

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

**of an application by JD Phillips (LU
2018/357) to the Gore District Council**

Minute of the Hearing Commissioners

1. This application was heard before us in Gore on Tuesday, 5 May 2018 and concerns an application for the proposed demolition of the scheduled heritage building at 128 Main Street Gore, and an application for its replacement by a new single storey commercial building.
2. The hearing was then adjourned pending a subsequent site visit which we undertook in the afternoon. During our initial deliberations following this, we noted that the Council's s 42A report on the application was not accompanied by an independent assessment of the likely costs of structural strengthening of the heritage building at 128 Main Street. Secondly, we had some concerns with the design of the proposed replacement building.
3. We accept that the building is below 34% NBS, and is earthquake prone. For this reason, we agree that for it to be usable in the future, and to have a realistic prospect of being tenanted, it would require upgrading and refurbishment. We also accept that the cost of such upgrading and refurbishment is a relevant consideration in our assessment and decision as to whether this application should be granted or declined. (Gore District Plan, Policy 2.5.4 (6), Southland Regional Policy Statement 2017, Policy HH2).
4. An assessment of potential strengthening and refurbishing costs was undertaken on behalf of the applicant by Mr Peter Cooper of Jones and Cooper Builders Ltd, and attached as Appendix 1 to the brief of evidence by Mr Watt, the applicant's planning consultant. We note that Mr Cooper is a submitter in support of the application. Reference was also made in the AEE by Mr Watt to an 'estimate' for strengthening by Mr Michael Sheridan (who prepared a report for the building on its structural integrity).
5. We emphasise at this stage that we are not asserting that the evidence relied on by Mr Watt is unreliable or inaccurate. However we are conscious that this is a scheduled heritage building, and it is important that there be an independent assessment of the costs of

strengthening and refurbishment, given that this is a determinative issue in this case. We would also emphasise at this point that no decision has been made on the application.

6. Given these concerns, we request the Council to obtain an independent assessment of the costs of strengthening and refurbishing the current building, having regard to the information provided in Mr Cooper's assessment contained in Appendix 1 to Mr Watt's brief of evidence.
7. A second concern of the Commission is the external appearance of the proposed building which is very unsympathetic, and indeed strongly contrasts, with the character of the existing heritage building. While we accept that a two-storey replacement building may not be economic, and any new building has to be functional and provide contemporary standards of accommodation, we consider there is scope in terms of the facade treatment of the new building to make it more sympathetic to its predecessor.
8. Accordingly we request that the applicant provide further information with respect to whether it would be possible to (1) make use of brick as a facade material as a veneer on the street frontages, and possibly that salvaged from the existing building, and (2) a veranda style and treatment which is more characteristic of the existing building.
9. We request that this information be provided to the Council by Friday 29 June 2018, and then circulated to the reporting officer for her information, and to the applicant for their comment in writing with respect to the supplementary information on strengthening and refurbishment costs. We do not anticipate reconvening the hearing.



(Signed)
Bob Nixon, Chair, Hearings Commission