

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS
IN CHRISTCHURCH**

TE MAHERE Ā-ROHE I TŪTOHUA MŌ TE TĀONE O ŌTAUTAHĪ

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions on Plan Change 13 (Heritage)
to the Christchurch District Plan

**STATEMENT OF PRIMARY EVIDENCE OF AMANDA EMMA OHS ON BEHALF
OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

HERITAGE

Dated: 28 May 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE	4
CODE OF CONDUCT	4
SCOPE OF EVIDENCE	4
SUBMISSIONS SEEKING TO AMEND THE EXTENT OF HERITAGE ITEMS AND SETTINGS.....	5
SUBMISSIONS SEEKING NEW HERITAGE ITEMS	11
SUBMISSIONS SEEKING REMOVAL OF HERITAGE ITEMS AND SETTINGS FROM THE SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC HERITAGE ITEMS (APPENDIX 9.3.7.2)	20
AMENDMENT OF PROPOSED HERITAGE ITEM – SYDENHAM CEMETERY ...	30
CONCLUSION	31

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. My full name is **Amanda Emma Ohs**. I am a Senior Heritage Advisor.
2. I have prepared this statement of evidence on behalf of the Christchurch City Council (the **Council**) in respect of Plan Change 13 including matters arising from the submissions and further submissions on Plan Change 13 to the Christchurch District Plan (the **District Plan**; **PC13**) My evidence specifically relates to the heritage significance assessments that have been undertaken in response to submissions regarding existing and proposed heritage items.
3. The key points raised in my evidence concern the boundaries of heritage items and settings, the potential for further heritage items to be included in Schedule 9.3.7.2 (the **Schedule**) as a heritage item, and the potential for the de-scheduling of heritage items, that is, the removal of Heritage items from the Schedule.
4. My recommendations in response to submissions, are in summary:
 - (a) I do not support the removal or the expansion sought of the Papanui War Memorial Avenues (Heritage item 1459). I support an amended name for the heritage item which clarifies that the tree avenues, plaques and road reserve are included in the item.
 - (b) I support an amendment of heritage setting 684 (Riccarton Tea House) with revision of what is sought.
 - (c) I support the amendment sought to heritage setting 423 (Dwelling, 27 Glandovey Road).
 - (a) I support changes to the Statement of Significance for 47 Rue Balguerie (Heritage item 1152) but do not support an amendment of the heritage setting.
 - (b) I do not support the scheduling of the 20th Battalion and 20th Regiment War Memorial or 111 Hackthorne Road.
 - (c) I do not support the scheduling of the Former Law Courts, the Barnett Avenue Pensioner flats (demolished), the Upper Riccarton War Memorial (demolished), the Princess Margaret Hospital or the Burnside Stable (Former quarry stables) at this time.

- (d) I support the scheduling of the Teddington (Allandale) Lock up and setting.
- (e) I do not support the removal of 9 Ford Road (1439), 129 High Street (1403), 159 Manchester Street (1402), 35 Rata Street (1433), 25 proposed baches in Taylors Mistake, or all (operative and proposed) scheduled Taylors Mistake baches as sought through submission (#96).
- (f) I do not support the removal of heritage items 463 (Antonio Hall - Former Holy Name Seminary incorporating Baron's Court/Kilmead, Motor House and setting); 602 (Daresbury and setting) from the Schedule.
- (g) I support a reduction of the setting of Daresbury.
- (h) I support a reduction in the extent of heritage item 463 (Former Holy Name Seminary incorporating Baron's Court/Kilmead, Motor House and Setting).
- (i) I support a remapping of the boundary of proposed heritage item Sydenham Cemetery to include the entrance gates and site of the former sexton's dwelling.

INTRODUCTION

5. My full name is **Amanda Emma Ohs** and I am the Senior Heritage Advisor at the Council. I have over 20 years' experience in the field. I hold a BA Honours degree in art and architectural history from the University of Canterbury and Post Graduate qualifications in heritage management.
6. I am experienced in heritage significance and heritage impact assessments in the context of my role at the Council. I have led research and assessment programmes for heritage items and reviewed and developed revised heritage item assessment criteria and methodologies for the District Plan Review in 2015. I provided expert evidence to the Independent Hearings Panel for the Christchurch District Plan Review in 2015, to the Independent Hearings Panel for Plan Change 14 in 2023, and have provided expert heritage evidence at resource consent planning hearings. I am a full member of ICOMOS Aotearoa New Zealand.
7. In preparing this evidence I have:

- (a) Read the submissions relating to my evidence and area of technical expertise.
- (b) Contacted owners of buildings proposed for scheduling by submitters to request relevant information and to seek their views on the potential addition of their property to the Schedule.
- (c) Contacted submitters and owners of buildings subject to de-scheduling submissions (Antonio Hall, Daresbury) to request site visits and further information relevant to their submissions.
- (d) Undertaken research, where necessary regarding proposed new heritage items and changes to settings. For this I have consulted sources including: historic aerals and newspapers; Council heritage files and property records; photographic records, Certificates of Title and Deposit Plans. I undertook site visits to Daresbury and the Former Law Courts and viewed Antonio Hall from the street.
- (e) Reviewed Statements of Significance and heritage aerial maps, where necessary, in response to submissions.
- (f) Reviewed the evidence of:
 - (i) William Fulton;
 - (ii) Stephen Hogg;
 - (iii) Gavin Stanley;
 - (iv) Glenda Dixon
 - (v) Dr Ann McEwan;
 - (vi) and
 - (vii) Suzanne Richmond
- (g) Reviewed the following documents:
 - (i) PC13 Provisions as they relate to heritage items¹;
 - (ii) Section 32 Evaluation of PC13 prepared by the Council, including appendices²;

¹ The proposed provisions including heritage items schedule are attached to Suzanne Richmond's evidence

² [PC13-Section-32-report-for-notification-March-2023.PDF \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

- (iii) Draft Section 42A Report on heritage prepared by the Council, including appendices;

8. I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the Council.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 9. I hold the qualifications of BA with First Class Honours, majoring in Art History from the University of Canterbury, and a Post Graduate Diploma in Cultural Heritage Management from Deakin University, Melbourne.
- 10. I have 24 years' experience in heritage conservation management and research in the Heritage Team at the Council. During this time, I have undertaken many research and significance assessments and led research and assessment update programmes for heritage items. This has included identifying and assessing potential new heritage items. I have also undertaken spatial identification and mapping of heritage items and settings.
- 11. My role includes provision of heritage advice on resource consent applications, which involves assessing impacts of proposed works such as repair, alteration and strengthening works on heritage values and significance of scheduled heritage items and settings.
- 12. I am a member of ICOMOS New Zealand, and DOCOMOMO New Zealand. I am a past co-convenor and current member of the Australia ICOMOS and ICOMOS Aotearoa New Zealand Joint Scientific Committee on Risk Preparedness (ANZCORP).

CODE OF CONDUCT

- 13. While this is a Council hearing, I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (contained in the 2023 Practice Note) and agree to comply with it. Except where I state I rely on the evidence of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my expressed opinions. I confirm that, while I am employed by the Council, the Council has agreed to me providing this evidence in accordance with the Code of Conduct.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 14. My statement of evidence addresses the following matters:

- (a) Submissions seeking amendments to the extent of heritage items and Settings in the Schedule;
- (b) Submissions seeking the inclusion of new heritage items in the Schedule;
- (c) Submissions opposing new heritage items;
- (d) Submissions seeking the removal of Heritage items from the Schedule (de-scheduling).

15. I address each of these points in my evidence below.

SUBMISSIONS SEEKING TO AMEND THE EXTENT OF HERITAGE ITEMS AND SETTINGS

16. A number of submitters have sought to amend the extent of heritage items and settings. Some submitters seek to reduce the area included in the setting for heritage items, as they consider the specific settings as notified in PC13 do not reflect the current situation on the ground due to changes in ownership, use, subdivision or development. In some cases, it is submitted that the whole area of a setting as notified in PC13 does not possess heritage significance to warrant inclusion.

Papanui War Memorial Avenues (Heritage item 1459)

17. A number of submissions have been received on this proposed new 'Highly Significant' heritage item. Some submitters support the scheduling of heritage item 1459 (#206, #765, #1019, #1020, #1021). One submitter opposed the scheduling of the War Memorial Avenues as a heritage item (#1067). Some submitters also express concern that intensification in these streets could impact their heritage value, as well as the health of the trees (#1019, #1020, #1044, #1050). Submission points concerning the heritage and character of the residential properties in some of the streets where heritage item 1459 is located, and which seek heritage area protection for specific streets are outside my area of expertise. Submissions on heritage area protection for specific areas and streets are addressed in the evidence of Ms Glenda Dixon and Dr Ann McEwan. A further submission was made by the Papanui Heritage Group in support of submission #1094 (#709) which sought to amend the Papanui War Memorial Avenues proposed heritage item to include the street, housing, trees and plaques on Windemere Road (Schedule entry and map). Some submitters appear to seek to extend the

area of this heritage item to include the road reserve in specific streets (Windermere Road #709/#1094 Philippa Tucker).

18. The proposed Heritage item is comprised of the avenues of trees and plaques, including the road reserve. Private land and residential properties within the 16 streets do not form part of the Heritage item. The extent of the heritage item is clear in the heritage aerial map for the item attached as **Appendix A**. I recommend that the name of the heritage item in the schedule and the Statement of Significance be amended to 'Papanui War Memorial Avenues - limited to the avenues of trees and plaques, including road reserve', in order to clearly indicate that the road reserve is included as part the heritage item.
19. These 16 streets were established separately to the planting of the war memorial tree avenues. The avenues of trees are spatially integrated with the road reserve - the trees are located on the edges of the road reserve. To reflect this, the road reserve is included as part of the heritage item. This also protects the heritage item from the adverse effects of works on the heritage values. Works in the road reserve that could impact the heritage values of the heritage item are: kerb build outs, new tree plantings, changes in the road design, the addition of street furniture, and earthworks. Potential impacts are: damage to trees' root systems; interruption of views along the avenues, and disruption of the regular spacing and placement of trees in the avenue. Consideration should be given to enable necessary works which do not have potential to impact heritage values of the item through planning provisions. This is addressed in the evidence of Suzanne Richmond.
20. Whilst groups of trees and plaques are not common in the Schedule there are precedents for the inclusion of this type of place as a heritage item – namely the Poplars, Lamp Standards and Setting (Heritage item 643), the Pilgrims Landing Site and Setting (Heritage item 736), and Kingsford Smith Landing Site (Heritage item 632).
21. Submissions #206, #329, #709/#1094 (and FS#99), #1019, #1020, #1021, #1041, #1050) sought heritage protection be extended to include the adjacent dwellings. In my opinion, it is not appropriate or justified to extend the heritage item to include the adjacent dwellings in the 16 streets. Although some dwellings remain which would have existed at the time the war memorial was established, and some houses may be connected with owners or families who had associations with the war and may have contributed

funds towards the memorial, the dwellings do not have an identified direct association with the war memorial or any public commemorative value.

22. Submission #206 (Emma Wheeler) seeks for the plaques, trees and the people using St James Avenue and Windermere Road to be protected by making them 'Category 1' streets. I note that Category 1 is Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Tāonga Act 2014 terminology for historic places and does not relate to District Plan terminology (Highly Significant and Significant). I note that heritage item 1459 is 'Highly Significant' which is the highest status for Heritage items in the Schedule.
23. One submitter, Ms Catherine Elvidge (#1067) seeks that this heritage item is not scheduled. I consider the item is of heritage value to the Christchurch District and has met the requirements of Policy 9.3.2.2.1 (Identification, assessment and scheduling of heritage items). I concur with the Statement of Significance³. The Council has received a number of submissions in support of this new heritage item, and members of the community have shown an active interest in recognising and protecting the memorial trees in recent years.
24. Ms Elvidge requests that the plaques not be included as part of the scheduled heritage item, and notes they are in Council ownership so there is no benefit to scheduling. A number of Council owned properties are scheduled heritage items – and whilst internal management can provide some protection, District Plan scheduling provides visible, formal and public processes to promote appropriate heritage protection.
25. Scheduling the plaques as part of heritage item 1459 will ensure provision of heritage advice into decision making around changes and future planning in the streets in order to ensure retention of heritage values and fabric. I note that scheduling also provides a public acknowledgement and status for heritage places – a statement of what the community values, as well as statutory protection. In my opinion the plaques will benefit from formal protection in the District Plan, as in the past they have been stolen or removed (for example with a change of street light poles) and not always or regularly replaced due to lack of provision for their associated heritage values.

³ [Plan-Change-13-Statements-of-Significance-New-Items.PDF \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

26. The plaques were funded by local residents and the RSA and were originally installed in conjunction with the planted memorial tree avenues⁴ and in my opinion, they are an integral part of the memorial. The plaques alert locals and visitors of the significance of the avenues and provide a formal marking of the war memorial avenues in a readily recognisable format. As noted above, there is precedent for plaques to be part of heritage items and I consider that there is justification in this case for them to be part of heritage item 1459 in terms of heritage values. In conclusion, I consider it is appropriate to schedule the War Memorial Avenues on account of their significance, and I do not support the relief sought.
27. Alternatively, Ms Elvidge sought to reduce the extent of this heritage item by: amending the Schedule to include specific aspects of the streets which comprise the item; excluding the plaques and only scheduling trees from the original memorial planting or those of significant landscape value; and including the trees in sub-chapter 9.4 Significant and other trees instead of sub-chapter 9.3 Historic Heritage.
28. Ms Elvidge considers there is a lack of clarity in the description as “Papanui War Memorial Avenues” and requests that if the heritage item relates only to the plaques and trees this should be specified in the Schedule. I agree that clarity of the extent of the heritage item could be improved and suggest that this could be done by amending the description and/or name field in the Schedule to ‘Papanui War Memorial Avenues - limited to the avenues of trees and plaques, including road reserve.’ Ms Elvidge seeks that only trees from the original memorial planting or those of significant landscape value are scheduled. I am not qualified to comment on whether the War Memorial Avenues have significant landscape value, however I can address the request to limit the heritage item to original plantings.
29. The trees that make up the Papanui War Memorial Avenues heritage item are a living memorial - the age and nature of this living memorial means that not all the original plantings have survived to this day.
30. Change over time in the absence of planning controls has contributed to some of the avenues now being made up of different eras and species of trees, in addition to the original plantings. Different species have been planted in some cases because the original species were not suitable, did not thrive or became unsuitable. Scheduling the trees as heritage items will

⁴ [Plan-Change-13-Statements-of-Significance-New-Items.PDF \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

ensure that removals and replacement plantings retain the heritage values of the war memorial.

31. In my opinion the heritage significance of the Papanui War Memorial Avenues is not reliant on the original plantings or the original species remaining in the 16 streets. The date and species of the trees in each street has been identified and this was taken into account for the heritage assessment. All trees located in the road reserve of the 16 streets are part of the heritage item.
32. Ms Elvidge sought to include the trees in sub-chapter 9.4 Significant and other trees instead of sub-chapter 9.3 Historic Heritage. Based on my discussion above, I consider the Papanui War Memorial Avenues meet the requirements of the scheduling policy in Chapter 9.3. They have intangible historical, social, cultural and memorial values which are in my opinion appropriate to be recognised with heritage status. I am not familiar with the tree assessment criteria and methodology or scheduling policies in order to determine whether they would also meet the requirements for recognition in that chapter.

Riccarton Tea House, 165 Racecourse Road

33. Council proposed a setting in PC13 as notified which reduced the setting for Riccarton Tea House in the District Plan (Heritage item 452 heritage setting 684). The submitter (Canterbury Jockey Club, #1059) seeks to reduce this further, as identified on a map in their submission (**Appendix B**). I do not support the squared off setting put forward in the submission as it does not relate to the landscape forms of the setting that are integral to the contextual values of the tea house. I support a reduction of the notified Setting, however not to the extent or design that the submitter seeks – I have proposed a revised setting in **Appendix C**.
34. I consider this revised setting to be the minimum required to ensure views and physical connection to the racecourse are maintained, as well as protecting important landscape features such as the evidence of the former moat and the treed perimeter. In my opinion, retaining the unimpeded physical and visual connection of the tea house with the racecourse is an important aspect of the heritage values of the tearooms, which enabled women to participate in the spectator sport as they were denied access to the stands due to alcohol being served there.

35. I accept the exclusion of part of the tree lined accessway leading to the area of the site in which the tea house is located. It is common practice for settings to include accessways from the street as this is usually key to their heritage values, historical and ongoing use. However, in this case, given the great distance of the tea house from the main entry point to the racecourse site, I do not consider it is justified to include the accessway in whole or part.
36. The proposed revised setting reduces the operative setting area to the south-west beyond the moat as this is a grassed area, more utilitarian in character, with accessory buildings. The proposed setting reduces the operative setting to the west and brings the boundary closer to the moat landforms but includes the tree perimeter on the other side of the moat landforms as this was part of the original landscape design.
37. In conclusion I do not support the revised setting requested in the submission, however I do support a reduced setting from the notified setting. My proposed revised setting is shown in **Appendix C** and has agreement from the submitter, as noted in the evidence of Suzanne Richmond.

Dwelling and setting, 27 Glandovey Road/ 7 & 9 Thornycroft Street

38. Submitters (Whiting #1070 and Peebles #1072) seek to reduce the setting (423) of the heritage item 209, a dwelling in Glandovey Road. The setting outline in PC13 as notified relates to previous land parcels, and I accept that it is necessary to update this to reflect the current situation and still retain an appropriate heritage setting for the heritage item.
39. I agree with the submitters that the properties at 7 and 9 Thornycroft Street have no physical relationship to 27 Glandovey Road. In addition, these properties are not integral to the contextual heritage values of the heritage item or its function, meaning and relationships. They were historically part of the site associated with the house, but this has changed over time. The operative and proposed setting outline relates to the previous property ownership and subdivision pattern.
40. Nos 7 and 9 Thornycroft Street (now 9 Thornycroft Street) housed a 1940s semi-detached dwelling which was demolished in c2002. The two land parcels were combined and reduced from the west, and the west corner brought into the land parcel on which heritage item 209 sits.
41. Given the long-term association of the land at what is now 7 Thornycroft Street as part of the landholdings of the dwelling, it would be appropriate to

retain it as part of the setting if it were in the same ownership as heritage item 209, or if it had a strong physical, use or visual association with the heritage item. Neither are the case. The area of land fronting Thornycroft Street adjacent to 5 Thornycroft Street (present day 7 Thornycroft Street) has been associated with the house at 27 Glandovey Road since its construction in 1933. It is unclear what the area was used for – from historical aerials⁵ it appears to have contained a shed and mown grass.

42. In conclusion, I do not consider that 7 and 9 Thornycroft Street are integral to the contextual heritage values, function, meaning and relationships of heritage item 209. I consider that the current immediate land parcel of 27 Glandovey Road meets the definition of heritage setting and propose an amended setting as per the map in **Appendix D**.
43. I support a minor change to the Statement of Significance for this property to reflect this change. The revised Statement of Significance is attached as **Appendix E**.

Dwelling, 47 Rue Balguerie and setting (Heritage item 1152)

44. John Hardie, on behalf of JG & JL Hardie Family Trust S1012.1 and S1012.2 seeks to remove protection of the heritage setting from the operative district plan and opposes protection of the interior.
45. I note that the interior is not currently protected as part of the heritage item. As specified in the Schedule entry, the interior has not yet been assessed.
46. I recommend retaining the operative heritage setting as I consider no change has occurred there since the District Plan Review in 2016 which impacts its contribution to the heritage values of the dwelling.
47. I support an amended Statement of Significance that updates the information in accordance with that provided by the submitter. This is attached as **Appendix F**.

SUBMISSIONS SEEKING NEW HERITAGE ITEMS

48. The Schedule is regularly updated as research and identification continues to be undertaken. Additional heritage items are added to the Schedule on an ongoing basis, with a view to reflecting current community values, and with the aim of a comprehensive schedule that represents the historical

⁵ [Historical Aerial Imagery \(canterburymaps.govt.nz\)](https://canterburymaps.govt.nz/)

development of the District. The Christchurch Contextual Historical Overview (2005, updated 2013)⁶ provides a basis for identification. This document sets out an overview of the history of the City and identified scheduled places which represented historical themes. The report also recommended additional specific places which represent important historical themes to be added to the Schedule.

49. From time to time the public make suggestions to heritage staff of individual places for consideration as heritage items. As part of this proposed plan 45 new heritage items have been added. A table of all proposed new Items is attached as **Appendix G**. Submissions have sought the addition of eight heritage items, which I consider below. Additions to the Schedule must meet 9.3.2.2.1 Policy – Identification, assessment and scheduling of heritage items.

20th Battalion and 20th Regiment War Memorial, Jane Deans Close

50. Three submitters (#1045, #1090, #636) seek the addition of this memorial (consisting of a plaque on a lamp standard dating from c1990) to the Schedule. Photographs are provided in **Appendix H**.
51. This plaque commemorates the fallen of the 20th Battalion and 20th Regiment. It reads *“Dedicated to the memory of members of the 20th N.Z Infantry Battalion & 20th N.Z. Armoured Regiment who lost their lives in the 1939-45 War. Originally an Infantry Battalion it was the first Infantry Unit to leave the South Island during that war. The original Memorial to the fallen was erected near this site in 1948. Lest we forget. Greece, Crete, North Africa, Italy.*
52. Research to date indicates that the memorial feature in Jane Deans Close is located near the site of the vocational training centre for disabled servicemen built in 1944-46 on Riccarton Road. A memorial avenue of Fir trees was planted at this centre on 2 September 1949 commemorating the 20th Battalion and 20th Regiment. It was known as 20th avenue. A memorial plaque was also installed somewhere on the memorial avenue in c. late August 1949. In the 1960s the Disabled Serviceman’s League were advertising basket ware, upholstery, French polishing and furniture making services.

⁶ [Christchurch-Contextual-Historical-Overview-Revised-2013.pdf \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

53. The present-day memorial plaque was likely installed in the late 1990s on part of the extensive former site of the rehabilitation centre, which was demolished by 2000.
54. The feature is located in the road reserve and in Council ownership. Council maintains the memorial (as a Parks asset), so it has a level of protection via management, however, scheduling in the District Plan could provide an additional layer of protection from any proposed alterations or removal in the future with changes to the road reserve.
55. Dr McEwan has undertaken research on the feature for the Council and does not support its scheduling as a heritage item – this is addressed in her evidence. A Statement of Significance has not been drafted as this feature does not readily fit with the heritage assessment methodology and scheduling policy in PC13.
56. In my opinion the feature has some historical, social and cultural heritage value on account of its memorial purpose. The feature appears to have some cultural value to parts of the Christchurch community, which is evidenced by the submissions and by the regular ANZAC ceremonies held there (according to Submissions #1045 and #1090). In my opinion, any war memorial no matter how modest a feature has some heritage value to a community however I am not convinced that the structure itself warrants Scheduling under PC13. The structure lacks tangible heritage values – although it is now possibly 30 years old, it is not of any particular craftsmanship or architectural significance. I consider it has low to moderate authenticity and integrity due to it being a replacement memorial, not on but near the site of the lost original memorial avenue, and with a different context.
57. While it is not common for plaques to be scheduled heritage items, there is some precedent with the Pilgrims Landing Site and setting (Heritage item #736), and Kingsford Smith Landing Site (Heritage item #632). With these heritage items, the sites are of clear significance to the Christchurch District, and the plaques and markers are secondary to that intangible significance connected with the sites. The Pilgrims landing site marker (rock and plaque) dates from 1934. The Sumner War Memorial Lamp Standards form part of a wider heritage item including the Esplanade, Tuawera/Cave Rock and Pilot/Signal Station and sea walls (Heritage item #1288). The Sumner memorials date from the 1920s and have craftsmanship,

architectural/aesthetic and contextual values as well as historical and commemorative values.

58. The threshold for scheduling is set at a necessarily high bar – places need to be of significance to the Christchurch District. I do not deny the memorial has heritage value to the community, however I am not convinced it meets the policy for scheduling due to its more local and modest level of significance, and its low integrity and authenticity and therefore I am not able to support the memorial being added to the schedule.

Former Law Courts, 282 Durham Street

59. Historic Places Canterbury (#835) seek that the former High Court, 282 Durham Street be added to the Schedule. Council heritage staff have undertaken research and an initial assessment of the building and setting. This documentation in my opinion indicates that the building possesses the heritage values in Appendix 9.3.7.1 and is of significance to the Christchurch District.
60. The Christchurch Contextual Historical Overview⁷ recommended the former law courts be added to the Schedule (Chapter 20: Justice, law and order. III Further possible heritage items).
61. The buildings and setting have historical/social and cultural values. Elements of the present complex provided a venue for judicial proceedings for between thirty and forty years. From 1989-2017 the main court building was in use and numerous era-defining trials took place there. The buildings have architectural/aesthetic and technological/craftsmanship value. They were designed by the Ministry of Works. The use of highly finished materials such as marble and polished timber in conjunction with raw and aggregate concrete panels is typical of Christchurch's Brutalist style architecture and is a feature that the Law Courts share with the neighbouring Christchurch Town Hall. The buildings and setting have contextual values as a landmark on Durham Street and for their location adjacent to Victoria Square and relationship with the Town Hall in terms of materials and architectural style.
62. There is a current resource consent for major alterations to the building, and I observed demolition of part of the complex was underway on 5 May 2025. In light of this, I consider it will be appropriate to undertake an updated

⁷ [Christchurch-Contextual-Historical-Overview-Revised-2013.pdf \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

assessment of heritage values, and in terms of Policy 9.3.2.2.1 C. once the alterations are completed.

63. In addition, the owner is not supportive of scheduling. I met with David Rycroft, General Manager, Huadu International Construction Group Ltd. as representative for the owner on 20 June 2022. Mr Rycroft advised me via email on 21 June 2022 that the owner is opposed to the scheduling of the building and setting. Although not District Plan policy, Council staff prefer to have owner support before scheduling any new heritage items.

Former Pensioners Cottages, Barnett Avenue

64. The Christchurch Civic Trust (#908) and Historic Places Canterbury (#835) seek the scheduling of the former pensioners cottages and the Civic Trust supports the adaptive re-use of the buildings. The cottages were demolished in August - September 2023.

Upper Riccarton War Memorial Library, 372 Riccarton Road

65. The Civic Trust (#908) and Historic Places Canterbury (#835) seek for this to be added to the Schedule. The Council owned building was demolished in February 2024.

Princess Margaret Hospital, 97 Cashmere Road

66. The Civic Trust (#908) and Historic Places Canterbury (#835) seek for this building to be added to the Schedule 'as soon as is practicable.'
67. The building was designed by A. H. Manson of Manson, Seward & Stanton in 1946-52 and built in 1952-61. It is one of two remaining large brick buildings in Christchurch to demonstrate the influence of Scandinavian and Dutch modernism on New Zealand architecture.
68. The Christchurch Contextual Historical Overview, 2005 (updated 2013)⁸ recommended Princess Margaret Hospital be added to the Schedule. The report states in Chapter 28: Health, hospitals and related institutions, III. *Further possible listings:*

"That there are so few buildings associated with the provision of health and welfare services listed and that some key listed buildings in this area have been lost as a result of the earthquakes makes the

⁸ [Christchurch-Contextual-Historical-Overview-Revised-2013.pdf \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

identification and listing of further such buildings a task that should be given priority. Attention should focus on Princess Margaret Hospital and Burwood Hospital, where older buildings not well-known but of interest may survive alongside the modern buildings of recent years.”

69. Research on the heritage values of the building was undertaken in c2006 by consultant historian John Wilson, for the Council. This documentation in my opinion indicates that the building possesses the heritage values in Appendix 9.3.7.1 and is of significance to the Christchurch District. The building is in my opinion also of national heritage significance for its architectural values. It has an entry in the publication ‘Long Live the Modern, New Zealand’s Architecture 1904-1984’, edited by Julia Gatley. This book presents a national framework for heritage assessment of New Zealand’s modern architecture.
70. The owner of the building is Te Whatu Ora – Health New Zealand Waitaha Canterbury (Formerly Canterbury District Health Board). Penny Wells, Corporate Solicitor for the owner advised me on 31 July 2023 (telephone conversation) that significant strengthening works are required, and the owner considers the associated costs are not likely to be economic. Seismic reports and costings reports were not available at that time. Penny Wells advised that the owner is not supportive of the building being scheduled as a heritage item. I contacted Penny Wells again by email on 18 May 2025 to see if there was any update on the building and the owner’s views, and I had not yet received a response at the time of writing.
71. In my opinion the building is likely to meet Policy 9.3.2.2.1 a. and b., however a Statement of Significance has not yet been prepared to confirm this. In addition, advice from the owner indicates there may be engineering and financial factors related to the physical condition of the item that could make it unreasonable or inappropriate to schedule, in line with the ‘exemption’ clauses of the scheduling policy – 9.3.2.2.1 c. iii, iv. Given the lack of available financial and engineering information, I am not able to support scheduling of the building at this time. I strongly support the building being assessed under Policy 9.3.2.2.1 when the relevant information becomes available.

Dwelling, 111 Hackthorne Road

72. Owner at the time of the submission, Bruce Alexander (#857) sought to add this residential dwelling to the Schedule, on account of its age and history.

Bruce Alexander died in August 2023. The owners of the property are now Ilana Alexander, Jane Alexander and Margot Moller.

73. The submission states that the house was built in 1920 as a weekend holiday cottage and was the first house built on Hackthorne Road. The owner had lived at the property for 52 years at the time of the submission. The submission notes that the house is of kauri weatherboard and heart rimu construction and has been extensively altered over time.
74. Dr McEwan undertook initial research on the house for the Council and does not support scheduling in her evidence. I have reviewed the research documentation and do not consider that there is sufficient evidence to date that indicates the house would meet the criteria for scheduling as heritage item under policy 9.3.2.2.1. A site visit was requested in July 2023 but not undertaken.
75. In light of the above factors, I do not support the scheduling of this property as a heritage item.

76. Teddington (Allandale) Lock up, 153 Governors Bay-Teddington Road (#1065, #1074)

77. The submission requests that the Teddington Lock Up is added to the Schedule.
78. The building and setting are on Council owned land. Council is the owner and the asset owning unit is supportive of the scheduling of the place (Email from Kelly Hansen, Manager Parks Planning & Asset Management, 30 April 2025). Parks staff have indicated that the building may need to be relocated at some point in the future as part of coastal adaptation planning. As the building has historically been relocated, I consider relocation, if necessary and to a sympathetic new location, could retain heritage values.
79. Heritage staff researched the building and setting, including a site inspection earlier this year. I prepared the Statement of Significance which was reviewed by heritage staff. The building and setting were found to meet the threshold for scheduling as a Significant heritage item. The Statement of Significance was peer reviewed by Dr Ann McEwan who supported the assessment. This is addressed in Dr McEwan's evidence.
80. The Former Governors Bay Lock-up has historical and social significance for its association with the history of policing in Christchurch and the

development of Governor's Bay and Allandale and the wider Whakaraupō-Lyttelton Harbour area. It has cultural significance as it demonstrates a distinctive way of life in the second half of the 19th century in New Zealand when the philosophy of policing was one of a localised presence within the community. Architectural significance is derived from it being a surviving 1870s lock-up which demonstrates the less common end-to-end cell arrangement of colonial lock-ups. The building has technological and craftsmanship significance as it retains many original features including steel lined walls, metal bars, doors and locks. It has contextual significance as it remains on the same land parcel on which the original police complex was built in 1877, and the building and setting have archaeological value because due to their potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past human activity on the site including that which occurred prior to 1900.

81. I support the relief sought by the submitter as the building and setting have been shown to meet Policy 9.3.2.2.1. The Statement of Significance and heritage aerial map are attached as **Appendices I and J**.

82. Former Quarry Stables and setting, 79 Bamfords Road, Allandale (#1074)

83. The submission requests that the Burnside Stable is added to the Schedule.

84. Heritage staff researched the former quarry stables building and setting, including a site inspection earlier this year. I drafted the Statement of Significance on this information, which was then reviewed by other heritage staff. This assessment determined the building and setting met the threshold for scheduling as a Significant heritage item. The Statement of Significance was peer reviewed by Dr Ann McEwan who supports the assessment. This is addressed in Dr McEwan's evidence. The Statement of Significance is attached as **Appendix K**).

85. The Former quarry stables and setting are of historical and social significance as they demonstrate the role that horses played in colonial Canterbury and the types of buildings that were required to house and maintain them. They have cultural significance as they are associated with a distinctive way of life in the mid-19th century when horses provided the power required to shift and transport goods, people and stone around the harbour area and beyond. The Former quarry stables have architectural significance as an example of a mid-19th century stable building which has

largely retained its original form, plan, materials and fixtures. They have technological and craftsmanship significance as the building retains original materials, including fixtures and construction methods. The Former quarry stables have contextual significance as they contribute to the remaining colonial character of the Governors Bay area including the importance of horses, along with the Teddington Smithy. The Former quarry stables and its setting are of archaeological significance because they have the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site. Māori settlement of the Whakaraupō-Lyttelton Harbour area means that evidence of early Māori activity may exist on the site.

86. The building and setting are on land owned by the Living Springs Trust. Trust Chair, Denis Aldridge has been emailed regarding the Living Springs Trust support for the scheduling of the building (Emailed 29th April, 5 and 14th May 2025). Although there is no District Plan policy requiring owner approval for scheduling, the current approach taken by staff is not to propose heritage items for scheduling without the private owner's approval. As no response has been received regarding the Trust's support or otherwise for scheduling I am not able to support the relief sought by the submitter at this time.

SUBMISSIONS OPPOSING NEW ITEMS

87. Ben Hay-Smith (#1035) opposes the addition of the following properties to the Schedule – 9 Ford Road (1439), 129 High Street (1403), 159 Manchester Street (1402), 35 Rata Street (1433), and 25 baches in Taylors Mistake and requests that Council consider omitting them from the Schedule. All of these properties have owner support for scheduling, all have been assessed as meeting the Policy for Scheduling of heritage items at 9.3.2.2.1. For these reasons I do not support their removal from the Schedule as part of PC13.
88. Heritage items are required to meet one of more of the broad heritage values as per the thresholds set out in Policy 9.3.2.2.1. These values are based on national and international practice and have been developed with reference to definitions and criteria including those in the Resource Management Act, the ICOMOS NZ Charter, 2010, the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act. In summary, heritage items must meet at least one of the heritage values at a significant or highly significant level and be of significance to the District, as well as possess a minimum of moderate integrity and authenticity.

89. Associations with particular people is just one part of the historical and social significance criterion - it is not possible to schedule a place as the submitter states 'just because a famous person happened to live there once.' Scheduled heritage items are required to have more than just a passing association with people of note. The heritage values are intended to be objective. Heritage value in the context of the proposed plan is not determined by representing 'beautiful architecture' or 'amenity value' as the submitter suggests, but rather intrinsic, recognised architectural design values and characteristics, as well as important works by significant architects, or quality examples of particular architectural styles and periods.

**SUBMISSIONS SEEKING REMOVAL OF HERITAGE ITEMS AND SETTINGS
FROM THE SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC HERITAGE ITEMS
(APPENDIX 9.3.7.2)**

90. Submissions have been received seeking the de-scheduling of heritage items in the Schedule. This is for a range of reasons such as condition, earthquake damage, structural reasons, cost to strengthen and repair or heritage significance. Some submitters have stated that they wish to demolish the buildings, and desire to have heritage items removed from the Schedule in order that they can be demolished without requiring resource consent.
91. Policy 9.3.2.2.1 'Identification, assessment and scheduling of historic heritage items' sets out the heritage values and thresholds of significance for scheduling heritage items (9.3.2.2.1 a., b). It also includes scheduling exclusion matters (9.3.2.2.1 c. ii-iv) to prevent the addition of new heritage items to the Schedule where it is unreasonable or inappropriate for reasons related to the impact on heritage significance of required restoration, reconstruction or maintenance, repair or upgrade work, and/or for engineering and financial factors.
92. There is a resource consent process for owners to seek permission to demolish heritage items. Policy 9.3.2.2.8 'Demolition of scheduled historic heritage' sets out matters to have regard to when considering the appropriateness of the demolition of scheduled heritage items. I note that some of these matters are closely related to the matters in Policy 9.3.2.2.1. However, a key difference between the scheduling and demolition policies is the ability to retain heritage values and significance through a reduced degree of demolition (9.3.2.2.8 iv), for example by retaining part of a complex. No such protection of heritage

values during demolition would apply if a heritage item is de-scheduled in its entirety.

93. In order to undertake my assessment of submissions related to Daresbury and Antonio Hall against Policy 9.3.2.2.1, particularly part c. iii and iv, I instructed and have relied on the evidence of structural engineer –Mr Stephen Hogg; conservation architect –Mr William Fulton and quantity surveyor – Mr Gavin Stanley.

Former Holy Name Seminary incorporating the former Dwelling Baron's Court/ Kilmead, Motor House and setting (commonly known as Antonio Hall), 265 Riccarton Road (Heritage item 463, heritage setting 203)

94. Third party submitter Justin Avi (#1037) seeks the removal of Antonio Hall from the Schedule on the basis that 'it is not heritage – it is an eyesore'. No additional supporting information is provided. Whilst the submission does not make a compelling case for de-scheduling, the recent extensive fire damage which has destroyed parts of the complex has informed a reassessment of the heritage item by staff.
95. The heritage item is scheduled as 'Highly Significant' and consists of the former homestead, homestead additions, chapel, motor house, accommodation block and setting. The heritage item and setting are identified on the heritage aerial map⁹ and its heritage significance is assessed in the Statement of Significance¹⁰ dated 22 September 2014.
96. The property is listed by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) as a Category 2 Historic Place (#7336). HNZPT advised they have not undertaken a review of the listing subsequent to the fire damage.
97. All parts of the complex, but in particular the original homestead, suffered damage in the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes and the entire complex has been unoccupied since this time. Parts of the heritage item are also badly fire damaged from two events in April 2019 and November 2021. The fires largely destroyed the original homestead (west wing, 1909) and the central section (1949/1960/1961). I consider the damage is such that heritage values and significance of those parts of the heritage item are lost and unsalvageable.

⁹ [HeritageBatchRevised_30.jpg \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

¹⁰ [HID 463.pdf \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

Those areas should therefore in my opinion be removed from the heritage item outline on the heritage aerial map (**Attachment L**).

98. The chapel was fire damaged at the south end where it adjoined the central section, resulting in the partial collapse of the southern end wall. The roof structure and ceiling at this end has burnt out and the interior although largely intact has also been fire damaged. Fire also damaged the south end of the accommodation wing – with damage concentrated on two gable ends and a section of the roof structure.
99. The loss of the former homestead portions of the complex and the removal of them from the extent of the heritage item impacts the level of significance under the heritage assessment criteria and of the heritage item as a whole. In my opinion, the remaining fire-damaged chapel and accommodation wing and the motor house together with the setting possess historical/social, cultural/spiritual, architectural/aesthetic, technological/craftsmanship, contextual and archaeological value at a significant level, have a moderate degree of authenticity and are of heritage significance to the District – therefore they meet Policy 9.3.2.2.1 b. i. The significance of the heritage item has reduced from Highly Significant to Significant, and the Statement of Significance has been updated accordingly (**Attachment M**). Dr Ann McEwan has peer reviewed the statement of significance and agrees with the removal of the fire damaged homestead from the heritage item and the assessment of significance of the revised heritage item as 'significant'. Dr McEwan addresses this in her evidence.
100. My proposed reduction of the heritage item and reassessment of its heritage significance has been informed by the documentation of fire damage outlined in reports by Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) (**Appendix N**) and Miyamoto (**Appendix O**), advice from Council staff (**Appendix P**), and photographs held in the Council property files, including recent drone footage dated March 2024 (**Appendix Q**). I viewed the site from Riccarton Road on 5 August 2023. I have taken the 'Site Inspection Structural Report, 4 April 2024' (**Appendix R**) prepared by Council officer Richard Gant and the dangerous building notice issued on 14 April 2025 (**Appendix S**) into account. The report and notice advise the building owner to remove the west-end structure (main homestead) completely, remove all unsuitable debris from the centre wing south end and the roof structure and part gable walls down to the top of the first-floor wall height of the south-east end of the accommodation wing. I consider the

integrity of the accommodation wing would be sufficiently retained if the requirements of the dangerous building notice are implemented.

101. I have considered the scheduling exclusion matters at 9.3.2.2.1 c. ii-iv. It is my opinion that the roof and this portion of the upper floor are likely to be capable of reconstruction in a manner that would retain heritage values. There is no available detailed advice on associated costs or scope of repair works for any of the buildings at this time.
102. Mr Hogg addresses engineering factors associated with the fire damage to the chapel and accommodation wing in his evidence. In his opinion, based on his experience and with reference to the photographs of the fire damaged buildings, it would be physically possible to engineer a repair solution for both buildings. This would involve the removal of damaged fabric (eg burnt areas of the roof of the chapel and accommodation wing) and its replacement 'like for like' along with replacement of lost elements such as the end wall of the chapel. Mr Hogg states that the fire damage repairs he suggests will improve the seismic strength of the repaired buildings (chapel and accommodation wing) and that these should be strengthened to a minimum of 67% NBS if they are to be restored back into service.
103. Based on Mr Hogg's engineering advice, I consider that it does not appear to be unreasonable to schedule the chapel and accommodation wing in relation to engineering factors of the fire damaged buildings.
104. The principal owner of the property Mr Chiu, through their representative Murray Withers advised via email in 2023 (**Appendix T**) that the buildings were uninsured. There are no available cost estimates for repair and strengthening to determine whether there are financial factors which would make it unreasonable to schedule the chapel, accommodation wing and motor house and setting. Murray Withers advised by email on 27 May 2025 that the owner is of the view that the heritage item should be removed from the Schedule and they consider it 'uneconomic to reinstate or preserve any portion of the complex, given the extent of the fire damage, the absence of insurance, and the state of disrepair' (**Appendix T**).
105. Another factor to note is the Housing Health Report (undated, site visited 11/7/24) by Council officer Tony Dowson (**Appendix U**) which notes the damage to the buildings and the 'widespread presence of degraded asbestos

material in several forms throughout the site.’ The report states that the building is potentially injurious to health under S123 of the Building Act 2004.

106. I note that in terms of the relief sought by the submitter, de-scheduling will not require the owner to beautify the property, undertake demolition of the fire damaged parts of the complex, or to meet a standard of maintenance of the grounds. De-scheduling would mean that full demolition can occur, and the site be developed without requiring the owner to apply for resource consent for heritage matters. I do not think this is appropriate considering the heritage significance embodied in the chapel, accommodation buildings and motor house and their ability to be repaired.
107. I note that even with the operative and as notified heritage scheduling in place, the demolition of the fire damaged west and central sections can be carried out as ‘make safe’ works with no resource consent required due to the unsupported state of the remaining elements the potential for their collapse in, for example strong winds.
108. In conclusion, I consider the chapel together with the accommodation wing, motor house and setting still meet the scheduling policy as a ‘significant’ heritage item, and recommend that the Statement of Significance, Schedule and mapping be updated to reflect this.

Daresbury and Setting (Heritage item 602, heritage setting 185), 9 Daresbury Lane

109. This submission from the owner Daresbury Limited (#874) seeks removal of the heritage item and setting from the Schedule ‘so that it may be able to be demolished where appropriate and consistent with Policy 9.3.2.2.8 (Demolition policy).’ The submitter states that the building was heavily damaged by the Canterbury earthquakes 2010/2011 and has been vacant and uninhabitable since that time. They consider that restoration, strengthening and repair to meet Building Code are not economically feasible. The submission states the extent of works required would result in loss of heritage fabric to the extent that the building would constitute a replica as deconstruction of the remaining fabric is required for strengthening. It also states that much of the heritage item's

heritage features are lost, its 'heritage status is diminished' and it no longer has significant heritage values.

110. Historic Places Canterbury (#835) supports the scheduling of Daresbury and strongly opposes its removal from the Schedule. The Christchurch Civic Trust (#908) also supports the continued scheduling of Daresbury.
111. I have had regard to the evidence of Mr Hogg, Mr Fulton and Mr Stanley in relation to this building as well as documentation related to the building's history held in the Council's heritage and property files. I visited the building and viewed the interior and exterior on 21 July 2023.
112. The building and setting are scheduled as a Highly Significant heritage item. Daresbury is listed as a Category 1 Historic Place by HNZPT.
113. The heritage values and significance assessment are set out in the Statement of Significance,¹¹ dated November 2014. I agree with the Statement of Significance which includes the following summary:

Daresbury and its setting have high overall significance to Christchurch, including Banks Peninsula and New Zealand as a turn of the 20th century large Arts and Craft inspired residence and use as a vice-regal residence. Daresbury has high historical and social significance for its association with businessman George Humphreys and the Humphreys' family in whose ownership it remained until 1985. Daresbury has high architectural significance as the most outstanding example of Samuel Hurst Seager's interpretation of the English Domestic Revival style and Arts and Craft inspired detail. Daresbury has high craftsmanship significance for the quality of its construction and detailing and high contextual significance for its place within the distinctive large houses that typify the suburb of Fendalton. Daresbury and its setting have potential archaeological significance as the site was once part of the Deans' Riccarton estate and in view of the late 19th century development of the property.

114. I would also add to this from the cultural and spiritual significance section:

Daresbury and its setting has cultural significance as an embodiment of the lifestyle of a professional business family in the early years of the 20th century. It also has cultural significance for its aesthetic and stylistic embodiment of a particular design and philosophy movement of the time – that of the Arts and Crafts movement.

¹¹ [HID 185.pdf \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

115. The building meets a number of the heritage values (historical/ social, architectural/aesthetic, technological/craftsmanship and contextual) at a highly significant level and is in my opinion of high significance to the District for its heritage values. Mr Fulton in his evidence also concludes that Daresbury and Setting, in their current state, meet the threshold for inclusion in as “Highly Significant.”
116. Mr Fulton discusses the history and addresses the heritage values and significance of the heritage item and setting in his evidence. He agrees with Dave Pearson Architects (Heritage Assessment and defects/remedial work schedule, 19.06.2019) overall summary of significance which rates the building as having ‘exceptional’ significance.
117. I note that the land to the north of the Waimairi Stream was included as part of the heritage setting for Daresbury in the 2015 District Plan Review because it was part of the original landholding, contained a historical entrance and driveway which led to the existing bridge and the dwelling on the south side of the stream. At the time the setting was scheduled, this area was unbuilt, with an overgrown woodland character containing a number of mature trees.
118. Resource Consent approval for subdividing the area to the north of the stream into seven residential lots with a new accessway (with the heritage setting divided into 4 lots) was granted in 2021 (RMA2020/2930), and consent for buildings on new lots within the setting have been approved or lodged in recent times (Lot 4 – partly located in the setting, 67A Fendalton Road, RMA/2024/3336; Lot 5 – partly located in the setting, 67B Fendalton Road, RMA 2024/1328; Lot 6, 67C Fendalton Road, RMA/2024/1330 – granted; Lot 3 – partly located within the setting, 71B Fendalton Road, RMA/2023/2100).
119. The operative heritage setting provisions over this area to the north of the Waimairi Stream provided for consideration of impacts of the development on the heritage values of Daresbury through consenting processes for the subdivision and the new dwellings. This part of the heritage setting continues to make some contribution to the heritage values of Daresbury.
120. However, with the removal of trees, the realignment of the driveway, and the establishment of 4 new lots and dwellings within the setting, there is now limited tangible evidence within the area of setting to the north of the stream related to the heritage value of Daresbury. This evidence consists of: the section of driveway immediately adjacent to the bridge on the north of the Waimairi Stream (which reflects the alignment of the early driveway), the bridge (a non-scheduled

heritage feature within the setting), and the remaining trees. Views along the driveway to the homestead from Fendalton Road are likely to be limited once the consented dwellings are constructed.

121. Based on this current context, I consider an amended setting which includes the stream boundary and bridge and excludes the new lots reflects the current environment is more appropriate and will provide adequate protection for the heritage values of Daresbury.
122. Based on the discussion above, I consider the heritage item and revised setting meet Policy 9.3.2.2.1 a., and b. ii. A.-D.
123. Mr Fulton provides an assessment in terms of 9.3.2.2.1 c. iii. and considers 'the proposed reconstruction and restoration to generally be appropriate and will not compromise the heritage significance of Daresbury,' and 'a proposed strengthened and restored Daresbury will retain its heritage significance and thus be worthy of its Heritage status.' He also considers that 'While there is a loss of some, mostly unseen original fabric with a corresponding reduction in Technological value, the overall Heritage significance of Daresbury will remain considerable. This ensures that it is worthy to remain a scheduled heritage item both locally (Council) and Nationally (HNZ).'
124. Mr Hogg details the expected physical impact on the heritage fabric with the necessary strengthening works in his evidence. Substantial intervention is required – however this degree of change, with similar methodology has been considered acceptable for many scheduled heritage items as part of earthquake recovery.
125. It is my experience that Christchurch earthquake recovery for heritage buildings after earthquakes, given the extent of necessary deconstruction and reconstruction required for some places (eg Theatre Royal, Mona Vale), pushed the boundaries of traditional heritage conservation approaches. However, these have been accepted as heritage wins because heritage values are retained to the extent that the places still contribute to the District's sense of place and identity.
126. Repair and strengthening of heritage buildings has often resulted in the reduction of technological and craftsmanship values with the introduction of new fabric and new construction systems. However, with salvage of materials and their reinstatement in line with heritage conservation best practice – as is

possible at Daresbury - acceptable heritage outcomes have been achieved even with very extensive works.

127. It is likely that the works required would in my opinion reduce the level of technological and craftsmanship value to 'significant' rather than 'high significance.' I do not consider that the work likely to be required to repair and strengthen the heritage item would significantly compromise its heritage values and integrity such that it would no longer retain its heritage significance, and therefore in my opinion, it does not qualify under the scheduling exemption policy at 9.3.2.2.1 c. iii.
128. Based on Mr Hogg's evidence and considering the building in terms of Policy 9.3.2.2.1 c. iv - whether there are engineering factors related to the physical condition of the heritage item that would make it unreasonable or inappropriate to schedule the Heritage item – there is no indication that it is unreasonable in terms of engineering factors to continue to schedule the building. Mr Hogg states that as the building is able to be repaired and strengthened it is not unreasonable or inappropriate for structural reasons for it to remain on the Schedule.
129. Consideration of financial reasons that would make it unreasonable or inappropriate to continue to schedule the heritage item is provided for in Policy 9.3.2.2.1 c. (iv.). Mr Stanley has provided a cost estimate and evidence for repair or demolition and rebuild of Daresbury. He has determined an estimate for repair and strengthening at \$7,984,555, with demolition and replacement with a modern structure with a high standard of finish estimated to be between \$7,853,868 and \$11,218,878. Suzanne Richmond addresses financial reasonableness in her evidence. Mr Stanley has also provided a cost estimate for a replica replacement building. I note that I do not consider a replica replacement to be an appropriate heritage outcome.
130. I note that heritage works for the appropriate repair and strengthening of the building (including interior heritage fabric conservation) would be eligible for application to the Council Heritage Incentive Grants scheme. However, as noted above in relation to the Mitre Hotel, I note this fund is very limited. I acknowledge that grants available for a privately owned building such as Daresbury are not likely to significantly assist the owner.
131. I consider Mr Fulton's comment regarding costs in relation to significance is pertinent – *'The cost of repair of Heritage buildings of the nature Daresbury is*

significant but is proportional to the scale of the project and the heritage value placed on the building.'

132. The submission seeks removal of the heritage item and setting from the Schedule 'so that it may be able to be demolished where appropriate and consistent with Policy 9.3.2.2.8 (Demolition policy).' I do not consider that there is any engineering¹² or heritage conservation¹³ evidence presented in the submission to justify removal of the building and setting from the Schedule of Significant Historic Heritage items under Policy 9.3.2.2.1 c.iii or c.iv. Therefore, I do not support the relief sought by the submitter.
133. I support a reduction of the setting for Daresbury, to remove the area to the north of the Waimairi Stream, in light of the subdivision and consented dwellings. The proposed amended setting is shown in **Appendix V**. The amended Statement of Significance is provided in **Appendix W**.

Taylors Mistake Baches (Submission #96; further submission #102)

134. Submission #96 seeks the removal of 14 baches from the operative heritage Schedule and rejects the proposed protection of an additional 25 baches at Taylors Mistake Bay.
135. Mr Snoep does not consider that the Statement of Significance of the baches meets the qualifying standard, however the reasons for this are not provided in his submission. He also appears to seek a Permitted activity status for demolition of the baches.
136. Further submission #102 supports the proposal to schedule all baches and opposes the proposal to permit demolition of baches that have their license to occupy cancelled. The submitter prefers that if a license is cancelled, the bach becomes a museum or sculpture that is to be viewed but not inhabited.
137. Stabilisation, monitoring and addressing agents of decay in vacant heritage buildings that are not safe to occupy is accepted heritage conservation practice. These practices would retain heritage fabric and value. Given that licenses to occupy the baches are based on mitigation of health, safety or environmental risks, these conservation processes may not be considered safe to undertake in some instances if a license has been cancelled due to these factors not being mitigated. Owners may not be willing to invest in

¹² [Daresbury Limited #874 #2053 - Evidence Brett Gilmore - Engineering](#)

¹³ [Daresbury Limited #874 #2053 - Evidence David Pearson - Heritage](#)

maintenance of a building that cannot be occupied. Intangible heritage values and community associations may still reside in a bach that is left vacant, unrepared and unmaintained, or one that has become a ruin. However, health and safety considerations may restrict the viability of this as an outcome.

138. I note that all scheduled baches have been researched and assessed as meeting the threshold and policy for scheduling. This means they have heritage value to the district. Taking into account the heritage scheduling policy at 9.3.2.2.1, part c, baches in high rockfall risk area have not been proposed for scheduling as part of PC13.
139. I consider the baches meet the threshold for scheduling on account of their heritage value to the District, their degree of integrity and authenticity, and I consider they have met Policy 9.3.2.2.1. I support the Statements of Significance for the baches. I consider that a blanket rule permitting their demolition would not provide adequate protection for these places which embody important heritage values for the district. Therefore, I recommend the operative and proposed baches remain scheduled and do not support the relief sought by Mr Snoep.

AMENDMENT OF PROPOSED HERITAGE ITEM – SYDENHAM CEMETERY

140. The notified extent of the heritage item (1443) mistakenly omitted the land parcel containing the entrance (including entrance gates), and the area containing a shelter and ashes plot, which was the former location of the sexton's cottage. The entrance to the cemetery has historical, social, cultural, architectural, aesthetic and craftsmanship significance for its continued use to enter the cemetery, the gates and landscaping, and as part of the original layout.
141. The site of the sexton's cottage has historical and social significance as evidence of past practices of providing for sextons to live on site in the city's cemeteries. The shelter is of historical, social, cultural architectural and craftsmanship value, as an altered early structure related to the use of the cemetery by visitors. The ashes area shows changes in burial practices over time, and evidences the continued use of the cemetery.
142. In order to protect the full extent of the heritage item and its fabric and values, the outline is proposed to be enlarged to include the land parcel

containing the entrance, entrance gates, site of the former sexton's cottage (now demolished), and the shelter.

143. The Statement of Significance as notified includes reference to this area as being part of the cemetery:

The entrance to the cemetery was originally approached along a tree-lined driveway off Milton Street, however this was replaced when Simeon Street was extended south to meet the entrance. The entrance features decorative iron gates, ironwork and masonry pillars. A small weatherboard public shelter with a hipped roof, closed in on three sides was erected to the left of the entranceway in 1908. After the demolition of the sexton's house in 2000, this was moved to the right of the entranceway, in front of the newly designated ash plots. At this time it was reoriented and one side was removed. The ashes plot contains an area in which plots are laid out in a 'swirl' design, in which four arms branch out in a radial pattern. A sexton's house had been built to the right of the entrance by 1901, but this was demolished in 2000 to make room for an ashes plot. A 1908 shelter that was originally located to the left of the driveway at the entrance was relocated to the site of the sexton's cottage at this time.

144. I recommend that the heritage item be amended in accordance with the heritage aerial map at **Appendix X**.

CONCLUSION

145. In conclusion, as I have outlined above, with due consideration, and based on my expertise and with reliance on the expertise of others as identified, I am able to support the relief sought by some submitters, support others in part, and am not able to support the relief sought by other submitters.

- (e) I do not support the removal or the expansion sought of the Papanui War Memorial Avenues (Heritage item 1459). I support an amended name for the heritage item which clarifies that the tree avenues, plaques and road reserve are included in the item.
- (f) I do not support the removal of 9 Ford Road (1439), 129 High Street (1403), 159 Manchester Street (1402), 35 Rata Street (1433), 25 proposed baches in Taylors Mistake, or all (operative and proposed) scheduled Taylors Mistake baches.

- (g) I support an amendment of heritage setting 684 (Riccarton Tea House) with revision of what is sought.
- (h) I support the amendment sought to heritage setting 423 (Dwelling, 27 Glandovey Road)
- (i) I support changes to the Statement of Significance for 47 Rue Balguerie (Heritage item 1152) but do not support an amendment of the heritage setting.
- (j) I do not support the scheduling of the 20th Battalion and 20th Regiment War Memorial or 111 Hackthorne Road.
- (k) I do not support the scheduling of the Former Law Courts, the Barnett Avenue Pensioner flats (demolished), the Upper Riccarton War Memorial (demolished), the Princess Margaret Hospital or the Burnside Stable (former quarry stables) at this time.
- (l) I support the scheduling of the Teddington (Allandale) Lock up.
- (m) I do not support the removal of heritage items 463 (Former Holy Name Seminary incorporating Baron's Court/Kilmead, Motor House and setting); 602 (Daresbury and setting);
- (n) I support a reduction of the setting of Daresbury.
- (o) I support a reduction in the extent of heritage item 463 (Former Holy Name Seminary incorporating Baron's Court/Kilmead, Motor House and Setting).
- (p) I support a remapping of the boundary of proposed heritage item Sydenham Cemetery to include the entrance gate and site of the former sexton's dwelling.

Date: 28 May 2025

Amanda Ohs