

**BEFORE THE HAMILTON CITY COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER** of an application pursuant to the Resource Management Act  
1991

**BY** the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints Trust  
Board

**FOR** of an application for resource consent, for proposed  
demolition of the former Temple View Block Plant

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF WENDY TURVEY (HISTORIC HERITAGE)  
ON BEHALF OF HAMILTON CITY COUNCIL**

---

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 My full name is Wendy Turvey.
- 1.2 My qualifications and experience are set out in paragraphs 1-4 of my evidence in chief dated 21 August 2020.
- 1.3 I re-confirm that I have read the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses. My evidence has been prepared in compliance with that code.

### **Scope of Evidence**

- 1.4 This supplementary statement responds to a letter from Bloxham Burnett and Oliver dated 9 October and Attachments from Walker Architects, Beca, CJM Consultants, Telfer Young and Memorandum from Archifact dated 8 October 2020 and letter from BBO dated 9 October 2020 (comments on the Draft Conditions).
- 1.5 My evidence will address the following:
  - a) Impacts of less intense uses on heritage values
  - b) Proposed amendments to consent conditions.

## **2. IMPACTS OF LESS INTENSE USES**

- 2.1 The applicant has undertaken an assessment of a range of additional uses including a gymnasium/men's shed, theatres, cinema, display galleries, public hall and education. I concur with the findings that a theatre/cinema is not an appropriate use in the zone and that the adaptation of the building would negatively impact on its heritage values due to the magnitude of change required. I furthermore concur with the logic that display galleries, museum, public hall and education may not be suitable uses in the zone, require modification to heritage fabric and that these uses are also well accommodated elsewhere on the site (Pacific Church History Museum, GR Biesinger Building and Kai Hall).
- 2.2 As pointed out in the Archifact memorandum of 8 October 2020 the structural analysis undertaken by Beca shows that the building meets minimum standards for occupation in its current form. While the applicant has explored uses for the building, all of the options explored, assume extensive modification to the building fabric with consequential change in use implications. Less economically attractive options where minimal modification is required and where the change in use is driven by the need to retain fabric are less well canvassed. Storage facilities for local community use, storage of maintenance equipment for the site, are probably not an economically

attractive option to the applicant but would require minimal intervention. The Mens' Shed/gymnasium option explored has been examined from the perspective of a high value refit and not from the perspective of minimum fabric intervention.

- 2.3 The scheme proposed is intended to strengthen the building to 67% NBS. Nowhere in the documentation is the statutory Importance Level (IL) of the building noted. The IL will impact on the structural calculations and the NBS percentage ratings for the strengthening options being proposed. Under the existing definitions (given in Clause A3 of the Building Code<sup>1</sup>), I would consider this to be an IL2 building as it is unlikely, if not impossible, to accommodate 300 people in one area at any one time.
- 2.4 The proposed strengthening scheme has not been peer reviewed nor has the initial budget cost estimate.
- 2.5 The per square metre floor area cost of \$4,681.89 is above what I would expect, based on the current standard industry rates and recent research conducted by the University of Auckland and Victoria University of Wellington (Filippova and Noy 2019, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/disa.12360>). Other areas worthy of review by a suitably qualified structural engineer and quantity surveyor include the P&G percentage, the margin percentage, the number of allowances made on a per item basis and the per square metre rates for some trades. Whether a peer review of these aspects is justified is a matter for the Hamilton City Council to determine, with the information available to them.

### **3. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CONSENT CONDITIONS**

- 3.1 As stated in my evidence of 21 August 2020 demolition is a permanent adverse effect for which there is no mitigation. If demolition is the outcome, the heritage values are irretrievably lost. From a heritage perspective I cannot support the demolition of a Category B building.
- 3.2 The applicant has proposed a set of amended conditions (letter dated 9 October 2020), should the application be granted.
- 3.3 The applicant's offered mitigation of a memorial plinth is not adequate mitigation to commemorate a significant heritage site. Although there will not be extensive public views of the proposed interpretation sign on Tuikaramea Road it is still my opinion that a neighbourhood interpretation sign is appropriate considering the significance of the site. My recommendation is that Condition 3 is retained.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/regulation/public/1992/0150/latest/DLM162576.html#DLM4417717>

- 3.4 I accept the applicant's proposed revision of Condition 4.
- 3.5 With respect to Condition 5, I accept the applicant's argument around the lack of flexibility around the retention of a permanent exhibition. A revised condition regarding permanent retention of the building record in the Pacific Church History Museum archive would suffice.
- 3.6 With respect to condition 7 an amended condition retaining "The Bench Press" and "Back Workout" posters, being retained in the Pacific Church History Museum archive is acceptable.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 I therefore confirm the Conclusion contained (paragraphs 56-63) of my evidence dated 21 August 2020.
- 4.2 Should demolition proceed I support the applicant's proposed amendments to conditions with the exception of Condition 3 where I seek the retention of the condition pertaining to interpretative signage in Tuikaramea Road.

**20 October 2020**

**Wendy Turvey**