor plans and elevations have been prepared to show what an office use could look like and what kind of changes would need to be made to the building to facilitate this change. Beca Consultants have undertaken an assessment of the office concept plans and provided some marked up plans



showing what seismic strengthening would be needed to bring the building up to at least 67 %NBS<sup>1</sup> for such a change of use (Attachment 3). Both the Walkers plans and the Beca seismic strengthening concepts have been utilised by CJM Quantity Surveyors to prepare a financial costing of the upgrade works which total \$3,779,803 including GST (Attachment 4). Telfer Young have reviewed all of these documents and prepared an Economic assessment of the proposal (Attachment 5) which concludes that: “Both models show a negative result after allowing for the costs of development to be deducted from the “As Proposed” value. This would clearly show that the repurposing of the former Block Plant as either Office or Residential accommodation is not feasible.<sup>2</sup>” Mr Adam Wild from Archifact has reviewed the documents from Walkers, Beca, CJM and Telfer Young and prepared a memo assessing the heritage impacts of the proposed office alternative use scheme (Attachment 6). Mr Wild concludes his assessment of the office reuse option by stating that: “The extent of invasive strengthening and associated demolition of existing floor slabs and walls clearly shows that quantitatively a significant proportion of these elements would require demolition where required to meet the designed adaptation reconstruction. This action would directly affect the authenticity of the building fabric of the heritage building and the legibility of its heritage building typology, and correspondingly impact the historic heritage values for which the Block Plant was recognised in the ODP.”<sup>3</sup>

Residential use: Walker Community Architects have prepared a plan set in Attachment 2 demonstrating how the Block Plant building could be adapted and refurbished for use as a set of 6 apartments ranging in size between 91 m<sup>2</sup> and 165 m<sup>2</sup>. A set of floor plans and elevations have been prepared which demonstrate what the apartments would look like and what the visual impact of such a change would be on the heritage fabric of the building. Beca Consultants has provided a seismic upgrade review of the apartment plans (Attachment 3) to demonstrate the areas where parts of the structure would need to be removed and/or replaced and strengthened to achieve the recommended seismic strength of 100%NBS<sup>4</sup>. CJM Consultants have carried out a costing exercise on the apartments demonstrating that the proposed works would cost \$4,592,419 including GST to complete (Attachment 4). Telfer Young consultants have reviewed all of the preceding documents and prepared an Economic assessment of the proposal (Attachment 5) which makes the following conclusion: “Both models show a negative result after allowing for the costs of development to be deducted from the “As Proposed” value. This would clearly show that the repurposing of the former Block Plant as either Office or Residential accommodation is not feasible.<sup>5</sup>”

Mr Adam Wild of Archifact has reviewed all of the preceding information and prepared a memo on the impacts of this adaptive reuse (Attachment 6). Mr Wild concludes his assessment of the residential option by stating that: “The extent of invasive strengthening and associated demolition of existing floor slabs and walls clearly shows that quantitatively a significant percentage of these elements would require demolition where required to meet the designed adaptation reconstruction. This action would directly affect the authenticity of the building fabric of the heritage building and correspondingly impact on the historic heritage values for which the Block Plant was recognised in the ODP. These modifications introduce a significant level of alteration to the east elevation<sup>6</sup> with a high degree of modification of the original and existing building

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 4.3 – Recommendations, Beca – Former Block Plant Seismic Assessment report March 2020 in Appendix 1

<sup>2</sup> Pg 56, Telfer Young report, Market Valuation, 465 Tuhikaramea Road, Temple View, Hamilton City 29 April 2020

<sup>3</sup> Pg3, Archifact memo dated 7 May 2020, Block Plant, Temple View, Adaptive reuse options

<sup>4</sup> Section 4.3 – Recommendations, Beca – Former Block Plant Seismic Assessment report March 2020 in Appendix 1

<sup>5</sup> Pg 56, Telfer Young report, Market Valuation, 465 Tuhikaramea Road, Temple View, Hamilton City 29 April 2020

<sup>6</sup> Walker Architects Option 2 – Apartments, Elevations Drawing A06



fabric in order to provide sufficient glazing to allow natural light into each apartment. This is also evident to the western and northern elevations, while the southern elevation remains relatively intact.”<sup>7</sup>

Question 4: Cumulative Effects: Mr Adam Wild from Archifact has prepared a comprehensive memorandum on cumulative effects as associated with the removal of the Block Plant as Attachment 7. Mr Wild concludes that:

“The conservation and adaptive reuse of 5 significant heritage buildings (including the Temple) along with the significant improvements to the urban and environmental context for those buildings means that there have already been substantial positive cumulative effects on heritage values within the Temple View project. Whilst demolition of the Block Plant will have a minor cumulative effect in terms of brownfield development and loss of redundant buildings, this is adequately compensated by the restoration and re-purposing of higher quality heritage buildings elsewhere within the Temple View area. In conclusion, there is no cumulative adverse effect on historic heritage values of the surviving four listed Category B scheduled items or the Category A Temple individually or collectively arising from the proposed demolition of the Block Plant building. Consequently, there are insufficient grounds for refusal based solely upon cumulative impacts upon remnant heritage values.”<sup>8</sup>

Question 5: Our consultation with Heritage NZ has consisted of an initial verbal discussion combined with a brief site visit with Robin Byron in June 2019. Since that initial site visit we have sent Heritage NZ a full copy of the application as lodged with Hamilton City Council along with a copy of this further information response. As soon as we have a response from Heritage NZ we will forward it through to you.

Question 6: Our advice from the client is that there is no underground fuel storage tank associated with the Block Plant and on that basis the first sentence in the AEE under Figure 8.2 Block Plant Generator<sup>9</sup> is incorrect. However, there is likely to be some contamination from above ground storage tanks which were used to fuel the generator along with the general use of fuel and chemicals within the Block Plant over the years. It is for this reason that we have made application within the consent documentation for a Discretionary consent under the NES. We understand that no PSI or DSI reports have been prepared but the Church as applicant are willing to accept appropriate conditions requiring this level of reporting to occur at the correct time during and following the removal of the Block Plant building.

We look forward to seeing this application publicly notified as soon as possible.

---

<sup>7</sup> Pg4, Archifact memo dated 7 May 2020, Block Plant, Temple View, Adaptive reuse options

<sup>8</sup> Archifact memorandum to BBO dated 1 April 2020, pg 7

<sup>9</sup> Assessment of Environmental Effects, Page 30



Please contact me if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely  
Bloxam Burnett & Olliver



Chris Dawson  
Planning Project Manager  
0275 333 899 / 07 834 8521  
cdawson@bbo.co.nz

cc – Adam Aalders, David Heperi, Derek Nolan, Aidan Cameron, Adam Wild, Abdul Saheed, Chris Peel, Aaron Beer, Doug Saunders

K:\140450 Temple View Developments\64 Block Plant Demolition\Correspondence\BBO\003 - BBO to HCC re s92 response (18 May 2020).docx

