

Waikato Regional Theatre application (010.2018.0010143.001) – outstanding s92 matters / residual issues – May 2019

<p>Heritage (Alexy Simmons)</p>	<p><u>Query 12</u> <i>The Archifact Tabulation of Heritage Significance addresses part of query 1 “provide a heritage significance ranking for the various features and structures”. It does not provide a robust assessment of effects, as requested. The Archifact Tabulation of heritage Significance is a less detailed rewrite/ summary of some of the Salmond Reed Assessment of Heritage Values Report (pages 5 through 11). The Tabulation does not build on the Salmond Reed assessment. It contains a paucity of new values assessment information.</i> <i>The Tabulation does present a separate evaluation of the Hamilton Hotel southeast elevation (on Sapper Moore-Jones Place). Archifact assigned a 'considerable' rating to this part of the structure. Salmond Reed evaluated the entire 1923-29 building envelope as exceptional. There are other differences in significance ratings. For example the under stair toilet (17 in the Archifact Tabulation and Salmond Reed pg 9).</i> <i>The Archifact Tabulation does not contain sufficient information to inform a design decisions relating to conservation of original fabric or inform a Construction Management Plan. I recommend use of the Salmond Reed Assessment in conjunction with the Archifact Tabulation because it provides more detailed information to inform both a Conservation Implementation Plan and/ or a Heritage Construction Management Plan .</i></p> <p><u>Query 13</u> <i>“Please provide further details on how heritage elements will be managed and incorporated into the design of the ground floor frontage.” This question is not answered. The response provided by Mr Wilde suggest that there is no involvement of the heritage architects in the design process. He noted conservation and preservation implementation should be a condition of the consent.</i></p> <p><u>Query 14</u> <i>A conservation plan should have been prepared prior to the design work. (I don’t know if the Salmon Reed Assessment was prepared prior or in conjunction with this work and has informed the design decisions. That assessment is not a conservation plan, but does provide some guidance by rating the significance of the parts of the hotel complex.) With regard to Mr Wilde’s interpretation of my email to Shannon at Archifact: I did not confirm acceptance of a Heritage Assessment as a replacement for a conservation plan which should have been prepared at the commencement of this project. The email I sent to Shannon at Archifact on 19 February was a summary of the conversation I had with him. (See below)</i> <i>“Shannon, Please find attached the Draft s92 Review Comments you requested. You noted in our conversation today that Archifact proposed preparing a conservation plan at the commencement of their engagement on the project, but this proposal was not accepted. You also expressed the opinion that the Jasmox design had now advanced beyond the stage where a conservation plan would be useful. You observed a Heritage Assessment has not been done. We discussed preparation of a Heritage Assessment that builds on the Salmon Reed Report. The purpose of the Heritage Assessment would be to inform a Conservation Implementation Plan and assist in the mitigation of effects. I noted that Heritage New Zealand were an affected party and the purpose of the review comments was to assist in the preparation of a robust resource consent application”.</i></p> <p><u>Query 15</u> <i>As noted in the email above, a Conservation Plan was proposed, but not accepted at the commencement of the project. Mr Wilde again states the HCC concern about heritage fabric demolition, refurbishment and design be included as a resource consent condition.</i></p> <p><u>Summary Comments</u> <i>Mr Wilde’s comments suggest the preservation of significant heritage building fabric is being given minimal attention as part of the preliminary design work. As he correctly noted, a Conservation Plan for a significant heritage structure like the Hamilton Hotel is prepared in advance of new building design work to guide designers. Shannon (Archifact) expressed the opinion that the Jasmox design had now advanced beyond the stage where a conservation plan would be useful.</i> <u>Tattico Amended AEE April 2019</u> <i>I read the specific sections of the man body of the current AEE that related to heritage (6.2 and 6.3). I found few changes have been made in the sub-sections relating to Historic Architecture or Archaeology. When I compared the AEE with the Schedule of Responses I was also puzzled by the AEE text.</i> <i>Sub-section 6.2 doesn't seem to take into account the new Artifact Addendum: Tabulation of Heritage Significance or the much more detailed Salmond Reed Assessment of Heritage Values Report (2018). For example: 6.2 AEE Page 34 1st paragraph “The proposed demolition of these structures will have little impact on the heritage value of the former hotel building. The proposed redevelopment of the site will help emphasize the heritage features of the former hotel building. Parts of the hotel building will need to be altered to allow for the new additions, however alterations to the hotel building are limited to works that will enable construction and does not require substantial modification to the hotel building.”</i> <i>page 35 Summary “Overall, the proposed demolition works to be undertaken are considered to have minimal impact on the heritage values of the site.”</i> <i>The statement contradicts the recent Archifact Addendum: Tabulation of Heritage Significance. The Archifact Addendum identification several building segments and spaces that will be demolished as having considerable and moderate significance, e.g. part of item 06 [considerable value], all of item 08 [moderate value], 17 under stairs toilet [considerable / moderate value], 18 Queen Suite [exceptional value]. The Salmond Reed values assessment includes higher values for the southern elevation exterior and under stairs toilet and provides more detail about the interior.</i> <i>There was no reference in the parts of the AEE I read to a Heritage Construction Management Plan or a Conservation Implementation Plan to mitigate effects to heritage fabric.</i></p>
<p>Transport (Alastair Black)</p>	<p><i>As requested, we have reviewed the additional information provided by FLOW in response to HCC’s s92 request for further information. In general, there appears to be sufficient information for us to carry out a review of the transport effects.</i> <i>One area of difference is the approach to traffic management – we favour a more conservative approach with a scale of mitigation given the safer risks with high number of pedestrians combined with drop-off and pickups. For example, we favour something like this (which is similar to the framework applied to Claudelands Arena):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0-??? people = no traffic management - ??? to ??? people = some traffic management, e.g. temporary warning signs, etc - ??? to 1,300 people = some temp traffic management before the show and road closure at end of show <p><i>The extent and timing of works within Sapper Moore-Jones Place is still unclear, for example I don’t think we have any drawings requested in Item 42. My understanding is that this project was only going to be doing the regrading etc necessary to enable trucks to use the service area, with the pedestrian and amenity improvements at some later unknown date. The response to Item 23 and 24 implies Sapper Moore-Jones Place will be a shared space. What do you understand the scope of work in this area to be? This needs to be confirmed so that the effects of truck manoeuvring on pedestrians are understood.</i></p>
<p>Archaeology (Alexy Simmons)</p>	<p>None – just recommends progressing HNZ authority application process in parallel</p>
<p>Trees (Grant Sirl)</p>	<p><i>No further details or an explanation on the potential effects pertaining specifically to the proposed construction of a deck and screen respectively around the two (2) trees to be retained, being a Norfolk Island pine # 16.1 and Bunya pine # 16.3 has been provided.</i> <i>Reference has been made to pruning the respective trees to accommodate the aforementioned structures and noting such work is unlikely to adversely affect either tree. That said modifying the crown structure of a scheduled tree will have obvious influences on the form/balance of a crown shape, hence the latter being an assessment criteria when evaluating scheduled trees. Subsequently such treatment of a scheduled tree could be detrimental to the visual amenity of that tree,</i> <i>Furthermore, and being of most concern is the potential effects on the long-term health and vitality of each subject tree as a consequence of a screen being placed on the eastern side of the tree canopy of the respective trees. The radiation of the screen from natural sun light and continuous illumination needs to be considered and the section 92 request specifically requested the applicant provide comment on this matter.</i> <i>Secondly no comment has been provided on the ‘de-watering’ of the site to enable site excavation work and the potential effects on the two subject trees proposed to be retained.</i> <i>It would also be of assistance to clearly define the potential effects on the scheduled trees that are to be retained and with reference to the Arborlab report page 6 point 6.5 if the closest edge of the foundations is the proposed palisade wall construction ?, proposed to be only 7.5m from the Bunya pine and 9.3m from the Norfolk Island pine. (measurement from tree trunk base nearest alignment of works or trunk centre ???).</i> <i>Based on the tree dimensions provided in the Arborlab report (trunk girth) the tree protection zone around the Norfolk Island pine (#16.1) would be 12m and Bunya pine (#16.2) 16m respectively. I stand to be corrected if the latter calculations are not correct but if so the proposed encroachment into the deemed tree protection zone is invasive and has the potential to have a long-term adverse effect on the health, vitality and potentially stability of the respective trees.</i></p>

	<p><i>It is the potential cumulative effects of the proposed site works in the first instance and construction work thereafter, including the placement of permeant structures near and around the scheduled trees that has to be given the greatest weight when assessing effects and, in my opinion, in this instance this level of detail has not been provided.</i></p> <p><i>The protection of the subject trees should not, in my opinion, be purely based on a condition of consent pertaining to a 'tree protection methodology' and/or 'tree management plan'.</i></p> <p><i>A matter for clarification. The amended AEE, section 6.4.1 – Tree Removal refers to three trees to be removed numbered 16.1, 16.3 & 16.5. (#16.1 – Norfolk Island pine & #16.3 – Bunya pine have been noted in other correspondence as being retained). The applicant should in the first instance confirm those trees proposed to be removed.</i></p>
Geotech (John Brzeski)	<p><i>Overall, the report by CMW is good and demonstrates that the site is suitable for the construction of the theatre taking the risk of geohazards affecting the development into account. However, there are a number of additional points I would like CMW to consider:</i></p> <p><i>1. Please consider effect the proposed development will have on the neighbouring properties:</i></p> <p><i>a. The AEE suggests that dewatering will be required during construction. Have the effects of this on the neighbouring properties been considered? Are any drawdown settlements expected?</i></p> <p><i>b. Please consider the cut and fill to be undertaken as part of the project. Are these being undertaken close enough to a boundary so as to impact on a neighbouring property?</i></p> <p><i>2. Please confirm what works, if any, are to be undertaken within the Gully Hazard Zone and consider the effects of the proposal on the gully during construction and once the theatre is completed</i></p> <p><i>3. Please consider the screen that is to be constructed on the lower slopes</i></p> <p><i>4. Are any retaining walls planned as part of the earthworks? If so, please consider these in the geotechnical report.</i></p> <p><i>Once we have answers to these queries we can write some conditions.</i></p>
Infrastructure (Martyn Smith)	TBC – engineering designs still to come from applicant
Urban Design (Colin Hattingh)	TBC
Contamination (Carmel Mangan)	None – conditions provided (email 1/5/19)
Noise (Peter McGregor)	None
Planning (Andrew Cumberpatch)	<p><u>Cultural (Queries 4/5)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reliance on Clough Arch Assessment - Cultural values statement to come? <p><u>Overall effects assessment (Query 9)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No response as such to query? No specific section of AEE referred to <p><u>Conditions (Query 11)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needing more refinement and certainty - Response implies applying for consents for columns in embankment later on. Would make sense to do all in one go? <p><u>External (Queries 63-65)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No direct response on Embassy or Promenade (how delivered etc.) Need to understand if this is to be wrapped into application - No drawings showing details of these works (cross references to DD Report incorrect) <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any updated architectural plans as a result of DD report?