

---

**REPORT 6**

**BUILT HERITAGE INCENTIVE FUND MARCH 2014**

---

**1. Purpose of Report**

This report provides recommendations for the distribution of the Council's Built Heritage Incentive Fund (BHIF).

**2. Executive Summary**

The Built Heritage Incentive Fund helps conserve, restore and protect Wellington's heritage-listed buildings and objects. During the 2012-22 Long Term Plan deliberations it was agreed that the Fund should focus on "*on remedying earthquake prone related features or securing conservation plans / initial reports from engineers.*"

This is the final of three rounds scheduled for the 2013/14 financial year with a total of \$400,000 available to allocate over the year. This final round has a total of \$164,000 available.

For this final round of the 2013/14, eleven applications are seeking funding of **\$479,203**. Six applications are for seismic strengthening of heritage buildings; three of which are for physical works to be undertaken and the other three for seismic investigation or design. The remaining five applications are for repair, restoration or maintenance of heritage buildings.

Officers recommend that eleven applicants be allocated a total of **\$164,000** (excluding GST if applicable).

**3. Recommendations**

It is recommended that the Transport and Urban Development Committee:

1. *Receive the information.*
2. *Agree to the allocation of Built Heritage Incentive Fund Grants as recommended at Section 5.1.3 and summarised in Appendix Tw*

## **4. Background**

The Built Heritage Incentive Fund (BHIF) is a key initiative of the Wellington Heritage Policy 2010. The policy demonstrates Council's "commitment to the city's built heritage to current owners, the community, visitors to the city and to future generations". The BHIF helps meet some of the additional costs associated with owning and caring for a heritage property.

The BHIF had \$400,000 available in the 2013/2014 financial year to be distributed over three separate rounds. There is also provision for any unspent money from the Heritage Resource Consent Fee Reimbursement Fund (\$50,000) to be diverted to the Built Heritage Incentive Fund for this final 2013/14 funding round.

Criteria for the fund are included as Appendix One.

Work proposed in the BHIF applications is to start once funding has been allocated. Grants are paid out. Successful applicants have 18 months to undertake the work and provide evidence of completion to Officers before the grant is paid out.

## **5. Discussion**

### **5.1 Built Heritage Incentive Fund**

#### **5.1.1 Applications received**

Eleven applications were received this round seeking funding of \$479,203. The original information provided through the online applications has been made available to Councillors through the Hub dashboard.

Of the \$400,000 available in the 2013/14, \$125,127 was allocated in the July 2013 funding round and \$217,000 was allocated for the November 2013 round.

\$164,000 is available for allocation in this final BHIF round for the 2013/14 financial year. This includes the balance of the unspent money from the Heritage Resource Consent Fee Reimbursement Fund and previous unpaid allocations from 2008-2011 funds.

The recommendation is that a share of \$164,000 be allocated to all eleven applications, utilising remaining funds for the 2013/14 fund. \$59,000 of the available funds has come from unpaid allocations as a result of funds not being uplifted from previous allocations (2008-2011).

#### **5.1.2 Proactive work**

During the 2013/14 financial year, officers have utilised the \$40,000 made available for proactive BHIF work by holding an interactive workshop on Cuba Street in November 2013, publishing a brochure to promote the fund and to appointing Vivian Rickard (former Principal Heritage Advisor WCC) to liaise directly with earthquake

prone heritage building owners. These tasks include encouraging BHIF applications, facilitating dialogue with neighbouring property owners with a view to joint strengthening schemes, as well as collating information about specific properties' financial needs in relation to strengthening their building.

A number of building owner meetings are being planned to be carried out in the run up to the 2014/15 BHIF rounds, the first of which is planned to focus on Newtown, John Street and Berhampore Heritage Areas. The first of three 2014/15 BHIF rounds closes on 1 August 2014.

### **5.1.3 Funding allocation process**

During the 2012/22 Long Term Plan deliberations it was agreed that the BHIF will focus on “*on remedying earthquake prone related features or securing conservation plans / initial reports from engineers.*” As such, this work has been given a higher priority in this funding round. Other work the BHIF will consider includes the repair or restoration of original heritage fabric (e.g. repairs to joinery or glazing), protective works on archaeological sites, and maintenance reports.

The following factors are considered in determining the support of BHIF applications:

- the risk of the heritage value diminishing if funding is not granted
- confidence in the proposed quality of the work/professional advice
- the project is visible and/or accessible to the public
- the project will provide a benefit to the community.

Continuing on from above, consideration is then given to the following when recommending the amount of funding:

- the value of the funding request
- the value of the funding request when considered against the total project cost
- the value of discrete stages of the project relating to immediate risk
- parity with similar projects in previous rounds
- equitable distribution in the current round
- the amount of funding available for allocation.

To ensure funds are used appropriately, conditions may be suggested in certain circumstances should funding be approved.

### **5.1.4 Officers' recommendations**

It is recommended that:

- All eleven applicants be allocated a total of \$164,000 from the BHIF.
- All applications have provided the necessary information to be accepted as valid applications under the criteria for the fund.

Officers have assessed the eleven applications received this round against the current priority and criteria of the BHIF. Particular regard has been given to building's current ability to achieve the National Building Standard (NBS). It is recommended that the applications be allocated funding as follows:

	<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Total Cost</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Recommended ex GST if applicable</b>
1	24 Waitoa Road, Hataitai – Repiling of building	\$32,027	\$31,510	\$10,000
2	Thorndon School Hall, 20 Turnbull Street, Thorndon – Seismic strengthening works to school hall	\$126,961	\$50,000	\$15,000
3	8 Salisbury Court, Wadestown – restore and repaint residential building	\$38,978.79	\$28,979	\$5,000
4	Dominion Building, 78-84 Victoria Street – Seismic engineering assessment report	\$49,785	\$25,000	\$10,000
5	Inverleith Apartments, 306 Oriental Parade – Seismic Investigations	\$26,967	\$26,967	\$10,000
6	Chesney Wold House, 372 Karori Road – Repair and maintenance of house	\$22,616	\$ 8,640	\$4,000
7	179 Riddiford Street, Newtown – repair and make good external wall cracking and replica parapet	\$217,645	\$95,000	\$15,000
8	4 Rintoul Street, Newtown - Design and project management of front window reinstatement including seismic portal frame	\$8,900	\$8,900	\$5,000
9	147 The Parade, Island Bay – seismic assessment, design and strengthening works	\$99,664	\$64,664	\$30,000
10	Former BNZ building, 79 Manners Street, Te Aro – Seismic engineering investigations	\$65,741	\$50,642	\$30,000
11	Former Sydney Street Substation, 19 Kate Sheppard Place, Thorndon – Seismic engineering assessment, design and strengthening works	\$88,905	\$88,905	\$30,000
		<b>\$778,192</b>	<b>\$479,203</b>	<b>\$164,000</b>

### **5.1.5 Officers' consideration**

A detailed discussion for each of the eleven applications recommended to be allocated funding is outlined in Appendix Three. The discussions include the project description, outcomes for heritage and comparisons to previous grants.

Officers are satisfied that there are no conflicts of interest involved in any of the applications.

### **5.1.6 Financial Considerations**

The recommended allocations for this round of the BHIF are within the funding levels provided for in the 2013/14 Annual Plan.

### **5.1.7 Long-Term Plan Considerations**

The recommended allocations for this round the BHIF are consistent with the priorities of the Long Term Plan.

Contact Officers:

*Trevor Keppel, Senior Heritage Advisor, City Planning and Design.*

*Mark Farrar, Senior Advisor, Funding and Relationships*

*Phil Railton-Jacks, Funding Advisor*

## Supporting Information

### 1) Strategic Fit / Strategic Outcome

*The Smart Capital strategy identifies four goals which link directly to the Built Heritage Incentive Fund:*

- *People-centred city – resilience comes from confidence in the safety of the building stock. A strong sense of identity and ‘place’ extends to Suburban Centre Heritage Areas with eligibility to this Fund;*
- *Connected city – protection of access and public transport routes by strengthening adjacent buildings;*
- *Eco-city – re-use of older building stock (embodied energy) is target through this Fund;*
- *Dynamic central city – the diversity of cultures and buildings are what forms the history of the city and this Fund allows owners to continue to tell Wellington’s ‘story’.*

### 2) LTCCP/Annual Plan reference and long term financial impact

*\$360,000 has been allocated to this project in the 2013/2014 and 2014/15 years only.*

### 3) Treaty of Waitangi considerations

*[None.](#)*

### 4) Decision-Making

*Not a significant decision for Local Government Act matters.*

### 5) Consultation

#### a) General Consultation

*Consultation has occurred as part of the development of the Built Heritage Policy.*

#### b) Consultation with Maori

*N/A*

### 6) Legal Implications

*No legal advice has been sought for this round of the Heritage Incentive Fund.*

### 7) Consistency with existing policy

*This initiative is consistent with existing Council policy.*

## Appendix One

### **BUILT HERITAGE INCENTIVE FUND Full Criteria**

#### **Prerequisites**

1. The project makes a positive contribution to achieving the Council's Strategic Outcomes as listed in the Council's Long Term Plan.
2. The project is within Wellington city.
3. The project relates to buildings and objects listed in the District Plan, or to buildings and objects identified as contributing to a heritage area listed in the District Plan.
4. The project conserves and enhances the heritage significance of the item where elements of the item are protected by provisions of the District Plan (eg the exterior of a heritage place).
5. The applicant is the owner or part-owner of the heritage building or object (eg a private owner, or a charitable trust including church organisations). The Crown, Crown entities, district health boards, community boards, Council controlled organisations and Council business units are not eligible for this funding.

#### **6. Assessment**

The project must be for:

- a. stabilisation, repair or restoration of original heritage fabric relating to historic buildings, structures, or objects or their remains (eg repairs to masonry, joinery, plaster or glazing, earthquake strengthening, fire protection, protective works on archaeological sites) OR
- b. professional services (eg structural strengthening reports, maintenance reports, conservation plans, archaeological site assessments, conservation work specifications, or supervision of work, technical advice etc) OR
- c. reimbursement of Council resource consent fees for work which the Council supports as not harming heritage values, and where consent is required as a result of heritage listing

**Note:** A project which has received funding for either a or b above is not eligible for c - reimbursement of Council resource consent fees.

#### **7. Administrative**

The applicant provides evidence of:

- appropriate project management
- appropriate technical supervision
- sufficient resources to complete the project on time
- demonstrated ability to report back on the project results as appropriate.

8. Applications for funds over \$3,000 will be considered only if a heritage report or advice from a qualified conservation professional is provided or budgeted for in the proposal.

9. Grants will only be assessed as a percentage of the heritage conservation component of a project, not of the total project cost. The grant assessment is at the sole discretion of the Council.

10. Only applications for work that has not yet commenced will be accepted for consideration.

### **Meeting the Council's strategic outcomes**

In particular, projects are considered relevant if they contribute to the following outcomes in the Council's Long Term Plan:

6.5 Our overall aim is to make the city more liveable, retain its character, and enhance an even stronger 'sense of place' through continual improvement to public areas.

The repair and conservation of listed heritage buildings provides a positive contribution to achieving a 'stronger sense of place'.



## Appendix Two

### Recommendations, Built Heritage Incentive Fund Allocations – March 2014


	Project	Purpose	Additional Conditions	Amount recommended (ex GST if applicable)
1	24 Waitoa Road, Hataitai	Repiling of building	Release of funds subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WCC Heritage Team's onsite approval of works</li> <li>• Evidence of discussions with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust about archaeological provisions that might be required to undertake ground work.</li> </ul>	\$10,000
2	Thorndon School Hall, 20 Turnbull Street, Thorndon	Earthquake strengthening works to school hall	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WCC Heritage Team's onsite approval of works.</li> <li>• Evidence of discussions with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust about archaeological provisions that might be required to undertake ground work.</li> </ul>	\$15,000
3	8 Salisbury Court, Wadestown	Restore and repaint residential building	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WCC Heritage Team's on site approval of works.</li> </ul>	\$5,000
4	Dominion Building, 78-84 Victoria Street	Seismic engineering assessment report	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report to be submitted to WCC</li> </ul>	\$10,000
5	Inverleith Apartments, 306 Oriental Parade	Seismic engineering assessment report	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports to be submitted to WCC</li> </ul>	\$10,000

6	Chesney Wold House, 372 Karori Road	Repair and maintenance works	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The WCC Heritage Team's on site approval of works</li> </ul>	\$4,000
7	179 Riddiford Street, Newtown	Works to repair and make good external wall cracking and replicate parapet	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The WCC Heritage Team's on site approval of works.</li> </ul>	\$15,000
8	4 Rintoul Street, Newtown	Design and project management of front window reinstatement including seismic portal frame	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design plans to be submitted to WCC</li> </ul>	\$5,000
9	147 The Parade, Island Bay	Seismic engineering assessment, design and strengthening works	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report and plans to be submitted to WCC</li> <li>Evidence of discussions with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust about archaeological provisions that might be required to undertake ground work.</li> <li>The WCC Heritage Team's on site approval of works.</li> </ul>	\$30,000
10	Former BNZ building, 79 Manners Street, Te Aro	Seismic engineering investigations	Release of funds is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports (including conservation architect input) and plans to be submitted to WCC</li> <li>The WCC Heritage Team's on site approval of investigation works.</li> </ul>	\$30,000
11	Former Sydney Street Substation, 19 Kate Sheppard Place, Thorndon.	Seismic engineering assessment, seismic design and	Release of funds subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports and plans to be submitted to</li> </ul>	\$30,000


		strengthening works	<p>WCC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of discussions with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust about archaeological provisions that might be required to undertake ground work.</li> <li>• The WCC Heritage Team's on site approval of works.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Total</b>			<b>\$164,000</b>

## Appendix Three


### Detailed Discussions for the Applications to the Built Heritage Incentive Fund – March 2014

<b>Project 1</b>	24 Waitoa Road, Hataitai
<b>Applicant</b>	Anita Williams
<b>Project:</b>	Re-piling of building
<b>Recommended Grant ex GST if applicable</b>	\$10,000
	<p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This building contributes to the Hataitai Suburban Centre Heritage Area (District Plan Map 6, Symbol 36).</li> <li>• The building has an interesting local history, being comprised of two shops, one of which (24a) has been a fruiterers or greengrocers for much of its history. During the 1920s the Hwong family operated a laundry in one shop and a fruiterers in the other. Nelson Young occupied the building as a greengrocer in the late 1960s.</li> <li>• The building retains much of its authenticity, not least for its prominent parapet, bull-nosed verandah and original recessed shopfront composition.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Description</b>	Re-piling the building
<b>The Issue</b>	The building's footings are structurally unsound. The applicant states that large parts of the floor have collapsed over the years and some floorboards are sitting on dirt ground, other parts have false floor built over old floorboards. The floor undulates, slopes and is generally uneven. Re-piling has been delayed for over a decade because of cost.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>The proposal is supported from a heritage perspective given the urgent need for the repairs, and potential complete structural failure if neglected further, which would result in one of Hataitai's treasures being lost forever.</p> <p>Although the building is not captured by the earthquake prone</p>

	<p>building program, this structural work fits with the current priority of the BHIF and is consistent with other examples of work required to structurally strengthen a building of this nature, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structural integrity through repair project and reinstatement of working spouting and downpipes; 332 Tinakori Road; \$15,000; August 2012 round.</li> <li>• Structural works and restoration; Nott House – 400 Middleton Road, Glenside; \$30,000</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated retaining heritage fabric in a heritage building.</li> <li>• Contribute towards the continued value the building has to the Hataitai Suburban Centre Heritage Area</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Release of funds will be subject to evidence of discussions with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust about archaeological provisions that might be required to undertake ground work, and The WCC Heritage Team's onsite approval of works</li> </ul>


<b>Project 2</b>	Thorndon School Hall, 20 Turnbull Street, Thorndon
<b>Applicant</b>	Board of Trustees of the Thorndon School Hall
<b>Project</b>	Earthquake strengthening works to school hall
<b>Recommended Grant</b> ex GST if applicable	\$15,000
	<p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan: Individually Listed Building; Map 18 Reference 276, 'Old St Paul's Schoolroom'</li> <li>• The Old St Paul's Schoolroom is a fine example of a 19<sup>th</sup> century timber Gothic ecclesiastic/school building. The exterior is notable for its simple overall form and for its decorative north façade, and the interior is notable for its fine timber 'stepped-vault' ceiling.</li> <li>• The building has historic significance for its construction and long use by the Anglican Church.</li> <li>• Now over 110 years old, the building has been used for many church and community activities giving it a social significance complementary to that of its parent church.</li> <li>• A large amount of original fabric remains, giving the building technical interest and a very high level of authenticity.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Description</b>	Earthquake strengthening works to school hall
<b>The Issue</b>	The building is currently not of the earthquake prone building list. It is thought to be able to achieve approximately 50% of NBS, however the Parish wish to secure the building's long term use by bringing it up above 67% of the NBS.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	The building owners have had a structural design plan carried out by seismic engineers, which will strengthen the building with internal changes proposed only. The owners wish for funding assistance to carry out this work in order to retain the building and its historic value to the school into the future. The project is supported from a heritage perspective given that only minor changes to the exterior are proposed. Given the use of the building it is thought to be of high importance to

	<p>strengthen.</p> <p>This work fits with the current priority of the BHIF and is consistent with other examples of work required to strengthen a building of this nature.</p> <p>The grant amount recommended for this project is consistent with previous grants for similar work and scale, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adelphi Finance House, 15 Courtenay Place; Earthquake strengthening of building; \$18,750</li> <li>• Morgan Building, 199 Cuba Street; Major works including seismic strengthening; \$18,000</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated retaining heritage fabric in a heritage building contribute to the cost of seismic strengthening works</li> <li>• Endorse Council recognition of a potential hazard to the community</li> <li>• Acknowledge and protect the heritage values of this individually listed building.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WCC Heritage Team's onsite approval of works.</li> <li>• Evidence of discussions with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust about archaeological provisions that might be required to undertake ground work.</li> </ul>

<b>Project 3</b>	8 Salisbury Court, Wadestown
<b>Applicant</b>	Carla Ray Vasquez
<b>Project</b>	Restore and repaint residential building
<b>Recommended Grant</b> ex GST if applicable	\$5,000
	<p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan: Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area; Map 15, 18 reference 24</li> <li>• Salisbury Garden Court has very great historical significance as a highly experimental and radical Depression era housing development. Based on American examples seen by its devisers Herbert and Kate Pillar, the housing scheme ushered in a unique (for the time) concept of communal living in New Zealand and despite the many changes that have occurred over the years the sense of community is still strongly evident. As such, the Court has considerable group value.</li> <li>• 8 Salisbury Garden Court is a typical example of this historic housing scheme and contributes well to the heritage area.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Description</b>	Restore and repaint residential building
<b>The Issue</b>	The building is not considered earthquake prone under the NBS as it is exempt from assessment under the standard. The building is, however in a poor state of repair and the new owners wish to restore to repair it to improve the drainage system, weather tightness, and repaint to improve its appearance.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>The improvements proposed will bring this house back into usable condition. The weather tightness and drainage works are urgent in nature and will allow the house to continue to be functional as well as contribute to this important heritage area.</p> <p>Previous grants for similar work include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structural repair project and reinstatement of working</li> </ul>



	<p>spouting and downpipes; 332 Tinakori Road; \$15,000; August 2012 round.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repainting works to the cottage; 194A Sydney Street West (Rita Angus Cottage); \$5,000</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated retaining heritage fabric and replacing 'like with like' in a heritage building.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	<p>Release of funds is subject to the WCC Heritage Team's onsite approval of works</p>

<b>Project 4</b>	Dominion Building, 78-84 Victoria Street
<b>Applicant</b>	Boyden Evans
<b>Project</b>	Seismic engineering assessment report
<b>Recommended Grant</b> ex GST if applicable	\$10,000
	<p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan: Individually Listed Building (Dominion Building); Map 17, Symbol 317</li> <li>• The Dominion Building is an excellent example of a Stripped Classical commercial building designed in a Chicago-inspired architectural style. It is notable for the quality of its design, materials and workmanship, particularly the Caen Stone external cladding (now over-painted), marble clad interiors, pressed metal spandrel panels, and steel windows.</li> <li>• Situated on the curved corner of Victoria and Mercer streets, the Dominion Building is a prominent and dignified structure in Wellington's townscape.</li> <li>• The Dominion Building is historically significant because it housed <i>The Dominion</i> newspaper and printery for almost fifty years.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Description</b>	Seismic engineering assessment report
<b>The Issue</b>	The building is not considered earthquake prone under the NBS. It is thought to be approximately 42% of NBS and the owner wishes to improve this by investigating two primary sheer walls.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>Strengthening of these walls could significantly improve the building's %NBS and secure the long term future of this historically important building. The work fits with the current priority of the BHIF and the applicant has engaged a conservation architect to oversee the project.</p> <p>The grant amount recommended for this project is</p>

	<p>consistent with previous grants for similar work and scale, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design and documentation of seismic upgrade work, Jaycee Building, 99-101 Willis Street, \$12,500, March 2012 round;</li> <li>• Riddiford Court Body Corp; Seismic strengthening solution; \$15,000; March 2011 round</li> <li>• Major works to key heritage features; windows, cupola, sign, façade panels; Dominion Building, 80 Victoria Street; \$25,000; March 2012 round</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated maintaining a heritage building;</li> <li>• Endorse Council recognition of a potential hazard to the community and visitors;</li> <li>• Acknowledge and protect the heritage values of this individually listed heritage building.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	Reports to be submitted to WCC

<b>Project 5</b>	Inverleith Apartments, 306 Oriental Parade
<b>Applicant</b>	Inverleith Body Corporate
<b>Project</b>	Seismic engineering assessment report
<b>Recommended Grant</b> ex GST if applicable	\$10,000




### Building Information


- District Plan: Individually Listed Building; Map 12, Symbol 245
- Inverleith is one of the earliest city high rise luxury apartment buildings in Wellington city. Designed in an Inter War Stripped Free Classical style, this building was revolutionary at the time in providing a form of city living not familiar in post World War I Wellington.
- This apartment block has had a quiet history and its historical importance is tied to its representative values, it demonstrates how attractive Oriental Bay was becoming as a place to live, and the changing styles of urban living in Wellington City. It is also associated with its architects, prominent firm Clere and Williams.
- This building is of technical interest as it is an early example of a high rise apartment block in Wellington and became the precedent for larger successors such as Wharenui, Craigsidem and Jerningham

<b>Project Description</b>	Seismic engineering assessment report
<b>The Issue</b>	The building is not considered to be earthquake prone. It is thought to be approximately 41% of NBS, however the body corporate wish to achieve above 67% by undertaking a detailed engineering assessment as the first step towards seismic improvements.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	The applicant states that the results of the detailed assessment will guide what the body corporate can do in order to improve the structural safety of the building. The applicant states that beyond

	<p>the engineering assessment phase, the body corporate will investigate the geotechnical conditions prior to deciding on the preferred strengthening solution.</p> <p>The proposed work fits with the current priority of the BHIF and is consistent with other examples of work required to strengthen a building of this nature, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design, develop and install earthquake strengthening; 130 Riddiford Street, Newtown; \$10,000; March 2012 round.</li> <li>• Riddiford Court Body Corp; Seismic strengthening solution; \$15,000; March 2011 round</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorse Council recognition of a potential hazard to the community on a high profile traffic and pedestrian route</li> <li>• Acknowledge and protect the heritage values of this individually listed building.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	Report to be submitted to WCC

<b>Project 6</b>	Chesney Wold House, 372 Karori Road
<b>Applicant</b>	Julia Rowling
<b>Project</b>	Repair and maintenance of house
<b>Recommended Grant</b> (ex GST if applicable)	\$4,000
	<p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan: Individually Listed Building; Map 11, Symbol 169</li> <li>• The house has architectural interest, not for its design features, but for the long history of change that has seen it transformed in major ways. Its complex physical history makes it an exemplar of the adaptability of timber buildings and the ability to respond to changing needs.</li> <li>• This house has historical value for its association with its original owner Stephen Lancaster, a prominent early Wellingtonian, and with the Beauchamp family and Katherine Mansfield. It is also historically important for its age, as it is among the city's older houses (circa 1866).</li> <li>• Chesney Wold has been significantly altered from the time of its original construction, and since the time that Katherine Mansfield's stories detail. It is representative of the adaptability of timber buildings and the ability to respond to changing needs, although careful examination is needed to determine what, if any, original fabric remains.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Project Description</b></p>

<b>The Issue</b>	The building has had many alterations to it over time including a new entranceway to its former side elevation. This new entrance and deck above has serious weather tightness issues that the new owner wishes to address.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>The repair and maintenance works will alter a relatively recent addition to the building, which is not weather tight. The changes will not alter any original or significant fabric and is considered to be essential and urgent works to ensure the long term viability of the building as a residence.</p> <p>The proposed work is consistent with other examples of work required to repair and maintain a building of this nature, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repair and restoration of the cottage’s exterior front façade; 48 Tarikaka Street, Ngaio; \$3,000; July 2013 round;</li> <li>• Exterior repairs and reinstatement; 218 Rintoul Street, Newtown; \$10,000; June 2012 round.</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated retaining heritage fabric and replacing ‘like with like’ in a heritage building.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	The WCC Heritage Team’s on site approval of works

<b>Project 7</b>	179 Riddiford Street, Newtown
<b>Applicant</b>	Melipo Kaldelis
	Repair and make good external wall cracking and replica parapet
<b>Recommended Grant</b> (ex GST if applicable)	\$15,000
	
<p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan: Individually Listed Building (Map 6, Symbol 403), Heritage Building in Newtown Central Shopping Centre Heritage Area (Map 6, Symbol 33).</li> <li>• The building is composed in a formal late Victorian neo-Classical style and has undergone several important changes over time. The prevailing impression of the building today is one of its time as a picture theatre.</li> <li>• This building contributes to the Newtown Central Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</li> <li>• Sited on a particularly prominent street corner, the former Ascot Theatre is a grand late-Victorian building.</li> <li>• The building has a strong association with cinema in Wellington and was a meeting place for many local residents.</li> </ul>	
<b>Project Description</b>	Works to repair and make good external wall cracking and replicate parapet
<b>The Issue</b>	<p>During the 2013 seismic events cracking has appeared to one of the exterior (west-facing) bay on the building. The owner wishes to repair this damage by stitching the brick walling on this bay and replacing the stucco render like for like. The works also include a replica lightweight parapet to this bay.</p> <p>The building owner has been issued a notice under section 124 of the Building Act 2004. The notice signifies that the building is earthquake prone as its seismic performance, based on</p>



	engineering advice, falls below 33% of New Build Standard, and is required to be strengthened to above 33% or face demolition.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>While the building is earthquake prone (falling below 33% of NBS), the works will not change this but simply repair the damage from seismic activity. It is stated in the engineering quotation submitted that this work should not be considered seismic strengthening. It is thought that the underlying weakness causing the damage is sub-soil slippage under this bay. The owners state that they are not in a position to direct funds towards addressing this issue. The works therefore do not represent engineering or heritage best practice, however they will remove an identified immediate threat (the damaged bay's unreinforced masonry parapet) and replicate in lightweight materials. The brick stitching will also be made good in a like for like manner. It is therefore considered to be a worthwhile project and eligible for BHIF assistance.</p> <p>The proposed work is consistent with other examples of work required to repair and maintain a building of this nature, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repairs of cracking in the heritage façade; Body Corp 350418 (The NZX ex Odlins Building); \$15,000; November 2010.</li> <li>• Repair and paint exterior of the Chancery; Cook Island High Commission 56 Mulgrave St, Thorndon; \$8,000.00; March 2010 round.</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorse Council recognition of a potential hazard to the community on a high profile traffic and pedestrian route;</li> <li>• Acknowledge and protect the heritage values of this individually listed building.</li> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated retaining heritage fabric and replacing 'like with like' in a heritage building.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	The WCC Heritage Team's on site approval of works.

<b>Project 8</b>	4 Rintoul Street, Newtown
<b>Applicant</b>	Mike Stewart
<b>Project</b>	Design and project management of front window reinstatement including seismic portal frame
<b>Recommended Grant (ex GST if applicable)</b>	\$5,000




### Building Information

- District Plan: Heritage Building in Newtown Central Shopping Centre Heritage Area (Map 6, Symbol 33).
- 4 Rintoul Street is a mixed-use, pre-1900 Victorian building with a carefully proportioned original upper façade and an original bull-nose corrugated iron verandah.
- 4 and 6 Rintoul Street have group value as a pair of near-identical buildings constructed together as a speculative venture by John Priest in 1897.
- This building contributes to the townscape of the Newtown Shopping Centre Heritage Area; a near-continuous group of late 19th and early 20th century buildings that are located on, or around, Riddiford Street between Newtown Avenue and Mein Street.

<b>Project Description</b>	Design and project management of front window reinstatement including seismic portal frame.
<b>The Issue</b>	The building has been subject to fire in recent years which cause significant damage to the front façade. It has been given a new lease of life with a new tenant establishing 'Monterrey' bar. The tenants and owners wish to make some improvements to the bar including the reinstatement of a front window with a portal frame to give the front façade seismic strength.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	The proposal has significant merit in that it aims to reinstate the ground floor façade to its original configuration, activate the street front, as well as installing some seismic strength to the front

	<p>portion of the building. The works would achieve a detailed design in preparation for resource and building consent applications.</p> <p>The grant amount recommended for this project is consistent with previous grants for similar work and scale, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repair and restoration of original exterior building fabric and insulation of exterior walls; 29 Tarikaka St, Ngaio; \$3,000.00; Jul 2011 round.</li> <li>• Repair and restoration of original exterior building fabric and insulation of exterior walls; 37 Tarikaka St, Ngaio; \$3,000.00; Jul 2011 round.</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated retaining heritage fabric and replacing 'like with like' in a heritage building.</li> <li>• Endorse Council recognition of a potential hazard to the community on a high profile traffic and pedestrian route;</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	<p>Release of funds is subject to the WCC Heritage Team's onsite approval of works.</p>

<b>Project 9</b>	147 The Parade, Island Bay
<b>Applicant</b>	Rajendra Patel
<b>Project</b>	Seismic engineering assessment, design and strengthening works
<b>Recommended Grant</b> (ex GST if applicable)	\$30,000
	<p><b>Building Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Plan: Island Bay Heritage Area; Map 4, Symbol 25;</li> <li>• The building makes a significant contribution to Island Bay Village Heritage Area., which has considerable heritage value as one of Wellington's best preserved groups of early 20<sup>th</sup> century commercial buildings.</li> <li>• The building is part of a pair of shops, and is a good representative example of an early 20<sup>th</sup> Century commercial development in outer suburban Wellington.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Project Description</b></p> <p>Seismic engineering assessment, design and strengthening works</p>
<b>The Issue</b>	The building was issued a notice under section 124 of the Building Act 2004. The notice signifies that the building is earthquake prone as its seismic performance, based on engineering advice, falls below 33% of the NBS. It is currently thought to be able to achieve 28% of the NBS.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>The owner is seeking to ensure the long term viability of the building by increasing its seismic performance to above 67%.</p> <p>The applicant has had some early design drawings carried out and these have been reviewed by a recognised conservation architect as being appropriate for the building. The internal portal frame proposed will be partly visible from the exterior of the building but this is to be minimal.</p> <p>The detailed design and strengthening works applied for will</p>

	<p>maintain the quality and longevity of this significant and prominent heritage building.</p> <p>The proposed work fits with the current priority of the BHIF and is consistent with other examples of work required to strengthen a building of this nature, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structural investigation and design for strengthening; The Plumbers Building, 124 Wakefield Street, Te Aro; \$25,000; March 2013;</li> <li>• Morgan Building, 199 Cuba Street; Major works including seismic strengthening; \$18,000.</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorse Council recognition of a potential hazard to the community on a high profile traffic and pedestrian route;</li> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated retaining heritage fabric and replacing 'like with like' in a heritage building.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	<p>Release of funds is subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report and plans to be submitted to WCC;</li> <li>• Evidence of discussions with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust about archaeological provisions that might be required to undertake ground work;</li> <li>• The WCC Heritage Team's on site approval of works.</li> </ul>

<b>Project 10</b>	Former BNZ building, 79 Manners Street, Te Aro
<b>Applicant</b>	Rasbeer Gill
<b>Project</b>	Seismic engineering investigations
<b>Recommended Grant</b> (ex GST if applicable)	\$30,000



#### **Building Information**

- District Plan: Individually Listed Heritage Building; Map 16, Symbol 374.
- Designed by prominent architect William Turnbull in 1912, this building has architectural value for its richly-ornamented facade designed in the Edwardian Baroque style, and an impressive banking chamber, largely intact.
- The building has historic significance as the second oldest surviving BNZ building in Wellington after the former BNZ Head Office buildings. It served as a BNZ branch for over 80 years and played a significant role in the commercial life of Te Aro in that time.
- The building has considerable townscape significance, occupying a prominent corner site in what is a major focal point within the city.
- The construction technology used in this building is significant. The technique of using steel framing encased in concrete was advanced for its time and gives the structure distinct technical value in a city where the frequency and strength of earthquakes was a serious challenge to building designers.

<b>Project Description</b>	Seismic engineering investigations
<b>The Issue</b>	The building is classified by Council as being ‘potentially earthquake prone’, meaning that further investigations are required to be undertaken by the owner in order to understand the %NBS. Following those investigations the owner and Council will have a

	<p>good understanding of the status of the building and be able to develop a design to seismically strengthen it.</p>
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	<p>The owner is seeking to ensure the long term viability of the building by increasing its seismic performance ideally to above 67%.</p> <p>Seismic engineers in consultation with a recognised conservation architect have identified areas to carry out investigative works to understand better the existing connections between beams and columns as well as other details. The works will require isolated demolition to investigate, particularly to the ground floor ceiling level. All investigative works will be made good after the information is gained about the seismic connections. The applicant has engaged a recognised conservation architect to guide the works in order to minimise effects on the original fabric of the building.</p> <p>At the end of this process, engineers will make recommendations on what is required to bring the building to the very least above 33% of the NBS. The owner will then decide on the best course of action to carry out recommended works.</p> <p>The proposed work fits with the current priority of the BHIF and is consistent with other examples of work required to strengthen a building of this nature, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structural investigation and design for strengthening; The Plumbers Building, 124 Wakefield Street, Te Aro; \$25,000; March 2013;</li> <li>• Initial assessments for structural strengthening; St Mary of the Angels, 17 Boulcott Street, CBD; \$30,000.00; Mar 2013 round.</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorse Council recognition of a potential hazard to the community on a high profile traffic and pedestrian route;</li> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated retaining heritage fabric and replacing 'like with like' in a heritage building.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	<p>Release of funds is subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports (including conservation architect input) and plans to be submitted to WCC</li> <li>• The WCC Heritage Team's on site approval of investigation works.</li> </ul>

<b>Project 11</b>	Former Sydney Street Substation, 19 Kate Sheppard Place, Thorndon.
<b>Applicant</b>	Trevor Lord
<b>Project</b>	Seismic engineering assessment design and strengthening works
<b>Recommended Grant</b> (ex GST if applicable)	\$30,000



#### **Building Information**

- District Plan: Individually Listed Heritage Building; Map 15 & 18 Symbol 435.
- The Sydney Street Substation is historically significant as one of the first substations constructed in Wellington to distribute electrical power throughout the city after the Capital switched to Mangahao power in 1924. It is representative of the construction of a new system of substations across the city, and with the involvement of local government in electricity generation during this period. The quirky mixture of architectural styles incorporated into its design distinguishes it from other substations, and gives it architectural significance.
- The building has technological and educational significance for its construction as an early substation, although the original electrical equipment has since been removed.
- The building has remained on site with few external alterations for over eighty years and contributes to the sense of place and continuity of the local streetscape.

<b>Project Description</b>	Seismic engineering assessment, seismic design and strengthening works
<b>The Issue</b>	The building was issued a notice under section 124 of the Building Act 2004. The notice signifies that the building is earthquake prone as its seismic performance, based on engineering advice, falls below 33% of the NBS.
<b>Review of Proposal</b>	The owner is seeking to ensure the long term viability of the building by increasing its seismic performance ideally to above



	<p>100%. The application seeks funding for engineering assessment and design by Win Clark who is well a respected engineer not least for his work on heritage buildings. The project has the written support of NZHPT and the applicant has provided builders quotes to carry out the strengthening works beyond the design phase. The owner seeks assistance to carry out the seismic design with Win Clark overseeing the physical works as it progresses.</p> <p>The proposed work fits with the current priority of the BHIF and is consistent with other examples of work required to strengthen a building of this nature, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stage Two: Seismic Strengthening from &gt;33% to 75% NBS; The Woolstore, 262 Thorndon Quay, Thorndon; \$42,000.00; Mar 2013 round.</li> <li>• Seismic upgrade and weather-tightening; Huddart Parker Building, 2 Jervois Quay, CBD; \$42,000.00; Mar 2013 round.</li> </ul>
<b>BHIF Outcome</b>	<p>The grant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorse Council recognition of a potential hazard to the community on a high profile traffic and pedestrian route;</li> <li>• Acknowledge the additional costs associated retaining heritage fabric and replacing 'like with like' in a heritage building.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional BHIF condition(s)</b>	<p>Release of funds is subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports and plans to be submitted to WCC.</li> <li>• The WCC Heritage Team's on site approval of works.</li> </ul>