

**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 hearing of submissions on Plan
Change 13 (Heritage) to the
Christchurch District Plan

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF STEPHEN HOGG ON BEHALF OF
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

HERITAGE ENGINEERING

17 June 2025

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

1. My name is Stephen James Hogg. I am a Technical Director in the structural engineering buildings group at Aurecon's Christchurch office.
2. I have prepared evidence on behalf of the **Christchurch City Council** to provide structural engineering technical evidence on the submissions seeking that Daresbury and Antonio Hall buildings be removed from the Schedule. I reaffirm that I am complying with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in presenting this summary of my evidence and responding to the submitter's evidence.
3. My evidence is based on my site inspection of Daresbury Homestead and the review of relevant documentation for both sites.
4. My evidence addresses the structural engineering matter of whether there are viable engineering options to repair the buildings to a safe and useable condition.
5. In relation to Daresbury Homestead the most detailed engineering assessment reports are those prepared by Quoin Consulting Engineers **(Appendix A of my PC14 evidence in chief)**. I consider these are the most relevant reports when considering the viable engineering options to repair the buildings to a safe and useable condition.
6. In the case of Daresbury Homestead, I agree with the damage assessment and broadly agree with the repair methodology proposed by Quoin Consulting Engineers. I consider other repair options such as shotcrete skin walls or fibre overlay are available which have not been fully evaluated; however, I also consider it is unlikely that these options will make a significant difference to the overall cost of repair.
7. In relation to Daresbury Homestead I have read the evidence prepared by Jonathan Cleese on behalf of Daresbury Limited and on behalf of Church Property Trustees.
8. I do not consider there is additional evidence that would change my opinions
9. In relation to Antonio Hall, I have not visited this site but have reviewed engineering reports and photos **(Appendix I and Appendix J of my PC14 evidence in chief)**. I consider it is technically possible to repair and strengthen the accommodation wing and the chapel which I consider can be

reinstated as standalone structures. They will both require strengthening. I agree with Lewis and Barrow's methods for strengthening (**Appendix I**) and note that other alternative options might be available.

10. I consider the repair and strengthening of Daresbury Homestead and the accommodation wing and chapel of Antonio Hall is possible from a technical structural engineering viewpoint however I have not considered the economic feasibility to do so.

Date: 17 June 2025

Stephen Hogg