

IN THE MATTER OF the Resource Management
Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF an application by the
Church of Jesus Christ of
Latter-day Saints Trust
Board to demolish the
Block Plant building

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ADAM WILD ON BEHALF OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS
CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS TRUST BOARD**

INTRODUCTION

1. My full name is Adam Wild and I am a director of Archifact – architecture & conservation limited (**Archifact**) an Auckland-based architectural practice specialising in building conservation and heritage management and accredited in accordance with the rules of the New Zealand Institute of Architects (**NZIA**) and the Registered Architects Board (**RAB**). I have been in this position since December 2003.
2. I am a registered architect and Fellow of the NZIA.
3. I hold a Master of Arts degree in Conservation Studies (Historic Buildings) from the Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies at the University of York and a Bachelor of Architecture from the University of Auckland.
4. I was the founding Chairman of the NZIA Heritage Task Group and in 2005 drafted the Institute's first Heritage Policy.

5. I am a full member of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (**ICOMOS**) New Zealand, a member of ICOMOS Pasifika, and an expert member of the International Polar Heritage Committee (a scientific committee of ICOMOS). I am a full member of the New Zealand Conservators of Cultural Materials association, a member of the International Association for Preservation Technology International, and a member of the International Cities, Town Centres and Communities Society. I am a member of Heritage New Zealand (**HNZ**) and have been a committee member of the Auckland Branch Committee of HNZ, serving for a number of years as deputy Chair of the Branch Committee and Chair of the Buildings and Sites sub-committee.
6. I am currently, or have been, conservation architect for a number of nationally and internationally significant building conservation projects. Included amongst these projects is the Treaty House at Waitangi (1834); Hulme Court, Auckland (1843); the Old Government House Precinct, Auckland (1840 and 1856), the City of Auckland's highest ranking historic place; the Heroic Era huts of Scott and Shackleton in the Antarctic; and the former Court House in Apia, Samoa.
7. I have undertaken area studies around New Zealand including in Whangarei, Auckland, Coromandel, Arrowtown, Akaroa, and Wellington which have resulted in new design guidelines for these distinctive historic areas.
8. I have been associated with the School of Architecture at Victoria University, Wellington and with the Department of Architecture at Unitec as an external examiner for their Master of Architecture candidates. Since 2009 I have acted as guest reviewer and as lecturer in a range of architectural conservation subjects including contributions to the History of New Zealand Architecture series at Unitec.
9. In the professional roles I have had and perform today as outlined above, I have acquired a sound working knowledge in the specialist discipline of building conservation, issues relating to the recognition and assessment of cultural heritage values, and methodologies for conserving these in accordance with national legislation and national and international conservation Charters.
10. In October 2012 my practice was first commissioned by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Trust Board (**Trust Board**) to:
 - (a) view the site;

- (b) undertake a series of heritage assessments of individual built elements on the site including both built elements already recognised and others built elements and wider or collective contextual matters which have led to a more complete understanding of the cultural heritage values of the place as found today; and
 - (c) to contribute to the development of the master planning for the former Church College of New Zealand campus (**CCNZ**) based on that informed understanding.
- 11.** As part of giving effect to the masterplan that was prepared by the Trust Board with my input, I gave evidence in April 2017 on the Trust Board's application to Hamilton City Council for a Comprehensive Development Plan consent (**CDP1**) and for the removal of the David O McKay Building (**DOM**).
- 12.** I am currently engaged by the Trust Board, through the main contractor, as conservation architect for the seismic strengthening and modifications to the Category A-listed Temple project.
- 13.** I was engaged by the Trust Board in June 2018 to advise on the proposal to remove the Block Plant building and I contributed to the Assessment of Environmental Effects (**AEE**), along with subsequent advice and reports. I have now been asked to prepare this statement of evidence in order to summarise the key matters of the current application to remove the Block Plant building (the **Application**) relevant to my expertise.
- 14.** This evidence is intended to supplement the information contained in the Application and the AEE.
- 15.** I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 16.** This evidence will address the following matters:
- (a) The historic heritage values (or lack thereof) of the Block Plant building ;

- (b) The protection afforded to the Block Plant building by the Operative (in part) Hamilton City Council District Plan (October 2016) (**ODP**) and the appropriateness of the proposal to demolish the Block Plant building;
- (c) Cumulative effects;
- (d) Consideration of alternatives;
- (e) Comments on submissions;
- (f) Response to the Officer's Report;
- (g) Comments on the draft conditions; and
- (h) Conclusion.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

17. The proposal to demolish the Block Plant building, whilst resulting in an adverse effect on the historic values of the place, will be less than minor. The mitigation offered by the Church is positive, and the removal of the building will enable a more appropriate use of the north and east sections of the Temple View area. While the loss of the Block Plant building is an irreversible effect, its intangible values survive more noticeably through the buildings which were created elsewhere in Temple View and around New Zealand. It is considered that demolition of the Block Plant building will, in balance with the broader public benefits arising from the wider proposed development, be an appropriate development of the site. In my opinion the application to demolish the Block Plant building is appropriate and can be supported.

HISTORIC HERITAGE VALUES OF THE BLOCK PLANT BUILDING

Historic qualities

18. The primary historic value arising from the Block Plant building is the production of concrete blocks used to construct Church buildings around the Temple View campus, New Zealand and the Pacific Rim. The building itself has associative value with this important historic activity as it *enabled* the creation of this building material. However, there is little value in the physical fabric of the building itself, rather its values can be most readily appreciated in the surviving Church buildings which were a product of the

machinery and labour employed within the building. While the loss of the Block Plant building is an irreversible effect, its intangible values survive more noticeably through the other buildings which were created using blocks produced from the building. The surviving Block Plant building is not, in fact the earliest place of manufacture of blocks produced at Temple View and it is not on the site of the earliest block fabrication. The earliest blocks were hand-cast and pressed at a different site. These earliest blocks can still be seen (with their respective bespoke imperfections) in the First House and are differentiated by these qualities from the later machined process blocks produced within the Block Plant building.

19. The Heritage Assessment of the Block Plant building I undertook does not contest the inclusion of the Block Plant building within the ODP, and reaches a similar conclusion about its overall heritage value to that contained in the ODP. However, the findings of my Heritage Assessment do show that perhaps the most significant heritage value of the Block Plant building can be found in the concrete blocks that were produced, enabling the Church to construct numerous significant Church buildings in New Zealand and abroad. These surviving concrete block buildings, most notably the Hamilton Temple building and the Mendenhall Library serve as an enduring reminder of the contribution of the Block Plant building, the machine it once housed, and the activity it represented in the development of the Church in Hamilton and around New Zealand. In total, 26 chapels around New Zealand were constructed using blocks produced by the block making facility at Temple View.
20. Concrete blocks were also shipped overseas to advance Church construction projects in Samoa, Tonga, and Fiji. The values inherent in the physical fabric of the Block Plant building themselves are less than the associative values associated with the building.

PROTECTION GIVEN TO THE BLOCK PLANT BUILDING

21. My evidence in relation to the historic heritage values of the former Block Plant building also considers effects arising from its proposed demolition with respect to those historic heritage values associated with this place and the appropriateness of that activity with respect to the protection afforded to this historic place in the ODP.
22. The Block Plant building is included in *Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, building, and associated sites)* of the ODP as a Category B place (ID# H135) for the following qualities:
 - (a) a - historic qualities;

- (b) b – physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities;
 - (c) c – context of group qualities; and,
 - (d) f – cultural qualities.
- 23.** The ODP does not identify the interiors of the subject buildings in its historic heritage listing or afford them any protection.
- 24.** The purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The HCC has, in the ODP, set out the purpose of meeting Council’s obligation under the RMA to recognise historic heritage, and more particularly “*protect*” recognised historic heritage from “*inappropriate subdivision, use, and development*”, as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.¹ The protection test focusses on the appropriateness of subdivision, use, and development, and implies an expectation for change and not a veto to it. Such an understanding is reflected in the ODP where demolition is not regarded as a prohibited activity, but may necessarily be considered against a high threshold.
- 25.** The RMA test for the ‘protection’ afforded historic heritage is centred around considerations of whether the work proposed is ‘inappropriate’ in accordance with the protection afforded historic heritage at s6(f). Of note the RMA qualifies ‘protection’ as being concerned with “*appropriate subdivision, use, and development*”, so the test for change in a heritage context must be measured against consideration of “*appropriateness*” and importantly the RMA anticipates change where it is “*appropriate*”.
- 26.** In addition to the RMA, the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act (**NZHPTA**) (2014) operates as a parallel legislative regime. Its sole purpose (Part 1 section 3) is to “*promote the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand*”. Notably, neither the Block Plant building nor any other asset across the whole of the former CCNZ campus or the Temple are recognised by HNZPT by virtue of inclusion in the New Zealand Heritage List. It is also acknowledged that part of the wider Temple View site around the Temple, having been associated with human activity before 1900, may be defined, in accordance with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, as an archaeological site.
- 27.** Chapter 19 *Historic Heritage* of the ODP includes in the purpose of this chapter (19.1b) the identification of “*those individual buildings, structures, places and sites that are*

¹ RMA Part 2 Section 6(f)

significant, and therefore warrant recognition and protection". These items are listed in Volume 2, Appendix 8 of the ODP and includes the subject building and site.

28. Chapter 19.2.1 of the ODP includes the Objective of *identifying and protecting* the city's historic heritage. The corresponding Policy at 19.2.1a addresses the protection of the city's historic heritage "... *from the adverse effects of subdivision, use and development*". Significantly, this is not a veto to subdivision, use, or development of the city's historic heritage, but in an RMA s6(f) sense, is about the appropriateness of that activity. Objective 19.2.2 of the ODP is concerned with the "protection" of heritage values. Accordingly, Policy 19.2.2b (concerned with the "*loss of heritage values associated with scheduled items*") needs to be read in the light of the "appropriateness" test.
29. In considering perceived adverse effects on historic heritage values within the Temple View area (including, but not limited to the former CCNZ campus at Temple View and considering potential cumulative effects) contributed to by the proposed demolition of the scheduled Block Plant building, it is important to first understand that context and the receiving environment within which effects are associated. 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.
30. In considering that context two other factors are also relevant in assessing perceived cumulative adverse effects within the Temple View area, these are:
- (a) The original vision 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 CCNZ; and,
 - (b) The Envisaging Project, from 2009, through which the Church has aligned with changes in the ODP and developed through a Comprehensive Development Planning process. The Church is now well down the path of giving effect to its Envisaging Project vision. 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*".²

² Paragraph 8.7, evidence of Chris Dawson to the Proposed Hamilton City District Plan hearings, November 2013

31. That goal in paragraph 30(b) above 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 both underway with most buildings removed and substantial earthworks completed. The development of housing through the northern and eastern parts of the Temple View project are a natural consequence of that project goal.
32. While the repurposing of church and community facilities is now complete, the housing area is about to commence. It is against that anticipated and consented context that 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 building. The public benefit from retaining the Block Plant building has similarly shifted due to the evolution of the receiving environment already consented.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ON THE WIDER HISTORIC HERITAGE ENVIRONMENT

33. The HCC issued a further information request on 11 February 2020 which sought, amongst other things, an assessment of the cumulative effects arising from the Block Plant building proposal. Specifically, the HCC sought information on the following:

"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".

34. Cumulative effects are more likely to arise when the receiving environment is more sensitive to change. As indicated above, 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 has itself substantially shifted the associative values of the Block Plant building 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 to. As such, in considering what has already happened and has been authorised, the particular environs of the Block Plant building are not sensitive to change.

35. 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 GR Biesinger Hall, 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 Waikato Branch awards for architecture for the Kai Hall, GR Biesinger Hall, and the Mendenhall Library. Separately each, and collectively all, of those conservation and upgrade works described here have generated positive cumulative effects which need to be considered in balancing any perceived adverse effects in this context.
36. The key issue is whether, in the context of the existing and consented environment, the loss of the Block Plant building 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 above. The conservation and adaptive reuse of five 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.

ALTERNATIVES TO DEMOLITION

37. An exploration of conservation through adaptive reuse of the existing heritage-listed Block Plant building at Temple View resulted in a number of options being considered and of those options three have been considered in detail. These options are:
- (a) Residential (apartments);
 - (b) Commercial (offices); and
 - (c) Place of assembly (gymnasium/mens' shed).
38. In order to consider these options reasonably, each option was considered through building conservation, architectural, and structural lenses and with likely costs and economic feasibility estimated.

39. It was recognised that the extent of interior and exterior reordering required to enable the adaptive reuse options requires significant additional interventions and that these interventions in turn would result in further architectural and structural considerations. In terms of effects on historic heritage values, these interventions result in additional adverse effects to the original fabric and historic integrity of the building as a whole as it is recognised in the ODP.

Residential option

40. This option adapts the existing building to residential use through the creation of six apartments within the existing building shell. While this adaptation aligns with the anticipated surrounding residential activity and its emerging residential context, it presents a different residential typology (from the anticipated scale of single house to a multi-unit apartment building); a typology not found elsewhere in this part of the Temple View project.
41. The proposed residential adaptation results in a high level of modification of the exterior and interior fabric (helpfully illustrated in the Beca sketch drawings SE-K001 and SE-K002) in order to provide the necessary level of amenity anticipated by this type of occupation. This is driven particularly by the required subdivision of the building and the provision of fenestration to all elevations, where all but the southern elevation would be modified. Existing historic changes to the eastern elevation (for example) would be further modified leaving even less detail from the original design evident. These changes would result in a quantitative and qualitative loss of value to the physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities recognised in the ODP listing.
42. In order to provide useable open plan floor plates appropriate to this activity the degree of architectural modification of the existing interior planning will result in the loss of existing interior (albeit not protected) fabric and modifications to the protected external historic heritage building envelope. Equally, the proposed adaptive reuse of the Block Plant building for residential activity will require a high level of modification in order to provide the level of interior amenity required by the Building Act by this occupation and anticipated in the Telfer Young *Market Valuation*³ report analysis.
43. The structural strengthening identified in the Beca report and the subsequent review of the proposed architectural adaptive reuse option for residential activity prepared by

³ Telfer Young Market Valuation, 465 Tuhikaramea Road, Temple View, Hamilton City, 29 April 2020.

Walker Community Architects identifies a number of further interventions that target 67% and 100%NBS options.

44. As the Beca Seismic Assessment of the Block Plant building report recognises in considering this adaptation: *“if a change of use to residential was proposed, then commercial drivers may dictate a performance of 100%NBS be achieved”*. 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 building was recognised in the ODP.
45. These modifications introduce a significant level of alteration to the east elevation⁴ with a high degree of modification of the original and existing building 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.

Commercial option

46. Adaptive reuse of the former Block Plant building for commercial activities is outside the consented Comprehensive Development Plan Area 2 activities and is also physically disconnected from the already consented⁵ retail area adjacent to Tuhikaramea Road consented as part of CDP1.
47. In order to provide useable open plan floor plates appropriate to the office use, the degree of architectural modification of the existing interior will result in the loss of existing interior (albeit not protected) fabric along with significant modifications to the protected external building envelope. This is helpfully illustrated in the Beca sketch drawings SE-K003 and SE-K004 which illustrate the existing walls that will need to be demolished (this also extends to existing floors and footings) which results in a quantitative removal of more than 50% of these elements.

⁴ Walker Architects Option 2 – Apartments, Elevations Drawing A06.

⁵ The CDP1 consent (HCC reference 10.2016.00009082.001) has authorised 500 m² of retail activity on part of the site adjacent to Tuhikaramea Road.

48. Equally, the proposed adaptive reuse of the Block Plant building for commercial activity will require a high level of modification in order to provide the requisite level of interior amenity anticipated by this occupation. Of particular note this modification introduces a significant level of alteration to the east elevation⁶ and includes a high degree of modification of the original and existing building fabric in order to provide commercial glazing. This degree of change is also evident to the western and northern elevations, while the southern elevation remains relatively intact.
49. The structural strengthening identified in the Beca report and the subsequent review of the proposed architectural adaptive reuse option for commercial activity prepared by Walker Group Architects identifies a number of further interventions that target 67% and 100%NBS options. 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 also 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 building was recognised in the ODP.

Place of assembly option

50. Finally, a request for further alternative adaptive reuse models associated with *Places of Assembly*⁷ as defined in the Operative Hamilton City District Plan was subsequently made by HCC in its initial s 42A report, and explored by the Church. Accordingly, I prepared a Memorandum which explored the implications of these further adaptive reuse options through an historic heritage effects lens and focussed on two proposed adaptations considered as a conjoined facility offering a combination of a gymnasium and 'men's shed'. I summarise the findings of that Memorandum below.
51. As identified above, any option for the adaptive reuse of the existing Block Plant building brings with it requirements under the Building Act that require degrees of intervention to the existing built heritage fabric that risk lessening the values for which the building was first entered on the HCC ODP schedule of heritage items.

⁶ Walkers Option 1 – Office Complex Elevation Drawing A06.

⁷ Places of Assembly: means land or buildings which are used principally for the public or private assembly of persons for cultural, entertainment, recreation, leisure, education or similar purposes. They include conference centres, seminar rooms, gymnasiums, public halls, theatres and cinemas, display galleries and museums.

52. The inherent qualities of the Block Plant building lend itself to smaller and less flexible space unless significant intervention is undertaken. Provision of additional windows results in loss of original fabric on the western elevation, while the amount of glazing to the proposed men's shed area seems almost under-developed as work in this area will necessarily require a high degree of daylighting and task lighting to the point that even more intervention to the elevations and / or roof might be anticipated.
53. From a heritage effects perspective, any adaption of the existing building is more particularly concerned with changes made to the existing external building fabric in response to requirements generated from a structural, architectural, and building services perspective. Seismic strengthening, provision of daylight and natural ventilation, and means of escape are all essential drivers required to ensure the viability of any adaptation and each may cause direct and consequential effects on the historic heritage values of the Block Plant building.
54. As to the appropriateness of a Place of Assembly activity in this location, and from a heritage perspective, the already realised central location of existing theatre, galleries, museum, public halls and education facilities found in the Mendenhall Library, the Kai Hall, and the GR Biesinger Hall aligns with both the Church's Envisaging Project for the Temple View Area and with a clear and simple urban design approach to gather places of public assembly in a central hub supported by the provision of adequate car parking and the interconnectedness of each of these facilities. As an outlying Place of Assembly, the adaptive reuse of the Block Plant building risks diluting the clarity of the Envisaging Project's already-realised provision for these facilities for public assembly in existing identified heritage buildings while, at the same time, being a poor 'neighbour' to its emerging and anticipated surrounding residential activity.
55. The Telfer Young *Market Valuation* (7 October 2020) report analysis acknowledges that the suggested repurposing of the Block Plant building in this suggested form would be "*economically unfeasible*" as indicated by the differential between the valuation of some \$2.1M measured against the total development cost of \$4.046M.
56. Notwithstanding that economic differential, from an historic heritage value and effects perspective, the consented surrounding enabling and development works associated with the Comprehensive Development Plan for the area has already shifted the values and significance of the Block Plant building. This is addressed in my memorandum considering the cumulative effects of removing the Block Plant building on the Temple View area, which I have summarised above.

Conclusion on alternatives to demolition

57. From an historic heritage value and effects perspective the consented surrounding enabling and development works associated with the Comprehensive Development Plan for the area has already shifted the values and significance of the Block Plant building. This is addressed in my memorandum considering the cumulative effects of removing the Block Plant building on the Temple View area⁸. The adaptive reuse options discussed above require significant intervention and alteration (resulting in loss) of original Block Plant building fabric and a loss of legibility of the original Block Plant building typology and consequential values as recognised in the ODP.
58. From an historic heritage effects position, I do not consider that any of the adaptive reuse options should be preferred over demolition. In this instance these options are no more appropriate than demolition given the significant further alterations to, and loss of, heritage building fabric would be involved beyond what has already occurred over many years. In my opinion the greater public benefit is linked to the greater Envisaging Project, the acknowledged success of refurbishing other recognised heritage assets within the Envisaging project area, and the consented changes made to the receiving environment within which the Block Plant building can be seen today.

COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS

59. A total of 14 submissions⁹ to the publically notified resource consent application have been received by the HCC; 13 in support of the application, and one in opposition. While none of the submissions received have been provided by recognised experts in historic heritage I have chosen to acknowledge the key submitters who represent the New Zealand Labour Missionary Charitable Trust as those who actually worked on the construction of the Block Plant building and the block making activity, and in the wider Temple View area as their views are important and unique. I also briefly address other submissions in support where they address a common theme, and also address the sole opposing submission with respect to references to effects on historic heritage values. Accordingly, my consideration of submissions follows three distinct heritage themes: the New Zealand Labour Missionary Charitable Trust; adaptive reuse; and cumulative effects on historic heritage.

⁸ Cumulative effects memo (final)_a, 01 April 2020_.

⁹ Submission 14, Kershaw Trust Ltd, was received after submissions closed 03/08/2020.

Submission 7 - the New Zealand Labour Missionary Charitable Trust (including Attachment 8 to the Section 92 – Further Information material in the application bundle)

60. The commitment and dedication of the New Zealand Labour Missionary Charitable Trust is inextricably linked to the establishment of the Temple at Temple View, to the establishment of the former CCNZ and its campus, and to the growth of the Temple View area and community. That association with the Church has remained active and vital as Temple View has evolved.
61. The enduring spirit of the New Zealand Labour Missionary Charitable Trust is highlighted in their commitment to other recognised historic heritage across the former CCNZ campus and in the conservation of the GR Biesinger Hall particularly. The GR Biesinger Hall was one of the more unusual building projects initiated by the CCNZ labour missionaries in an effort to show their appreciation to their construction supervisor, Elder George R Biesinger. The project involved the construction of a hall in his name and began on September 12 1960, during a time when Elder Biesinger had left New Zealand for a short period. In order to surprise Elder Biesinger on his return, the missionaries built the hall in 27 days working only in their spare time from 5am each morning, at noon, and in the evenings between 5pm and 10pm.
62. The submission in support of the application from the New Zealand Labour Missionary Charitable Trust provides a unique and compelling context to the significance (or lack of it) of the Block Plant building to those people most closely associated with it.

Submission 2 (David Walmsley), Submission 3 (John Kendall), and Submission 9 (Walter Philip Hague)

63. Messrs Walmsley, Kendall, and Hague both address the option of adaptive reuse of the Block Plant building and consider its repurposing as both ‘*almost impossible*’¹⁰ and that associated costs “*outweigh any heritage value.*”¹¹ As discussed in paragraphs 38 – 58 above I share their general concerns, and have tested (with others) a range of potential adaptive reuse options including residential, commercial, and places of assembly in detail. The requirements of these options result in necessary and significant alterations to, and consequential loss of, the heritage fabric the Block Plant building in order to

¹⁰ Submission 2, David Walmsley.

¹¹ Submission 9, Walter Philip Hague.

address matters of Building Act compliance. Such loss of fabric risks directly compromising the historic heritage integrity of the Block Plant building.

Submission 13 (Meshweyla Macdonald)

64. Ms Macdonald states that the “*demolition of this building will cause increased adverse cumulative effects on the already decimated Temple View environ*”.¹² While I sense that this reference may address a wider “*environ*” than simply historic heritage, I believe that in considering the perceived cumulative adverse effects on historic heritage arising from the proposal 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 building are not sensitive to change (in accordance with my evidence at paragraphs 32 – 36).

RESPONSE TO OFFICER'S REPORT

65. Ms Gooderham has provided two s42A planning reports: the first report (**the s42A report**) dated 24 September 2020 recommending that resource consent for the demolition be declined (paragraph 135) and a second, “*Supplementary*” s42A Planning Report (**the Supplementary Report**), dated 2 November 2020, recommending that demolition of the Block Plant building be approved (paragraph 80).
66. At paragraph 70 of the s42 Report Ms Gooderham found, as Ms Turvey had, that the application’s exploration of adaptive reuse models of office or residential use was “...*not economically feasible, and that the refurbishment of the building for either of these uses is likely to significantly erode any physical and aesthetic heritage values that the building may hold*”. In response to Ms Gooderham’s indication (at paragraph 81) that “*places of assembly uses for the Block Plant would be reasonable to assess further*” an exploration of such an adaptation was submitted to Council by the applicant on the 9th of October 2020.
67. In her Supplementary Report, Ms Gooderham follows an approach similar to that taken in her original s42A Report and provides a well-balanced consideration of the implications tested by the applicant of an adaptive reuse as ‘places of assembly’ as shown in the hybrid gymnasium / men’s shed model. Ms Gooderham has considered a number of factors (including the context of the historic building and its immediate environment; the

¹² Submission 13, Meshweyla Macdonald.

effect of demolition on the values or attributes of the building that contribute to its historical significance; the structural integrity and condition of the building; and opportunities and constraints associated with potential alternative uses for the building) while acknowledging that the “*primary consideration is the economic implications of undertaking strengthening in conjunction with the cost of establishing an alternative use*”.

68. I agree with Ms Gooderham’s recognition of the “*lack of demand for these additional facilities, given the location of the Mendenhall Building (museum and archive) and the Kai Hall (public hall)*” (also recognised by Ms Turvey at her paragraph 2.1) and the “*general incompatibility of the type of use with the future surrounding consented residential environment*” (paragraph 21).
69. I acknowledge the diligence of Ms Gooderham’s analysis has balanced a number of competing aspects to determine that (as she says at paragraph 78) “... *the re-use of the Block Plant as a gym/men’s shed is economically unfeasible*” and that (at paragraphs 63 and 69) “*exceptional circumstances*” as recognised in the Operative District Plan’s explanatory notes to the relevant Objectives and Policies of the Special Character Zone and the Historic heritage Chapter have been demonstrated and that demolition of the Block Plant Building is an “*acceptable*” response.
70. Ms Turvey’s supplementary evidence attached to Ms Gooderham’s Supplementary Report records (at paragraph 3.1) that “*demolition is a permanent adverse effect for which there is no mitigation*”, yet the Recommended Conditions of Consent – version 2 November 2020 provide at consent conditions 2-6 a series of generally accepted mitigation measures. Equally, also at paragraph 3.1 Ms Turvey says that “*if demolition is the outcome, the heritage values are irretrievably lost*”. From an historic heritage sense this is not so as the measures promoted through conditions of consent 2-6 offer some mitigation of that outcome.

COMMENTS ON DRAFT CONDITIONS

71. The draft Recommended Conditions of Consent, 2 November 2020 included in Ms Gooderham’s Supplementary Report includes at condition 5i-v requirements for a detailed record of the Block Plant Building. In my experience the condition would be better simply aligned with the Heritage New Zealand *Guideline No. 1 Investigation and recording of buildings and standing structures* (Nov 2018) and the Level II recording described therein which states:

Level II

This level is applicable as a minimum for recording of a building or structure of medium archaeological/heritage value. The recording shall include:

- *Measured Drawings of all principal interior and exterior elevations.*
- *Recording of the principal parts of the internal timber frame of the building or structure (as necessary).*
- *Measured drawings of overall building/structure, including where relevant, all floor plans, ceiling plans and roof plans*
- *Subfloor plans, including floor joists, bearers, wall footings or piles.*
- *Plans and sections (as necessary) to record ceiling joists and roof structures.*
- *Cross sections to show interaction of building elements and spaces (as necessary).*
- *Detailed written description of the structural elements.*
- *Detailed written description of the exterior.*
- *Detailed written description of each room.*
- *Detailed written description of the building's/structure's development over time (potentially including a stratigraphic matrix or matrices).*
- *Extensive photography.*
- *Selective sampling of historic fabric.*

72. I believe the reference at *Recommended Conditions of Consent 5v* to the use of “35mm camera lenses” is incorrect, inappropriate, and misinformed in terms of the use of both conventional 35mm film stock and the relevant lenses normally specified for archival recording and architectural photography. Digital photography and digital archiving is now at such a reliable level that the practical application of digital recording is now reasonably anticipated and should be accepted as an appropriate archival recording methodology in this instance. The condition ought not to constrain the use of a particular lens or recording media.

73. I would recommend that condition 5i-v be deleted and that the condition should refer instead to the HNZPT *Guideline* for the methodology to be used. This would also resolve the issue identified above with the current requirement for 35mm camera lenses, as reference to the *Guideline* will enable an appropriate choice of lens best able to capture the nature of individual spaces to be recorded.

CONCLUSION

74. From an historic heritage value and effects perspective, the consented surrounding enabling and development works associated with the Comprehensive Development Plan for the area has already adversely shifted the values and significance of the Block Plant building.
75. There is no cumulative adverse effect on historic heritage values of the surviving 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.
76. From a heritage effects perspective any adaption of the existing building is more particularly concerned with changes made to the existing external building fabric in response to requirements generated from a structural, architectural, and building services perspective. Seismic strengthening, provision of daylight and natural ventilation, and means of escape are all essential drivers required to ensure the viability of any adaptation and each may cause direct and consequential effects on the historic heritage values of the Block Plant building.
77. In this instance, the alternative reuse options put forward by the Applicant are no more appropriate than demolition given the significant further alterations to, and loss of, heritage building fabric would be involved beyond what has already occurred over many years.
78. Adaptive re-use option of a Gymnasium and 'Men's Shed', as initially suggested as a possibility by Ms Turvey and the reporting officer for HCC should not be preferred over the application for demolition in this case. In this instance this option is no more appropriate than demolition given the significant further alterations to and resulting loss of heritage building fabric that would be involved beyond what has already occurred over many years, and the incompatibility of the adaptation and the activities supported in the consented residential context.
79. In my opinion the greater public benefit is linked to the greater Envisaging Project, the acknowledged success of refurbishing other recognised heritage assets within the Envisaging Project area, and the consented changes made to the receiving environment within which the Block Plant building can be seen today. In this particular case, the appropriateness of the proposed demolition of the Block Plant building has been

comprehensively considered through the Application in the round and ultimately it can be concluded that the Application is appropriate.

Adam Wild

9 November 2020