

Before an Independent Hearings Panel
Appointed by Christchurch City Council

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: proposed Plan Change 14 to the Christchurch District
Plan

and: **Daresbury Limited**
(Submitter 874)

Statement of evidence of David Alan Pearson for Daresbury
Limited (Heritage)

Dated: 20 September 2023

Reference: Jo Appleyard (jo.appleyard@chapmantripp.com)
Annabel Hawkins (annabel.hawkins@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com
T +64 3 353 4130
F +64 4 472 7111

PO Box 2510
Christchurch 8140
New Zealand

Auckland
Wellington
Christchurch



STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF DAVID ALAN PEARSON FOR DARESBUY LIMITED

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is David Alan Pearson.
- 2 I graduated from the University of Auckland in 1973 with the degree of Bachelor of Architecture. I am currently a registered architect and an Associate of the New Zealand Institute of Architects.
- 3 In 1996, I established my own architectural practice with the aim of specialising in heritage and conservation architecture. I have also attended specialist conservation courses at the University of York in the UK. Today, I remain principal of the firm, now known as DPA Architects.
- 4 Since it was established, DPA Architects has grown in size to a staff of 13 and conservation architecture continues to be the mainstay of the firm's work. Over the years, a number of our projects have been recognised by the receipt of various awards from institutions including the NZ Institute of Architects and UNESCO.
- 5 In the aftermath of the Canterbury earthquakes of 2010-2012, DPA Architects was extensively involved in numerous projects throughout Canterbury extending from Waiau in the north down to Timaru. These generally required earthquake remediation and seismic upgrading work.
- 6 In particular, I acted as the heritage architect for the \$400m reconstruction and refurbishment project at the Arts Centre of Christchurch for a period of 10 years between 2012 and 2022.
- 7 On other projects, I have acted as both heritage and project architect. Projects of note included various churches such as St Barnabas in Fendalton, St Patrick's in Akaroa and St Bartholomew's in Kaiapoi. DPA Architects also oversaw the reconstruction of the Lyttleton Timeball and the restoration and structural upgrading of the Hurunui Hotel in North Canterbury. I have also acted as the heritage architect for the restoration of the former Midland Club and the former Public Trust buildings, both in Oxford Terrace.
- 8 Currently I am acting as the on-site heritage architect for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Canterbury Museum which includes the structural upgrading of the nineteenth century buildings on the site and the Robert McDougall Art Gallery at the rear. I am also the resident heritage architect for the restoration and structural upgrading project of the Old Municipal Building located in Oxford Terrace.

- 9 My experience also includes appearances at numerous council and local authority hearings and I have previously appeared as a witness in the Environment Court.

CODE OF CONDUCT

- 10 Although this is a local authority hearing, I have read the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in its Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and I agree to comply with it. My qualifications are set out above. I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 11 My evidence includes the following sections:
- 11.1 An outline of my involvement with Daresbury from 2018 to the present day.
 - 11.2 An outline of my understanding of the efforts that have been made to retain and restore Daresbury.
 - 11.3 A description of the existing heritage protection of Daresbury.
 - 11.4 Brief summary of the history and architectural style of Daresbury.
 - 11.5 A summary assessment of its existing heritage values.
 - 11.6 A summary of its present condition.
 - 11.7 Work that would be required to structurally upgrade the building.
 - 11.8 Other requirements to comply with the Building Code.
 - 11.9 Requirements of the Christchurch District Plan.
 - 11.10 Response to Council section 42a report and Statements of Evidence.
 - 11.11 Conclusion.

DOCUMENTS VIEWED

- 12 In preparing this evidence I have read the following statements:
- 12.1 Statement of Primary Evidence of Ms Amanda Ohs on behalf of the Christchurch City Council dated 11 August 2023.

- 12.2 Statement of Primary Evidence of Mr William Fulton on behalf of the Christchurch City Council dated 11 August 2023.
- 12.3 Statement of Primary Evidence of Mr Gavin Stanley on behalf of the Christchurch City Council dated 11 August 2023.
- 12.4 The relevant sections of the s42A report that relate to Daresbury as prepared by Ms Suzanne Richmond.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 13 My evidence is summarised as follows:
- 14 Daresbury is currently scheduled as a Highly Significant heritage item in the Operative Christchurch District Plan.
- 15 The building suffered substantial damage in the Canterbury earthquake sequence and proposals to structurally upgrade the building have been commissioned.
- 16 Over the past five years, Mr Milne has attempted to find ways in which the building could be structurally upgraded and restored, however, assistance funding as sought from a number of providers has not been forthcoming.
- 17 As part of PC14, Mr Milne's company, Daresbury Limited, has made a submission to have the building delisted as a historic heritage item. This would potentially enable the building to be demolished.
- 18 The building is currently scheduled as a 'Highly Significant' historic heritage item in the Christchurch District Plan. However, the work that would be required to structurally upgrade the building would involve the replacement of a substantial amount of heritage fabric to the point where much of the building is likely to be largely a replica.
- 19 Nevertheless, while the building, in my opinion, would have a reduced level of integrity and authenticity, I consider that it would still retain a level of significance and it may be appropriate for it to be rescheduled as a 'significant' heritage item.

MY INVOLVEMENT WITH DARESBUY

- 20 The building known as Daresbury suffered extensive damage in the Canterbury earthquakes of 2010- 2012 and has remained unused since that time due to the inherent danger of further damage and potential collapse from aftershocks. In particular, the chimneys that had previously been strengthened in a way that is no longer considered to be good practice, collapsed, causing extensive damage to the roof. Considerable damage was also caused to the external brickwork. I will provide additional detail regarding the condition of the building later in my evidence.

- 21 I was first engaged by Mr Milne in 2018 to provide heritage and technical advice as to how Daresbury might be retained and restored. In 2019, I prepared a detailed heritage assessment of the building which also included a schedule of the evident defects and proposed remedial work. In the same year, I assisted Mr Milne as he sought financial assistance from organisations such as Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (*HNZPT*), the Christchurch City Council and Equip, an organisation set up specifically to financially assist earthquake damaged privately owned buildings.
- 22 In the case of HNZPT, the application was unable to be approved as their funding was limited in the amount available and the government had strict guidelines as to priorities for distribution. Similarly, the Christchurch City Council was unable to assist as the Council's heritage funding had all been allocated to another project. Funding could have been available through the Equip fund, however, a building had to be assessed as being earthquake prone to be eligible. Unfortunately, only commercial buildings could be classified by the local authority as being earthquake prone. In this case, the Christchurch City Council was unable to apply that definition to Daresbury which was deemed to be a residential building rather than a commercial building.

EFFORTS TO RETAIN DARESBUY

- 23 Over the years, Mr Milne has continued in his efforts to retain and restore Daresbury. DPA Architects was retained to prepare a Heritage assessment of the building in which an assessment was made of its heritage values and also its material condition. A Structural Assessment Report for the building was then prepared by Quoin Structural Consultants. That report outlined the form and construction of the building, the geotechnical conditions on the site, the damage caused by the earthquakes, an assessment of the current earthquake strength of the building and recommendations for structural repairs.
- 24 In summary, the Quoin assessment concluded that areas of the building that were less damaged were earthquake prone with an undamaged strength of 13% NBS (that is 13% of the strength that a new building would be expected to achieve) not taking into account areas that had failed which would have a lower %NBS. Later in my evidence, I will describe in more detail the structural interventions that might be required and their impact on the heritage values of the building.
- 25 Following the completion of the structural report, Mr Milne prepared a detailed summary of the likely costs of restoring Daresbury which was subsequently reviewed by Stewart Harrison Quantity Surveyors. At that stage the estimate of costs for a Reduced Repair Option was \$5,419,124 excluding GST. Rhodes and Associates, on behalf of Council, has since adjusted the figure to include escalation to give an increased estimate of \$6,875,781.

- 26 Mr Milne then had the building electronically scanned which enabled DPA Architects to create a comprehensive three dimensional architectural model. This work ensured that a detailed electronic record of the building will survive for the future. At the same time further efforts were made to determine ways in which the building could be retained either in the form as it currently exists or alternatively, if partial retention might be an option.
- 27 Mr Milne also subdivided an area that he owned on the eastern side of the Waimairi Stream into five lots with intention being that income generated from the sale of those lots could be used to assist in the funding of the restoration of Dewsbury. Unfortunately, with the advent of Covid, subsequent economic downturn and slowing down of activity in the domestic sector, this proposal has not proved possible to implement. Efforts were also made to determine if a new use could be found for the building, such as a private hotel. Again these efforts did not come to fruition.
- 28 In summary, Mr Milne's original proposal was to see Daresbury structurally upgraded and restored to accommodate a new use. However, after many years of trying to find a use for the house and having sought funding from various sources, all to no avail, Mr Milne is now seeking to have the house delisted. He acknowledges that should the house be delisted, the way would then be open for it to be demolished without a resource consent being required. As stated in the submission made on behalf of Daresbury Limited, PC14 provides an opportunity to remove some of the listed items so they are able to be demolished where appropriate and consistent with Policy 9.3.2.2.8.

HERITAGE LISTINGS

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

- 29 The building is listed by HNZPT as a Category 1 Historic Place, Register number 3659. It was first listed on 2 April 1985. This means it is considered to be a place of outstanding historical or cultural significance.
- 30 Although an exact date of construction has not been determined, the house is believed to have been built between 1897 and 1901. Consequently, Daresbury is recorded as an archaeological site within the ArchSite recording scheme (M35/2152), being the place of human activity prior to the year 1900.

Christchurch District Plan

- 31 The dwelling and setting are included in the Christchurch District Plan Appendix 3 Schedule of Heritage Items as a Group 1 - Highly Significant Heritage Item (heritage item number 185, heritage setting number 602). The interiors of the building are not included in the listing.

BACKGROUND

Historical Account

- 32 Daresbury was built for George Humphreys, a prominent Christchurch businessman and co-founder of wine and spirits merchants, Fletcher Humphreys. The three-storey house was designed with a total of 40 rooms and, as noted, was constructed between 1897 and 1901.
- 33 The name 'Daresbury' came from Humphreys' wife's house in Scotland but is also a village and civil parish in Cheshire, England, which features many buildings of similar design. Daresbury then remained in the hands of the Humphrey family until 1985. Various changes have occurred to the building over time, the most obvious being the addition of the billiard room in the southwest corner and the verandah on the north face. The interior has also been remodelled on a number of occasions.

Architectural Style

- 34 The lower storey is built of brick, and the upper storey is half timbered. It was designed by Samuel Hurst Seager (1855-1933) who was an important New Zealand architect. He was also one of the first to seek to design buildings with a specifically New Zealand character, although ironically, Daresbury has its roots very much in rural England.
- 35 With its half-timbered gables, cantilevered upper floor, leadlights, tiled roof and tall brick chimneys, Daresbury is characteristic of a number of houses in Christchurch designed for affluent professionals around the turn of the century. The style of such houses had its origins in the Arts and Crafts movement in Britain which sought to use traditional construction techniques as a reaction against the increasing use of machines. New Zealand-based architects who had trained in, or immigrated from, Britain were then strongly influenced by the style which found ready acceptance amongst the well-to-do in Christchurch.

ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

- 36 The significance of Daresbury was evaluated in the heritage assessment prepared in 2018 by DPA Architects, using the criteria in the Christchurch District Plan for assessing significance. The assessment was also based on the 2014 Statement of Significance for Daresbury written by the Christchurch City Council. I have condensed that assessment as follows:

Historical and Social Significance

- 37 Daresbury is a significant Christchurch homestead associated with many notable historical figures including two governors general, an Archbishop of Canterbury and the future King George VI. The place also demonstrates the history of land development in Christchurch

where larger blocks of land were subsequently subdivided into smaller plots.

Cultural and Spiritual Significance

- 38 The place demonstrates the changing cultural traditions and patterns of domestic lifestyles for affluent Christchurch citizens over time, as well as the preference towards traditional 'British' architectural styled houses for those who could afford them. In particular, Daresbury provides evidence of the domestic lifestyle of a family of a high socio-economic standing.

Architectural and Aesthetic Significance

- 39 The place is a notable example of the English Arts and Crafts style which sought a return to traditional building techniques. Its architect, Samuel Hurst Seagar was a leading proponent of the style.

Technological and Craftsmanship Significance

- 40 Daresbury is notable for the quality of the craftsmanship evident in the building and for the use of materials such as brick at the lower level, timber and pebble dash for the half-timbered upper storey and clay tiles for the roof. The building is also known for the quality of its internal work.

Contextual Significance

- 41 Daresbury made a significant contribution to the character of the surrounding area as a substantial house located on a large piece of land which at one time included extensive gardens on the banks of the Waimairi Stream which flows through the property.

Archaeological and Scientific Significance

- 42 Daresbury and its setting have the potential to provide archaeological evidence of past human activity, along with information regarding past building construction techniques.
- 43 In my opinion, Daresbury in its post-earthquake form still retains significance under each of the criteria, however, as I will explain later, I believe that the building's heritage values in some categories have been eroded and will be further compromised if the work to restore and structurally upgrade it were to be carried out.

CONDITION OF THE BUILDING

- 44 My earlier heritage assessment included a description of the defects that were evident in the house, the majority being caused by the Canterbury earthquakes. Prior to the earthquakes, a major component of the roofscape was a group of six decorative brick chimneys. At some time in the past, the chimneys were filled with concrete in a mis-guided effort at strengthening them. The chimneys subsequently collapsed in the earthquakes causing extensive damage to the tiled roof.

- 45 The lower level of Daresbury is sheathed with bricks that were made at Homebush in Canterbury. The walls comprise an outer and inner wythe or skin of brickwork with a cavity between. Earthquake damage included uneven settlement of the foundations leading to damage to the brickwork which included crushed and fractured bricks, movement along mortar lines and outward displacement of bricks. At the upper level, the external walls which comprise timber framing with brick infills (known as brick nogging) overlaid with a pebble dash plaster were also damaged.
- 46 Internally, cracks have appeared in plaster walls and ceilings and floors have become uneven as the house has moved. However, the greatest damage inside the building occurred following the collapse of the chimneys which left holes in the roof. Although efforts were made to temporarily waterproof the building, water continued to find its way into the building where it has affected timber panelling and other fabric with extensive dry rot, mould and fungal growth being prevalent throughout the house.

STRUCTURAL REQUIREMENTS

Structural Assessment

- 47 As previously described, the structural report by Quoin concluded that less damaged areas of the building were earthquake prone with an estimated strength of 13% NBS, while failed areas would have a % NBS that was lower again. The Quoin assessment identified the following earthquake related defects:
- 47.1 Extensive cracking including vertical, horizontal and diagonal cracks through all brickwork.
 - 47.2 Lateral displacement of brickwork where partial collapse could occur in a moderate to large earthquake.
 - 47.3 Differential settlement of the foundations.
 - 47.4 Unevenness in the floor and first floor level.
 - 47.5 Collapse of the all the brick chimneys.
 - 47.6 Cracks in internal wall linings.
 - 47.7 Cracking of the exterior cladding at the upper level sheathing, allowing moisture ingress.
 - 47.8 Damaged roof tiles from chimney collapses.
 - 47.9 Other damage to elements and finishes.

Structural Repairs

- 48 In the following section, I provide a brief summary of the repair work that Quoin consider is required to remedy the damage caused by the earthquake and to upgrade the building to 67% NBS.
- 48.1 Brick walls. The Quoin recommendation was for the majority of the external brick walls at ground floor level to be deconstructed and rebuilt as a single brick width veneer on a timber frame.
- 48.2 Chimneys. Quoin recommends that the chimneys be deconstructed down to ground level and rebuilt as lightweight structures. The exposed sections of the chimneys could be rebuilt with a brick veneer on steel trussed frame.
- 48.3 Foundations:
- (a) Existing foundations. The Quoin structural report recommends that the existing foundations be removed in their entirety and replaced with new reinforced concrete foundations to which the new timber framed walls and bracing elements can be fixed.
 - (b) Chimney bases. The existing chimney bases should be removed and replaced with new reinforced concrete foundations beneath the steel braced frames that support the reconstructed chimneys.
- 48.4 Exterior plaster clad walls. The Quoin report recommends that the badly damaged areas of plaster and brick infills at first floor level be removed and replaced with a compliant weathertight cladding system. Such a system is likely to require a cavity and then be detailed with timber and decorative plaster to match the existing appearance.
- 48.5 Interior wall finishes. Quoin recommended that all heavy brick walls and chimneys be replaced with lightweight construction and all internal plaster surfaces be replaced with plasterboard rated for its bracing capabilities.
- 48.6 Earthquake strengthening and steel frames. The structural report recommends the provision of additional steel columns and frames along with additional roof bracing to enable the building to achieve 67% NBS. The Quoin proposal makes the assumption that the roof tiles will be replaced as part of the repairs.
- 48.7 Interior ceiling finishes. Quoin advises that ceilings will need to be removed to inspect ceiling framing and to fix diaphragms and recommends removal and replacement of ceilings other than the timber dining room ceiling. Although

the interior is not included as part of the scheduled item, the building contains features and finishes of historic interest.

48.8 Ground floor and foundation levelling. Foundations and floors throughout the building should be relevelled.

48.9 Non-structural elements and fixtures. The Quoin report also makes mention of repairs being required to non-structural elements and fixtures including windows and doors, internal joinery, floor finishes, fireplace surrounds, spouting and downpipes, plumbing and services and reinstatement of bathroom and kitchen finishes following structural upgrading work.

Comment on Proposed Structural Interventions

49 The structural upgrading and repairs recommended by Quoin are obviously very extensive and highly invasive and have contributed to the high estimated cost of the work as much of the building would effectively need to be rebuilt. In particular, the external walls throughout the building would need to be reconstructed on new foundations.

50 At ground floor level it is likely that much of the external brickwork could be salvaged and reused as the bedding mortar used for the bricks was lime based and easily removed. At first floor level, the external plaster pebble dash and brick nogging is proposed to be removed, to be replaced with a "compliant weathertight cladding system" which may have an impact on the detailing elsewhere on the building. Window surrounds, for example, may need to be redesigned. This could result in the upper levels of the building effectively being a replica of the original.

51 The Quoin report also suggests that the roof tiles will be replaced as part of the repairs. In fact, although a number of the roof tiles were broken when the chimneys collapsed, the majority of the roof tiles may be able to be salvaged.

OTHER REQUIREMENTS TO COMPLY WITH THE BUILDING CODE

52 Daresbury in its current form does not comply with the Building Code. In particular, the house is generally uninsulated and the windows are only single glazed. The house would, at least, need to be insulated and the windows potentially double glazed.

53 Although, in some instances, heritage windows can be retrofitted to accommodate double glazing, sometimes the sashes will need to be replaced. Whether the existing sashes at Daresbury can be double glazed has not been determined, particularly as many of them are glazed with small panes with lead cames. If the sashes do have to be replaced, it may not be possible to retain their existing

configuration with their small panes. If the sashes need to be replaced, this would further erode Daresbury's heritage values.

REQUIREMENTS OF CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT PLAN

- 54 Section 9.3 of the Christchurch District Plan seeks to protect and maintain the Christchurch District's historic heritage and contains Objectives and Policies aimed to encourage this. Section 9.3.2.1.1 Objective – Historic Heritage states that this will be achieved by enabling and supporting the on-going retention, use and adaptive reuse of historic heritage. The same section acknowledges the impact that the earthquakes had as follows:

ii "recognises the conditions of the buildings, particularly those that have suffered earthquake damage and the effect of engineering and financial factors on the ability to retain, restore and continue using them, and

iii "acknowledges that in some situations demolition may be justified by reference to the matters in Policy 9.3.2.2.8.

- 55 Section 9.3.2.2 of the Christchurch District Plan sets out the historic heritage policies. Daresbury is currently scheduled as a 'Highly Significant' (Group 1) historic heritage place. Policy 9.3.2.2.1 identification and assessment of historic heritage for scheduling in the Christchurch District Plan, sets out the requirements for a place to be scheduled. For a building to be categorised as meeting the level of 'Highly Significant' (Group 1), the historic heritage is required to:

A. meet at least one of the heritage values in Appendix 9.7.3.1 at a highly significant level; and

B. be of high significance to the Christchurch District (and may also be of significance nationally or internationally), because it conveys important aspects of the Christchurch District's cultural and historical themes and activities and thereby makes a strong contribution to the Christchurch District's sense of place and identity; and

C. have a high degree of authenticity (based on physical and documentary evidence); and

D. have a high degree of integrity (particularly whole or intact heritage fabric and heritage values).

- 56 Appendix 9.3.7.1. Lists the criteria for assessment of significance of heritage values. The criteria are:

56.1 Historical and social value

56.2 Cultural and spiritual value

- 56.3 Architectural and aesthetic value
- 56.4 Technological and craftsmanship value
- 56.5 Contextual value
- 56.6 Archaeological and scientific significance value.
- 57 Prior to the earthquakes, in my opinion, Daresbury clearly met the threshold for being scheduled as a Highly Significant historic heritage item, having significance under each of the criteria for assessment of significance of heritage values listed in Appendix 9.7.3.1.
- 58 In particular, the place was of high significance to Christchurch as it conveyed important aspects of the district's cultural and historical themes and activities and made a strong contribution to the Christchurch District's sense of place and identity. It also had a high degree of authenticity and integrity.
- 59 Policy 9.3.2.2.1 c. seeks to schedule significant historic heritage as heritage items and heritage settings where the thresholds for Significant (Group 2) or Highly Significant (Group 1) as outlined in Policy 9.3.2.2.1 b are met and in the case of interior heritage fabric, if it is specifically identified in the schedule.
- 60 As noted above, for a heritage item to be rated as being 'highly significant' it must have a high degree of authenticity and integrity. In my opinion, the integrity of the building has been affected by the earthquakes and its integrity and authenticity would be further impacted if the work required to restore it was to be carried out.
- 61 In general, most District Plans including the Christchurch District Plan, do not include the condition of a building as a criteria for assessing its historic heritage value. The reason for that is that criteria such as historical, social and cultural are not affected by its physical condition.
- 62 However, the current Christchurch District Plan that became operative following the Canterbury earthquakes differs from most other district plans in that while Policy 9.3.2.2.1 c proposes to schedule historic heritage where the thresholds are met, it includes the following conditions which may lead to buildings being excluded from being scheduled:

unless

iii the physical condition of the heritage item and any restoration, reconstruction maintenance repair or upgrade work would result in the heritage values and integrity of the heritage item being compromised to the extent that it would no longer retain its heritage significance; and/or

iv there are engineering and financial factors related to the physical condition of the heritage item that would make it unreasonable or inappropriate to schedule the heritage item.

63 Policy 9.3.2.2.8 sets out a number of matters to be considered whether it is appropriate to demolish a heritage item. These include:

ii. Whether the extent of the work to retain and/or repair the heritage item is of such a scale that the heritage values and integrity of the heritage item would be significantly compromised;

iii whether the costs to retain the heritage item, (particularly as a result of damage) would be unreasonable;

iv the ability to retain the overall heritage values and significance of the heritage item through a reduced degree of demolition; and

v. the level of significance of the heritage item.

64 As noted, I consider that the heritage values and integrity of Daresbury have been compromised as a result of earthquake related damage and may be further compromised if the work to restore and strengthen the building as recommended was ever to be carried out. In my opinion, however, the building would still have heritage value under other criteria, although a further assessment may result in it being assessed as a 'significant' rather than a 'highly significant' heritage item.

RESPONSE TO COUNCIL SECTION 42A REPORTS AND EVIDENCE

65 I have read the Statements of Evidence of Ms Amanda Ohs, Mr William Fulton and Mr Stephen Hogg and comment as follows:

66 Ms Ohs in paragraph 227 of her evidence states "*it is likely that the works required would in my opinion reduce the level of technological and craftsmanship significance to 'significant; rather than 'high significance'.*

67 I agree with this statement. Furthermore, as previously described in my evidence, I believe that some of the other work that would be necessary would further reduce its heritage values. The replacement of the stucco finished upper walls and potential replacement of windows would, in my opinion, further impact on its architectural and aesthetic heritage values. However, I do not believe that the building would then be totally devoid of heritage values as its historical and cultural values, for example, will remain intact.

- 68 I also agree with Ms Ohs statement in paragraph 230 where she acknowledges that grants available for a privately owned building area not likely to significantly assist the owner.
- 69 I have also read the Statement of Evidence prepared by Mr William Fulton. In its present state, he believes that the building has retained its heritage values and can still be considered to be a 'highly significant' heritage item. In paragraph of his evidence, Mr Fulton considers '*the proposed reconstruction and restoration to generally be appropriate and will not compromise the heritage significance of Daresbury*'.
- 70 In my opinion, the proposed work will compromise the heritage significance of Daresbury. Outwardly, the repaired building may largely retain its current appearance, however, as I have explained, the work will impact on its integrity and authenticity as the upper levels will largely be a replica.
- 71 Nevertheless, I still believe that Daresbury, should it be repaired, will still retain some of its heritage values. It will still comprise some heritage fabric and its historical and cultural values will not be affected. It may be that if the building is restored and strengthened, a rating of 'significant' rather than 'highly significant' may be more appropriate.

CONCLUSION

- 72 It is not disputed that Daresbury in its present form essentially meets the criteria for it being scheduled in the Christchurch District Plan as a 'highly significant' heritage item, due to, in particular, its historical and cultural values and its architectural and aesthetic values.
- 73 It is also not disputed that the building was significantly damaged in the Canterbury earthquakes and that work to restore and structurally upgrade it will be highly invasive, expensive and will result in large areas of the building being a replica of its original form.
- 74 Consequently, in my opinion, if the work as proposed were to proceed, there would be a loss of integrity and authenticity. Nevertheless, the building would still retain some heritage value with, for example, its historical and cultural values being largely unaffected. A reassessment of the building's heritage values may then result in it being reclassified as a 'significant', rather than a 'highly significant' historic heritage item in the Christchurch District Plan.

David Alan Pearson

20 September 2023