

## SUMMARY STATEMENT

1. My name is Gareth Wright. I am a Heritage Advisor at the **Christchurch City Council** (Council). My relevant expertise to this part of the hearing is assessment of heritage value and significance.
2. I have prepared primary technical evidence on behalf of Council on Plan Change 14, specifically in relation to the removal of the former Dwelling and Setting, 471 Ferry Road (the Building), from the Schedule of Significant Historic Heritage Items (the Schedule) in Appendix 9.3.7.2 in the District Plan.
3. The submission (S1043) of Cameron Parsonson requested that the Building be removed from the Schedule in the District Plan due to its condition.
4. The Building sustained substantial damage in the 2010-2011 Canterbury Earthquake Sequence (the Earthquakes).
5. In my primary evidence I have relied on the evidence for Council of heritage engineer Clara Caponi, conservation architect Timothy Holmes and quantity surveyor Gavin Stanley. I consider that:
  - (a) In its current condition the Building meets the necessary thresholds in Policy 9.3.2.2.1 to remain on the schedule.
  - (b) If repaired according to the recommended engineering scope and methodology, the Building would meet the necessary thresholds to remain on the Schedule.
  - (c) Financial factors in Policy 9.3.2.2.1 c. iv. might however preclude the Building remaining on the Schedule.
6. The owner did not make a submission or further submission on Plan Change 13 or 14, but as noted in paragraph 8.1.58 of Ms Richmond's evidence, is aware of the original submission by Mr Parsonson. I have had multiple conversations with the owner since the Canterbury Earthquakes, most recently in July 2023. As stated in paragraph 23 of my evidence, I am aware that the owner would prefer to see the building repaired but does not have the financial resources to do so herself. She therefore reluctantly supports removal of the Building from the schedule. I note Mr Holmes' comment in paragraph 45 of his evidence that the *works are likely to be uneconomic for*

*few people beyond builders or stone masons who are able to carry out the work themselves.*

7. A Further Submission (S2025) in support of Mr Parsonson's submission was received from Chris Smith. Mr Smith noted that the Building and its site had not been maintained since the Earthquakes. He also noted that the Building was effectively landlocked, with no access or parking except by arrangement with the (adjacent) Portstone Garden Centre. I understand that Mr Smith is a proprietor of the Garden Centre.
8. A Further Submission (S2051) in opposition to Mr Parsonson's submission was received from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga. This observed that the Building is included in the New Zealand Heritage List Rārangī Kōrero as a Category 2 historic place (#1915).
9. No rebuttal evidence was presented and no expert conferencing took place in relation to the Building.
10. Submissions S2025 and S2051 do not have a material bearing on the considerations which underlay my primary evidence. My opinions are therefore unchanged.

Dated: 23 November 2023

**Gareth Wright**