

**From:** Ian Leary <[itl@spencerholmes.co.nz](mailto:itl@spencerholmes.co.nz)>

**Sent:** 05 August 2021 17:33

**To:** Peter Daly <[Peter.Daly@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:Peter.Daly@wcc.govt.nz)>

**Cc:** Dennis Parbhu <[Dennis@ipgnz.com](mailto:Dennis@ipgnz.com)>; Halley Wiseman <[Halley.Wiseman@wcc.govt.nz](mailto:Halley.Wiseman@wcc.govt.nz)>; Heather Erlam <[heather@ipgnz.com](mailto:heather@ipgnz.com)>

**Subject:** RE: SR490717 - 114 Adelaide Road Request for Further Information.pdf

Peter,

We are now responding to your further information request on this matter.

We now ask that the consent be notified as soon as can be practically achieved. The applicant will not be providing any further information, as they are of the view that the WCC now has adequate information to be able to assess the effects of the proposal and make a decision.

In respect to the matters where information has been requested, we provide the following responses:

*General:*

1. *The application documents refer to Preliminary Strengthening Plan and a Seismic Strengthening Review, both prepared by Silvester Clark, which were not lodged with the application documents. Can you please provide these documents.*

Please find attached a copy of the Silvester Clark Report. A further report has been provided as part of the demolition consent.

*Heritage:*

2. *There are no demolition plans in the drawing package. Please provide demolition plans for all floors and the roof, for all structures on the existing site, showing the full extent of what is to be demolished for the proposed development and what is to be retained.*

Please see the revised plans, specifically sheets A-010, 011 and 012 show the demolition/retention plans.

3. *Some perspective renders are provided in the drawing package; however, they are of mixed quality. In this regard, please provide:*
  - a. *More accurate rendering of the views provided on sheet A-203*
  - b. *Existing versions of the views provided on sheets A-203, A-204 and A-205*

*These renderings should include the surrounding buildings.*

Amended perspective are provided A-203 and renders 204, 205..

4. *Reference is made in the Application for Alterative Building document (p7) and in the Heritage Impact Statement (p14) to a new parapet comprising of lightweight concrete panels with a replica moulded cornice that will replace the existing timber-frame parapet (which replaced an earlier and much grander parapet). No further detail is provided. If the applicant wishes the*

*reconstruction of the parapet to be considered as a positive heritage outcome that may or may not have some mitigative effect, then more information is required.*

- a. What will the design of the parapet be based on?*
- b. What will the dimensions relative to the existing parapet be?*
- c. What will the dimensions relative to the original parapet be?*
- d. How will the final material selection be made?*
- e. Will the installation impact on the existing historic fabric of the façade?*

An updated parapet drawing is attached – See A-013.

5. *What is the scope of restoration works for those parts of the building that will be retained within the proposed development? There is no information about this in any of the documents that I can see. It would be useful to understand, for example:*

- a. Are they proposing to clean and repoint the brickwork?*
- b. Are they proposing to retain and restore the existing windows, or replace them?*
- c. This is important not just in order to make a full assessment against the rules, but also to understand the gravitas that can be given to retention of the façade in terms of heritage values – there is a strong theme through the documents that retention of the façade is the main heritage benefit, and that without the development it wouldn't happen, so we need to understand what retention of the façade actually means in the context of the proposal.*

- a. External brickwork will be cleaned to remove any graffiti along the walls, but not painted. Internal brickwork will also be cleaned and left unpainted.
- b. Glass will be replaced where required as some panes include cracks or have been broken. Other glass panes will be retained, especially stained glass windows where possible.
- c. Retention of the facades includes cleaning of the brick walls and elements, and repairing glass when required. Window joinery will be corrected so windows can be openable. Structural elements will be detailed in conjunction with DPA to ensure an appropriate solution is adopted for seismic strengthening without impacting the existing heritage.

It is also expected that if consent is granted, that a condition would be imposed requiring a conservation plan, which would include detailing all retention and enhancement measures that will be carried out on the main façade.

6. *Can they provide evidence of the enquiries to funding organisations that they have made, or (at least) a list of the organisations that they approached (referred to on p18 of the Application for Alternative Building document).*

The question about funding organisations is always asked, but really, it is simply a *red herring*. No organisations have been formally approached. The application states that the applicant considered applying to the heritage fund, but based on the amounts available, did not consider it an option which would make any difference to the viability of the project. The amounts provided by various organisations are not substantial enough to change the wider viability options of the applicant.

7. *Please provide evidence of the minimum additional floor area (including numbers of floors), taking into account different land-uses, that makes retention of the existing building feasible. This needs to be based on updated costing information.*

Page 4 of the Feasibility Report, contained the information:

**Matrix of additional GFA scenarios based on boundary to boundary development:**

*Using the NET profit per square meter figure from table B, this section demonstrates that approximately 2,300 square meterage overall above the heritage facades is required before a financial gain is achieved once the project is completed.*

**Feasibility of proposed development based on satisfying the requirement of having significant set backs:**

*This section shows that, with the current height and setbacks from the heritage facades and height, IPG would face a financial loss of over \$1,140,000.00. The square meter numbers have been gathered from the area plans included in this resource application.*

The current proposal is not financially viable but the loss to be experienced by the owner can currently be accepted and is economically viable (be it a loss). Getting additional floor area is balanced by additional construction costs as the building becomes higher (structural element costs) and consenting probability is also factored in. The current proposal is considered the highest and biggest floor area, that is likely to be achievable.

Construction costs are increasing and are potentially reached a 25% increase (based on recent pricing estimates received by the applicant) since the initial evaluations were made. The applicant's economic preference is therefore demolition.

8. *Please provide an assessment by a suitably qualified Heritage Consultant of the proposal against the Heritage New Zealand guidelines. This assessment should pay particular focus to the partial demolition of structures section.*

Please find attached an amended heritage report, containing the information requested.

*Urban Design:*

9. *Please provide details and information about the location of plant and services, particularly where these protrude above the roof level, including a roof level plan. At this stage they are not showing any lift mechanism for either the passenger or car lifts either on the roof or in the basement.*

The services for this building are still a long way from being designed. However an amended roof layout plan has been prepared and submitted and shown on drawings A-105 and 106.

10. *Information about HVAC services. These are extremely generous 'hotel' rooms that could be used for longer-term stays and function more like residential apartments, which appears to be indicated by things like inclusion of storage cupboards, full sized kitchens and laundry facilities for each unit. If they are proposing services for units on an individual basis there will be exterior venting required and there is no indication of this on any of the plans or elevations.*

Indicative services are shown on the roof, as discussed above.

11. *There is not enough information about the exterior detailing. In this regard, please provide the following details and information:*
  - a. *The colour(s) proposed for the exterior, including the window frames*
  - b. *Proposed glazing specifications – colour reflectivity etc, including the glass balustrades.*

- c. *Depth of setback from the building face of the window panes on the upper floors and information about any explicit structural jointing of wall panels – required to determine if the façade will be adequately detailed.*
  - d. *Detailing for the proposed thicker/darker bit on the front corner at the upper levels. Is it window frame, or something structural?*
- a. Current proposed colour for the new exterior façade panels is “Resene Catalyst.” Total colour code is O61-134043. RGB is 200-82-65. Proposed colour for window frames is “Resene Thunder cc.” Total colour code is N45002-116. RGB is 7 77 75.
  - b. Glazing specifications can be subject to conditions and recommendations from the Heritage Architect and subject to detailed design.
  - c. Levels 02-06 this is shown as 400mm for the small balconies, and shown as 2000mm for level 07. Please refer current architectural drawing set.
  - d. Detailing for jointing of wall panels is yet to be discussed with façade engineer, details will be provided once available and can be subject to conditions.

*12. Has the applicant considered an exterior lighting scheme, particularly for the original building? If yes, please provide details.*

A detailed lighting scheme has not been produced to date, however it is our intent to illuminate the existing heritage façade.

*13. Plans A101 and A151 appear to propose five entry doors on the ground floor. The plans and elevations are inconsistent in regard to the corner door. There also appears to be a width of under 700mm for the main pedestrian access off Adelaide Road to the reception desk, which is not enough for good access. Can the applicant please clarify how the ground floor is actually going to work? Which is the ‘main entry’ to the building and how is this going to be given visual prominence/legibility?*

The corner door will be a double-door entrance as shown in the architectural images. Door width for pedestrian access off Adelaide Road have been increased. Plans and elevations are updated to show this.

The two main entrances will be the double- glass door adjacent the roundabout and the double door at the corner of Adelaide Road/Drummond Street.

*14. Plan A101 shows a ‘mezzanine level above’ which doesn’t appear on Plan A151 or any of the sections. Please provide details of this, including how is it accessed?*

The mezzanine has been removed from the proposal.

*15. Urban Design is also not particularly comfortable with the assumption that the flank walls will be built out to the full height of this development in the foreseeable future. More information is required about the proposed detailing for these elevations.*

Flank walls have been amended.

*16. Presumably if the building functions as a hotel it will required exterior signage in more locations than just over the vehicle entrance. Is the intention for this to be all fully compliant with the rules, or will additional signage trigger District Plan rules?*

The LED sign and signage over the vehicle entrance is only signage detailed for this project. Both signs will be illuminated. Consent is sought for both signs as part of the application.

*17. The setback distance of the digital billboard from the front and top edges of the southern elevation.*

The placement dimensions on the sign are shown on A-107

*18. The method of fixing/structure of the digital billboard, including whether it would have a frame, the extent of protrusion from the façade, and the location of any control structure boxes and/or wires*

The precast panels behind the LED screen will include fixing points cast into the panels. The steel frame supporting the LED screen will connect to these fixing points when installed. The LED screen will also include a surround frame, and will protrude approximately 200mm from the façade. Wiring will pass through an allocated riser space in the apartments to the LED screen to avoid external wiring. A services penetration will be provided in the precast panel to allow wire reticulation from the riser to the LED screen.

*Earthworks:*

*19. In relation to the proposed earthworks, please provide the following information:*

- a. An earthworks plan that illustrates area of cut and fill, in relation to boundaries*
- b. Sections that illustrate the earthworks in relation to all boundaries, and clearly demonstrates the maximum area of cut and/or fill.*

An earthworks plan is attached and numbered A-014

*Vehicle Access/Traffic:*

*20. Please provide the mechanism of the robotic parking system and the dimensional parking layouts for all proposed car parks.*

The parking arrangement will be a specifically designed mechanical system which at this point, has not been designed. The parking sizes are therefore irrelevant as humans will not be parking the vehicles.

At the end of the day, parking is not required to be provided at this location. The applicant intends to provide the mechanical car stacker, but if it cannot be feasibly done, then parking will be removed from the proposal.

*Wind:*

*21. Given the scale of the proposal in relation to the surrounding development pattern, please provide a wind tunnel test that illustrates the wind effect on the surrounding pedestrian environment and any residential properties.*

The applicant has been advised that the further delay to provide a wind tunnel test would be over 12 weeks. Given the WCC action to want to take possession of the building and undertake strengthening work, the applicant cannot afford to have this level of delay.

The applicant has provided a wind report from Opus which has assessed the likely effects of the proposal. A wind tunnel test may provide more certainty as to the likely wind effects of the building, however this particular proposal is not about the potential wind effects.

Wind effects, can be mitigated by the construction of a verandah. In this case, that option is not available because of the heritage façade. This consent is not about the wind effects. The potential wind effects need to be set alongside the heritage effects. If this building is deemed unacceptable because of the potential wind effects, then the only alternative would be to approve the demolition of the building. As there is no other feasible alternative. The applicant therefore objects to the requirement to undertake a wind tunnel test, but is of the view that the commissioners in this case will have adequate information to make a decision on the matter.

## **Conclusion**

The applicant has now responded to all information request and asks that the Council officers proceed to notification as soon as practically possible, so that this matter can be put before a hearings committee. As discussed above, it is the applicant's position that there is enough information to allow the commissioners to make a decision on the matter.

We look forward to confirmation that the application has been notified.

Regards

## **Ian Leary**

Director - Survey and Planning

**SpencerHolmes Limited**

PO Box 588, Wellington 6140

Level 10, 57 Willis Street, Wellington 6011

[itl@spencerholmes.co.nz](mailto:itl@spencerholmes.co.nz)

[www.spencerholmes.co.nz](http://www.spencerholmes.co.nz)

**DDI** 04-474-1193 **M** 021-517-953 **P** 04-472-2261

This email message and any attachments should be treated as CONFIDENTIAL. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify [admin@spencerholmes.co.nz](mailto:admin@spencerholmes.co.nz) immediately and erase all copies of the message and any attachments.