

Appendix T

RE: Antonio Hall, 265 Riccarton Road - Plan change 13/ 14 third party submission - seeking update on owner views



Murray Withers <murray@ratagroup.co.nz>

To ● Ohs, Amanda

Cc ○ 'Sam Yau'

UNCLASSIFIED

This sender murray@ratagroup.co.nz is from outside your organization.

Hi Amanda,

"Thank you for your email. The property is currently subject to a conditional Agreement for Sale and Purchase. As part of the preparation for sale, significant time and capital have been invested in feasibility analysis and related pre-development workstreams. Should the transaction proceed, it is the purchaser's intention to demolish the complex in its entirety. Should the sale not complete, our client considers 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. In light of this, our client is firmly of the view that the heritage listing should be removed from the planning schedule. The structure no longer possesses the integrity required to justify its heritage status, and any suggestion of repair or adaptive reuse is neither realistic nor commercially viable.

In addition, we note that Council has indicated an intention to retain heritage scheduling over the eastern wing of the property. We respectfully submit that this position is inconsistent with both the evidential record and the principles of the national heritage framework. Based on the archaeological assessment undertaken, it is clear that the eastern additions were not part of the original 1909 'Baron's Court' residence, but rather comprise later structures added during the site's tenure as a seminary – specifically during the substantial modifications of the 1950s and 1960s. These works were carried out for functional rather than architectural or cultural reasons and bear little heritage merit in their own right. In our view, the eastern wing (which is seismically compromised and severely impacted by the fire events) does not meet the threshold of historical or physical significance required to justify continued listing, particularly in the absence of original fabric, architectural integrity, or independent historical value."

Please keep us apprised of developments



M I Withers LLB

RATA

P: 0275641006

GROUP LTP

E: murray@ratagroup.co.nz

From: Murray Withers <murray@ratagroup.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 10:23 AM
To: Ohs, Amanda <Amanda.Ohs@ccc.govt.nz>
Cc: Dixon, Glenda <Glenda.Dixon@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Antonio Hall, 265 Riccarton Road - Plan change 13/ 14 submission

This is still very much a vexed question. We are discussing with various parties options. These options relate to the now vandalised east building . The main issue is communal washing and cooking facilities and where there might be located. We hope to resurrect this. Mr Chiu the Principal of the owner was able to visit for the first time post covid two months ago and some progress was made. As to the chapel if we can preserve it Mr Chiu will, but it is marginal, as the rear portion of the chapel severely burnt.

From: Ohs, Amanda <Amanda.Ohs@ccc.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 10:16 AM
To: Murray Withers <murray@ratagroup.co.nz>
Cc: Dixon, Glenda <Glenda.Dixon@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Antonio Hall, 265 Riccarton Road - Plan change 13/ 14 submission

Thank you Murray,

That is helpful to know –

So in summary, just to check my understanding -

1. There was no insurance for earthquake or fire damage for all of the buildings on the site.
2. There is no intention to rebuild the homestead or area behind the chapel which were largely destroyed by fire.

I just have one question -

What is the intention for the partially damaged but still standing accommodation wing and chapel please?

Kind regards,
Amanda

From: Murray Withers <murray@ratagroup.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, 24 July 2023 8:38 am
To: Ohs, Amanda <Amanda.Ohs@ccc.govt.nz>
Cc: Dixon, Glenda <Glenda.Dixon@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Antonio Hall, 265 Riccarton Road - Plan change 13/ 14 submission

Hi Amanda

I have talked this issue through at some length with Mr Chiu. Initially as you might be aware, after the first fire the homestead part (old wooden part) of the Antonio Hall complex was salvageable and Mr Chiu's intention was to undertake significant renovations and restore the homestead.

Mr Chiu is a victim of circumstances. Prior to the earthquakes he had spent a significant sum on extensive renovations to the East wing and converted that wing into travellers accommodation. The homestead of older part of the Buildings were occupied. The Buildings were uninsured. With the earthquakes, plans were unable to be continued, as the commons areas for the travellers accommodation were red stickered and the cost of strengthen work was prohibitive. Secondly the onsite custodian and manager was prevented from remaining on site.

The first fire was destructive but as i said although it damaged the area behind the chapel the older area and refurbished area were largely unaffected. With the property now vacant it was basically ransacked by the public. Police records show may intrusions on a daily basis. I am aware that a suggestion was made to have 24x7 security but that is and was uneconomic. The second fire destroyed the older wooden areas of the complex to a point where they are not able to be salvaged. There is now no intention to try and rebuild that part unless there was financial assistance from others. That assistance would need to extend to many millions of dollars. That is unlikely.

We agree that the heritage listing should be removed it is redundant and as the submitted state not a pleasant vista.

From: Ohs, Amanda <Amanda.Ohs@ccc.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, July 3, 2023 2:20 PM
To: Murray Withers <murray@ratagroup.co.nz>
Cc: Dixon, Glenda <Glenda.Dixon@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Antonio Hall, 265 Riccarton Road - Plan change 13/ 14 submission

Hi Murray,

You can search the actual submission here
<https://makeasubmission.ccc.govt.nz/PublicSubmissionSearch.aspx>

I've attached it for you - Its very brief as you will see.

Kind regards,
Amanda

From: Murray Withers <murray@ratagroup.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, July 3, 2023 1:48 PM
To: Ohs, Amanda <Amanda.Ohs@ccc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Antonio Hall, 265 Riccarton Road - Plan change 13/ 14 submission

Hi Amanda

I located the over view of the submission lodged it seems by Justin Avi but is there a process where i can see the whole submission

In terms of sharing information i will discuss with the Owner and refer back to you. We have had various preliminary designs undertaken and there have been one or two structural reports

completed. Once i have the green light i will share as much as I am permitted. In the meantime how do we see the full submission

From: Ohs, Amanda <Amanda.Ohs@ccc.govt.nz>

Sent: Monday, July 3, 2023 12:23 PM

To: Murray Withers <murray@ratagroup.co.nz>

Subject: Antonio Hall, 265 Riccarton Road - Plan change 13/ 14 submission

Dear Murray,

I understand from Council records that you provide local representation for the owner of this building.

The owner may be interested to know that we have received a third party submission seeking the removal of it from the heritage schedule .

Submissions on the plan changes were made public on Friday, you can view more information here <https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/plans-strategies-policies-and-bylaws/plans/christchurch-district-plan/changes-to-the-district-plan/proposed-changes-to-the-district-plan/pc13/>. There is an opportunity for further submissions. The relevant submission is #1037 PC 14.

In order to respond to the submission #1037, it would assist us to have additional information from the owner regarding their plans and intentions for the heritage scheduled buildings and setting, if they were willing to share that information – eg demolish fire damaged sections/ rebuild damaged sections/ repair and retain the least damaged buildings – eg chapel and dormitory. Or do they have wider development plans for the site?

It would also be useful to have access (provided the owner is willing to share them) to any structural reports/ damage reports/ Quantity surveying costings for repair and strengthening/insurance coverage and any gap between insurance cover and costs to repair/rebuild.

If the owner decides to lodge a further submission related to submission #1037, supporting information could be included with that if the owner desired.

If you are in a position to, could you please forward this information and my request for further information to the owner.

A site visit may also be required – I understand the safety issues with the site and have discussed visiting with Richard Gant in building consents. He advised it may be safe to view the buildings from a distance. Would the owner be willing to allow access to the site?

In terms of timeframes – we are working towards lodging Council evidence in early August.

Kind regards,
Amanda

Amanda Ohs

Senior Heritage Advisor

Heritage Team, Planning and Consents

Infrastructure, Planning and Regulatory Services

Christchurch City Council

<image001.jpg>

<image002.png> 03 941 8292

<image003.png> Amanda.ohs@ccc.govt.nz; heritage@ccc.govt.nz

<image004.png> Te Hononga Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch 8013

<image005.png> PO Box 73012, Christchurch 8154

<image006.png> <https://ccc.govt.nz/culture-and-community/heritage>
