

Attachment 7

Cumulative Effects assessment - Archifact



memorandum

archifact

architecture & conservation



limited

for: bloxam burnett & olliver
from: archifact – architecture & conservation ltd
date: 1 april 2020
re: block plant, temple view, s92 request – heritage cumulative effects

www.archifact.co.nz

64 khyber pass road
grafton
auckland 1023
po box 8334
symonds street
auckland 1150
new zealand
p 09. 966 6940
info@archifact.co.nz

introduction

Hamilton City Council issued a further information request on 11 February 2020 which sought, amongst other things, an assessment of the cumulative effects of the Block Plant proposal. Specifically:

“The assessment should consider the wider historic heritage environment in the Temple View area. Further information should be provided to understand the work undertaken to date, identification of how many buildings have been demolished, modified, or restored, their location, the extent of work undertaken and its impact on the historic landscape”.

cumulative effects

In considering perceived adverse cumulative effects on historic heritage values within the Temple View area (including, but not limited to the former Church College of New Zealand (**CCNZ**) campus at Temple View) contributed to by the proposed demolition of the scheduled Block Plant building, an understanding of that context and receiving environment within which the cumulative effects are associated needs to be clearly understood. That context is, in the first instance, associated with the former CCNZ campus along with the Temple and its grounds collectively referred to as the Temple View area.

In considering that context two other factors are also relevant in assessing perceived cumulative adverse effects within the Temple View area, these are:

1. The original vision the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (**the Church**) brought to this site when, on the 23rd of May 1949, they secured the land at Temple View and constructed a series of buildings focussed on the construction and support of the New Zealand Temple; and,
2. The Envisaging Project, from 2009, through which the Church has aligned with changes in the Operative District Plan and developed through a Comprehensive Development Planning process, which the Church is now well down the path of giving effect to.



The Temple View area has always been and will continue to be closely connected with the activities of the Church and its focus on the Temple being the most sacred building in New Zealand for church members. The Hamilton Temple was the first Temple built outside the United States and was developed in conjunction with the associated community buildings including the establishment of the adjacent CCNZ. It was the vision (indeed a policy) of the early Church leaders to establish CCNZ to provide quality education when this was not widely available in New Zealand. It was likewise the vision of more recent Church leaders to develop the Envisaging Project to set out a clear roadmap of development principles for the site following the closure of CCNZ at the end of 2009, focussing on the presence of the Temple and other key community buildings.

The primary goal of the Envisaging Project is to *“provide long-term protection of the sanctity and environment of the Hamilton New Zealand Temple by re-purposing the former school property in ways that will complement and enhance family life and the economic vitality of the Temple View community”*.¹

That stated goal has driven the work on the Temple View project to date and the focus on family life and economic vitality has driven the planning for the housing areas within the project. The result has been the consented CDP1 and CDP2 developments which are largely underway. The development of housing through the northern and eastern parts of the Temple View project are a natural consequence of that project goal. While the repurposing of church and community facilities is now complete, the housing area is almost ready to commence.

It is that envisaged and consented context within which cumulative effects should be measured. In the context of the former CCNZ campus, the Temple, and the Church's active Envisaging Project the sensitivity to change within the receiving environment has already been conditioned in anticipation of the proposed demolition of the Block Plant. The public benefit from retaining the Block Plant has similarly shifted due to the evolution of the receiving environment already consented.

Cumulative effects are more likely to arise when the receiving environment is more sensitive to change. Part of the environment in which the removal of the Block Plant building must be considered, and against which a sensitivity to change should be measured, includes recognition that the receiving environment, having evolved, has itself substantially shifted the associative values of the Block Plant from where they had been. Accordingly, the particular environment to consider in this case includes both consented developments already given effect to and anticipated (and consented) development which is yet to be given effect. As such, in considering what has already happened and has been authorised, the particular environs of the Block Plant are not sensitive to change.

Equally, consideration of cumulative effects should consider both the adverse and the positive effects arising from that activity; cumulative or otherwise. In this instance the already consented and realised evolution of the former CCNZ campus as part of the 2009 Envisaging Project has seen the conservation and adaptive reuse of the Category B-listed First House, the Mendenhall Library, the GRB building, the Kai Hall, and the comprehensive earthquake strengthening and conservation of the Category A-listed Temple (currently underway). Not only have these activities been tested at various resource consent hearings by independent parties, but the consented works associated with the surviving buildings have resulted in that work being acknowledged and celebrated through the awarding of NZIA Local Branch awards for architecture for the Kai Hall, GRB Building, and the Mendenhall Library. Separately

¹ Paragraph 8.7_evidence of Chris Dawson to the Proposed Hamilton City District Plan hearings, November 2013

each, and collectively all, of those conservation and upgrade works described here are positive cumulative effects which need to be considered in balancing perceived adverse effects in this context.

In addition, the Temple View project has resulted in a significant improvement in the quality of the spaces around and between the upgraded heritage buildings. The GRB and the Kai Hall now sit nestled on the edge of Legacy Park which has been carefully designed to complement each building while recognising the nearby Koromatua Stream and adjacent stands of protected Kahikatea Trees. High quality hard landscaping works and mass native planting add to the surroundings of each building and provide a positive improvement to the site context that each now enjoys.

The First House is now refurbished and utilised as accommodation and its surroundings have been similarly improved through careful landscape planting, fencing and hard landscape works. The Mendenhall building has likewise received a significant improvement in its surroundings, enabling the upgraded building to function effectively as the new heart of the Temple View area.

The following builds upon the aforementioned commentary in more detail. It provides a summary of cumulative effects which have either already arisen, or which have the potential to arise as a result of other consented development within the Temple View area. It identifies how many buildings have been demolished, modified, or restored (i.e. the level of consented development). It then assesses the extent to which the Block Plant demolition will have a cumulative impact on that historic landscape, if at all.

Existing Consented Development	Cumulative Impacts Relevant to Block Plant Proposal (Y/N)	Yes - details of relevant cumulative impacts	No - reasons why not relevant
Large scale earthworks and demolition of redundant CCNZ buildings	Y	Following closure of the College in 2009, all redundant, non-heritage CCNZ buildings have been removed and the site has been cleared in preparation for redevelopment. Removal of the Block Plant is consistent with that pattern and would have a cumulative effect in terms of increasing the brownfield nature of the site. Relative to the overall size of the Temple View area, and the extent of clearance which has already taken place,	

		the cumulative effect is considered less than minor .	
Demolition of David O McKay (Heritage Receptor)	N		Demolition of the David O McKay is a consented development which considered cumulative effects across the Temple view area at the time of its approval. As the David O McKay building no longer exists, the Block Plant proposal can have no cumulative effect on that individual heritage receptor, albeit that there is an acknowledged effect in terms of the demolition of redundant CCNZ buildings (as described above).
Adaptation of Mendenhall library (Heritage Receptor)	N		The Mendenhall library has now been restored and modified into the award-winning Matthew Cowley Pacific Church History Museum. Positive cumulative effects arise from its retention, adaptive reuse, and upgrade. It is not materially affected by the loss of the Block Plant. Owing to the size, appearance and location of the museum, and the lack of any physical or urban connectivity with the Block Plant, there will be no cumulative effects when these heritage receptors are assessed in combination. Consented intervening development will also assist in create urban screening between the Block Plant and the Museum.
Upgrading of First teachers house (Heritage Receptor)	N		This heritage building has been restored. Owing to the size, appearance and location of the First Teachers House and the lack of physical or urban connectivity with the block

			<p>plant there will be no cumulative effect when these heritage receptors are assessed in combination. Whilst the FT House might utilise building materials once made from the Block Plant, there is no visible connectivity between the two structures. Positive cumulative effects arise from the retention, adaptation, and upgrade of the First Teacher House and it is not materially affected by the loss of the Block plant.</p>
<p>Upgrading of Temple (Heritage Receptor)</p>	N		<p>This heritage building is in the process of being restored.</p> <p>Owing to the size, appearance and location of the Temple and the lack of physical or urban connectivity with the Block Plant, there will be no cumulative effect when these heritage receptors are assessed in combination. The Temple is an iconic freestanding structure which does not rely on connectivity (physical or otherwise) with the Block Plant. Positive cumulative effects arise from the retention and upgrade of the Temple and it is not materially affected by the loss of the Block Plant. In time, consented intervening development will create urban screening between the Block Plant and the Temple, thereby ensuring a nil cumulative effect when these heritage receptors are assessed in combination.</p>
<p>Upgrading of Kai Hall</p>	N		<p>This heritage building has been upgraded and restored.</p>

(Heritage Receptor)			Owing to the size, appearance and location of the Kai Hall and the lack of physical or urban connectivity with the Block Plant, there will be no cumulative effect when these heritage receptors are assessed in combination. Positive cumulative effects arise from the retention, adaptation, and upgrade of the Kai Hall and it is not materially affected by the loss of the Block plant. In time, consented intervening development will create urban screening between the Block Plant and the Kai Hall, thereby ensuring a nil cumulative effect when these heritage receptors are assessed in combination.
Upgrading of GRB (Heritage Receptor)	N		This heritage building has been restored. Owing to the size, appearance and location of the GRB Hall and the lack of physical or urban connectivity with the Block Plant, there will be no cumulative effect when these heritage receptors are assessed in combination. Positive cumulative effects arise from the retention, adaptation, and upgrade of the GRB and it is not materially affected by the loss of the Block plant. In time, consented intervening development will create urban screening between the Block Plant and the GRB Hall, thereby ensuring a nil cumulative effect when these heritage receptors are assessed in combination.
Stake Centre Development	N		The Stake Centre is not a heritage receptor but makes a positive

			<p>contribution to the Character Area through its careful design and use of quality building materials.</p> <p>Owing to the size, appearance and location of the Stake Centre and the lack of physical or visual connectivity with the Block Plant, there will be no cumulative effect when these receptors are assessed in combination.</p>
--	--	--	--

The key issue is whether, in the context of the existing and consented environment, the loss of the Block Plant creates a significant adverse cumulative effect in terms of wider remnant heritage values. This is not considered to be the case for the reasons outlined in the table above.

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.