

Appendix 6: Heritage Assessment Addendum – Heritage Properties Ltd



Langland's Building

Addendum to McStay 2017. Heritage Impact
Assessment report for 73-81 Dee Street

Report Prepared for Invercargill Licensing Trust
Author: Dr Hayden Cawte
Submitted: 13/06/2018

Langland's Building

Addendum to McStay 2017. Heritage Impact Assessment report for 73-81
Dee Street.

Report Prepared by:

New Zealand Heritage Properties Ltd
Salisbury House | 106 Bond Street | Dunedin
T 03 477 3933 | F 03 477 3928 | E info@heritageproperties.co.nz
www.heritageproperties.co.nz

Project Details

Archaeological Site No.	E46/63
Invercargill City Council, operative Proposed District Plan, Appendix II.3 Heritage Record	Identifier (October 2016): Three Bean Café/Guilty by Confection Fudge, Class 2, Map Number 9, Reference 93
Legal Description	Part Section 1 Block IX Town of Invercargill
Client	Invercargill Licensing Trust
Client Contact	Christine McMillan, Bonisch Consultants
Client Address	Invercargill Licensing Trust PO Box 208 INVERCARGILL 9840 Attn: Greg Mulvey
Report Authors	Dr Hayden Cawte
Report Submitted	14 June 2017
Report Submitted To	Invercargill Licensing Trust, Bonisch Consultants

Ownership and Disclaimer

This report has been prepared for Invercargill Licensing Trust in relation to a specific work program at 73-81 Dee Street, Invercargill, corner Dee Street and Don Street (Part Section 1 Block IX Town of Invercargill). This report and the information contained herein are subject to copyright. Ownership of the primary materials created in the course of the research remains the property of the named researchers and New Zealand Heritage Properties Ltd. This report remains the property of Invercargill Licensing Trust and New Zealand Heritage Properties Ltd.

The professional advice and opinions contained in this report are those of the consultants, New Zealand Heritage Properties Ltd, and do not represent the opinions and policies of any third party. The professional advice and opinions contained in this report do not constitute legal advice.

Cover Photo: Close up of Panorama of Dee and Don Street 1926 [A0010 S00940014] Invercargill City Libraries and Archives

Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition
Heritage New Zealand	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
NZHP	New Zealand Heritage Properties Ltd.
RMA	Resource Management Act (1991)
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
ICC	Invercargill City Council
ILT	Invercargill Licensing Trust

Table of Contents

Project Details	i
Ownership and Disclaimer	i
Abbreviations	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Figures	iii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Project Background	2
2 Summary of Heritage Values (McStay 2017).....	4
3 Summary of Feasibility study.....	5
4 Methodology	6
5 Assessment of Effects.....	7
6 Mitigation measure	8
7 Conclusions and Recommendations.....	10
8 References	12
Appendix A Development Plans	A-1
Appendix B Feasibility Studies	A-2
8.2 Warren and Mahoney May 2018 – Report on the “Challenges of retaining Façade”	A-2
8.3 WT Partnerships – High Level Façade Estimate for Dee Street Hotel. May 2018.....	A-3
8.4 High-level concept sketches for façade retention. Heenan, J. May 2018.....	A-4

List of Figures

Figure 1-1. Location of the project area, 73-81 Dee Street, Invercargill, Part Section 1 Block IX Town of Invercargill (outlined in red). The project area is bounded by Don Street to the north, Dee Street to the west, 5 Don Street to the east and 67 Dee Street to the south.	2
Figure 1-2. Hotel concept for the site including 73-81 Dee Street.	3

1 Introduction

In 2017, New Zealand Heritage Properties Ltd (NZHP) completed a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) on the building located at 73-81 Dee Street, a cornerstone building on what was referred to as Langland's block. The report “*One End of Langland’s Block Heritage Impact Assessment for 73-81 Dee Street, Invercargill*” (McStay 2017), considered the effects that the proposed demolition of the building and construction of a new hotel would have on heritage values. At the time, there were no architectural plans for the project and the effects were considered on the basis of a complete demolition only, without consideration of a proposed development plans and/or merits of the project.

The report recommended that less adverse options be investigated including the retention of the building’s façade. Subsequently, these and other recommendations have been considered and explored by the client, with independent feasibility studies being commissioned looking at the design, engineering, and financial implications (see section 3 below).

NZHP has been commissioned to complete this addendum report by Bonisch Consultants on behalf of the Invercargill Licensing Trust, in light of these completed feasibility studies. McStay’s report outlines the key background, legislation, methodology, building history and heritage values thus, will not be covered again here. This addendum considers the effects of the project upon heritage values, on the basis of the findings of the feasibility studies, as well as the completed architectural plans, including the merits of the project, and provides recommendations for the effective mitigation of those effects.

The building at 73-81 Dee Street once formed a complete set of buildings collectively referred to as “Langlands Block” that ran along Dee Street between Esk and Don Streets. 73-81 Dee Street is one of three remaining building sections of this block. Designed by architect Fredrick W. Burwell and constructed in 1885, the building is considered an archaeological site and is also scheduled on the Invercargill City Council District Plan (Reference 93).



Figure 1-1. Location of the project area, 73-81 Dee Street, Invercargill, Part Section 1 Block IX Town of Invercargill (outlined in red). The project area is bounded by Don Street to the north, Dee Street to the west, 5 Don Street to the east and 67 Dee Street to the south.

1.1 Project Background

The Invercargill Licensing Trust propose to demolish the existing building at 73-81 Dee Street including the façade and redevelop the site for a hotel. The proposed hotel forms part of the economic development strategy for the Southland Region and one of the “immediate priorities” identified in the Southland Regional Development Strategy’s rejuvenation of Invercargill (www.sords.co.nz).

The proposed demolition and redevelopment project footprint is wider than 73-81 Dee Street and includes 5, 7 and 11 Don Street and 57 to 67 Dee Street. These latter buildings do not form part of this report. The archaeological requirements of these buildings will be considered in an application to Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga for an archaeological authority at a later stage.

During the initial HIA, architectural plans were not available however, the project was reported as a new construction requiring the demolition of the existing structure(s) to accommodate at least 80 rooms with room for 40 more during later phases. It was to include at least six stories, carparking, conference rooms and a restaurant (Newman 2017). McStay (2017) has assessed the impact that the proposed redevelopment would have on 73-81 Dee street’s heritage values.

The report identified that heritage values would be adversely impacted. It was reported that the proposal would result in the loss of the scheduled heritage building and building façade, which are also defined as archaeological sites. The Dee and Don Street streetscapes would also be altered. Any earthworks for foundation removal, site clearance and new foundations, services and landscaping have the potential to impact surviving below ground archaeological remains.

On the basis of the findings it was recommended that less adverse options be investigated, among other mitigation options. This included considering the retention of the building's façade.

Subsequently, the Invercargill Licensing Trust has undertaken some high-level feasibility studies for the retention of the historic façade only, as well as investigating strengthening options for the building. These findings are summarised in section 3 below. As a result of these investigations, the retention of building, or its façade has been ruled out as unfeasible and uneconomic.

Completed architectural plans for the site show a landmark building on the corner of Dee and Don Streets with a large transparent opening to the street level along Don Street and the first section of Dee Street. The original plot size can be seen in the design of the façade, particularly along Don Street. The placement of windows do appear to reference the heritage streetscape and the use of a band of windows at the third floor does "frame" the historic context. The remaining elements are of contemporary and modern design (see figure 1.2).



Figure 1-2. Hotel concept for the site including 73-81 Dee Street.

2 Summary of Heritage Values (McStay 2017)

A discussion of Heritage Values is provided by McStay 2017. McStay evaluated the values including “archaeological, architectural, cultural, scientific, technological, contextual and amenity values” (McStay 2017:55)

The original report provides a detailed assessment of these values and identified that the building at 73-81 Dee Street has “Moderate to High” heritage values on the basis of the association with architect Burwell, and the high, archaeological, architectural, historical, amenity and contextual values, as well as the character contribution the building makes to the streetscape (*cf* McStay 2017. pg. 55). The table below (table 2.1) is a summary of these findings.

Table 2.1. Summary of heritage values taken from McStay 2017 (table. 9-2 pg. 58)

Value	Summary of assessment
Archaeological	High
Architectural	High
Cultural	Low-moderate
Historical	Moderate-high
Scientific	Moderate
Technological	Moderate
Contextual	High
Amenity	High

On the basis of these values, mitigation measures were presented as options to lessen the adverse effect. These included;

- Exploration of adaptive reuse options and/or retention of façade.
- A copy of the McStay 2017 HIA be provided to designers for consideration during concept development
- Voluntarily requesting public notification
- Recording of the building to a Level II as defined by Heritage New Zealand (2014).
- Public interpretation of the site both during and after works, including in the new hotel.

These measures and recommendations were the subject of the feasibility studies commissioned by the ILT.

3 Summary of Feasibility study

On the basis of recommendations from the HIA (McStay 2017), the Invercargill Licensing Trust have undertaken high-level feasibility studies for either retaining the façade and/or, redevelopment of the existing building in the hotel development.

The study includes;

- Conceptual engineering sketches of strengthening options in order to; Retain façade only, or strengthen existing structure completed by Jon Heenan of Beca (May 2018)
- Design statements, discussions and challenges from Architects Warren and Mahoney (May 2018) and,
- High-level cost estimates for façade retention only, or seismic upgrade of whole structure completed by WT Partnerships (May 2018).

The conceptual engineering sketches propose the use of shotcrete to support the unreinforced masonry façade which would then be tied into the new structure. This concept also requires new pile foundations to support the façade at basement level. The concept shows existing window heights not aligning with new structure floor heights meaning either one less floor in the new structure, or the redundancy of current window openings.

On the basis of these high level strengthening concepts, WT Partnerships have completed high-level cost estimates for these options. This presents an estimated cost of \$2,247,000 for the retention of façade only, compared with a new façade at a cost allocation of \$844,000. The strengthening options for 34%, 67% and 100% of New Building Standard (NBS) are estimated to cost \$1,965,000, \$3,156,000, and \$4,925,000 respectively.

Warren and Mahoney architects have considered the use of the façade within a hotel design, however, have determined that with the existing building having been constructed as first and second floor offices, the window location and widths are not consistent with efficient design for a modern hotel with 3.8m between walls being optimal (which could be achieved along Don Street but not Dee Street). Incorporating two existing window openings in each hotel room would presumably reduce overall numbers of rooms available and as Warren and Mahoney (2018b:1) describe “would impact upon efficiency”. They also cite openings to ground floor as a challenge to meet the design brief. Therefore, it was determined that while retaining the façade was possible, it would not be suitable or feasible to do so within the scope of a hotel development (Warren and Mahoney 2018b).

In conflating this data, the Invercargill Licensing Trust have determined that it would be unfeasible and uneconomic to reuse the building or retain the façade within the hotel development.

4 Methodology

In creating this addendum report, only the assessment of effects, in light of the presence of plans and feasibility studies was required. Accordingly, no site history or reassessment of heritage values was undertaken, instead, values and background was drawn from McStay's 2017 HIA – *One end of Langland's block. Heritage Impact Assessment for 73-81 Dee Street, Invercargill.*

In understanding the effects, mitigation options are considered and proposed. The extent of this mitigation is in light of the effect to heritage values. Determining the level of mitigation required when identified heritage values are high or significant and the loss or effect of a proposed development is complete, is notoriously difficult. Assigning monetary value to a largely intangible asset is also notoriously difficult.

Non-physical heritage elements can more easily be mitigated within a new development by ensuring connection to space and place, people and history. Where loss of physical elements is absolute and that loss cannot be accommodated or mitigated within the same site, ie. the retention of physical heritage elements at that site, then offsite measures are considered. That is to say, identifying mechanisms that can contribute to the protection, retention, reuse or redevelopment of heritage assets elsewhere in the city. In this sense, it is useful to consider the other heritage assets in the city and particularly those that the Invercargill Licensing Trust has control over.

5 Assessment of Effects

While final plans were not available to McStay in the completion of the original HIA, the proposed works included the complete demolition of the scheduled building. Thus, McStay (2017) was able to assess the impact on this basis, and provided recommendations in accordance with industry standards.

Final architectural plans have now been completed for the site. and, as well as considering the effect, the merits of the project can also be balanced against the loss of heritage values. The merits of the project are considered high, and the construction of a high-end hotel is central to the rejuvenation of the Invercargill and a key asset in the economic development strategy for Southland (Southland Regional Development Strategy: Action Plan 2015-2025: 28).

Overall, the effect upon heritage values remains the same as presented in McStay 2017, however, without the added knowledge of this merit, and of the unfeasibility in retaining the facade. McStay had recommended the investigation of less adverse options for the development including the retention of the façade. A feasibility study was undertaken (*cf.* WT Partnerships 2018, Warren and Mahoney 2018a, 2018b, Heenan 2018) and has shown that difficulties exist in retaining the façade that would still ensure the number of floors and rooms to make a hotel viable. The window location, size and heights also present a challenge, and it is suggested to make these redundant (Heenan 2018). Economic viability is also a factor with retention of façade, approximately three times the cost of a new façade and the likely reduction of room numbers impacting upon business viability.

Accordingly, these studies determine that retaining the façade presents challenges to achieving a high – end hotel, particularly with regard to window placement. Both the engineer and the architect state that the floor heights would present a challenge meaning ultimately plans would require existing window openings not to be used, or a reduction in height or both. Without being able to incorporate the façade into a functioning portion of the new hotel, to maintain that sense of reuse, there would be little value in retaining it only as a non-functioning veneer.

There is some symbolic reference to the dimensions of the original building footprints and height in the new design which provides some mitigation to the wider effect on the streetscape, but this is less so on Dee Street.

The proposed works will trigger the legal requirements of the HNZPT Act 2014 and an archaeological authority will be required for building demolition and earthworks. The effects to archaeological values remain the same as presented in McStay (2017), however, without the retention of the façade, this would be considered as “complete” demolition under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, making building recording a mandatory condition of an archaeological authority meaning the recording is mitigation for the loss of information, and not loss of the building itself. Ie. reduced efficacy as a contributor to overall mitigation.

Overall the heritage values are moderate-high and the scale of the impacts is large, however, feasibility studies undertaken in accordance with previous recommendations, have shown the difficulties and cost in retaining physical heritage values in keeping the façade. Thus, proposed solutions to ensure both retention of values, as well as hotel development are not likely to meet the needs of either party. Therefore, it is recommended that mitigation measures be considered that are commensurate with the impacts to heritage, in the removal of all of the built structure including façade, at 73-81 Dee Street.

6 Mitigation measure

McStay 2017 has identified the heritage significance of 73-81 Dee Street as moderate-high. The severity of the impacts to these values is large but in light of feasibility, can be mitigated by a package of mitigation measures that is commensurate with the loss of the heritage and archaeological values that will result.

Non-physical heritage elements such as connection to space and place, can be achieved “onsite” through such measures as interpretation information within the hotel complex or streetscape, and the consideration of hotel/building naming rights that form a direct link to the heritage building and the block. As an example, the use of “Langland’s” would provide a direct connection to the previous use of the site and form a historic connection to the block. A connection in name, would also lend itself to interpretation options within hotel visitor handbooks, menus and the like, which would ensure that the public understands the relationship to the site.

Information about the building relating to architectural, archaeological, scientific and technological values, and pre-1900 and post-1900 changes, should be recorded prior to and during demolition and preserved via record as one way of managing heritage values. It is recommended that the building should be recorded to a Level 2 standard as defined by Heritage New Zealand (Heritage New Zealand, 2014). However, it is important to be aware that the recovery of information is a method of mitigating the loss of archaeological information, not for the loss of the site itself.

Physical connections to the history of the site can be made through the reuse of materials or display of heritage and/or archaeological material within the new structure. However, it has been determined that there are few mechanisms in the new design that will provide a physical connection to heritage values and that this loss, should be mitigated by providing means of retaining, reusing, refurbishing heritage assets elsewhere. This can be achieved by the Invercargill Licensing Trust agreeing to make a contribution to the establishment of a heritage fund administered by Invercargill City Council with the purpose of assisting with heritage retention in the city and agreeing to retain, strengthen, refurbish and reuse heritage assets elsewhere in its portfolio. .

With respect to the quantum of a monetary contribution to the establishment of a Fund, allocations made by other Councils from similar sized communities have been considered for guidance. Contestable heritage funds made available by Palmerston North District Council, Queenstown Lakes District Council and Kapiti Coast District Council are a good basis for consideration. Each of these councils makes available, a sum of approximately \$30,000 per annum to heritage projects. Given the size of these communities, NZHP suggests that it would be appropriate for the Invercargill Licensing Trust to make a contribution of \$50,000 to the establishment of an Invercargill Heritage Fund. This would represent a considerable contribution to heritage in the city. If an average grant size were to be say \$10,000 that contribution could help preserve¹ five heritage buildings in the city.

In addition it is noted that ILT owns the following scheduled buildings in its portfolio:

- 197A Dee Street –“Lone Star” building,
- 90 Dee Street – “Waxy O’Sheas” building
- 38 Dee Street – “Speights Ale House “ building

To help offset the loss of the building at 73-81 Dee Street, it is recommended that ILT put in place procedures for retaining these buildings.

¹ Assuming grants would be issued on an incentive basis with the Fund being accessed to help with planned redevelopment works.

Accordingly, on the basis of the heritage values, and considering the merits of the project, the following mitigation measures are recommended as being effective mitigation to compensate for the effect that the proposed hotel development will have upon heritage values.

Mitigation measures for 73-81 Dee Street;

- Naming of hotel should consider a direct connection to the block and history – as an example - Langland's Hotel, Hotel Langland's, Langland's suite, Langland's Bar
- Public interpretation of the heritage, by way of either signage/panels, images, videos, or hotel information booklets. As an example this could include a “history of site” or “About Langland’s” page in guest information
- Recording of the Building to Level 2 during demolition (Heritage New Zealand 2014)
- Re-use of transferable materials in either, new structure, street furniture, fixture or fittings, way-finding etc.
- Financial contribution of \$50,000 to a Council managed Heritage Fund to assist with mitigating the loss of the building.
- ILT to put in place procedures for retaining existing heritage buildings in portfolio

7 Conclusions and Recommendations

The building and site footprint of 73-81 Dee Street has been determined to have moderate-high heritage values (McStay 2017). This addendum report considers the effects of the proposed redevelopment in light of completed architectural plans, as well as the results of feasibility studies, undertaken on previous recommendations (*ibid*).

The feasibility studies present a number of difficulties in the retention of the façade, and engineering and hotel design requirements would see the façade used simply as a non-functioning veneer which, would have reduced benefit to heritage values. There are also economic challenges in retaining façade only, or strengthening the existing structure.

Thus, the “assessment of effects” has considered the full demolition of the structure and removal of subsurface archaeological resources. Therefore, the overall effect remains the same as presented in McStay 2017, however, mitigation measures have been presented for the effective mitigation of this loss. Therefore, it is recommended that the following mitigation measures be adopted during the redevelopment of the site;

- Naming of hotel should consider a direct connection to the block and history – as an example - Langland’s Hotel, Hotel Langland’s, Langland’s suite, Langland’s Bar
- Public interpretation of the heritage, by way of either signage/panels, images, videos, or hotel information booklets. As an example this could include a “history of site” or “About Langland’s” page in guest information
- Recording of the Building to Level 2 during demolition (Heritage New Zealand 2014)
- Re-use of transferable materials in either, new structure, street furniture, fixture or fittings, way-finding etc.
- Financial contribution of \$50,000 to a Council managed Heritage Fund to assist with mitigating the loss of the building.
- ILT to put in place procedures for retaining existing heritage buildings in portfolio namely;
 - Waxy O’Sheas building at 90 Dee Street
 - Lone Star building at 197A Dee Street.
 - Speights Ale House at 38 Dee Street

The following, general archaeological recommendations also apply

1. Before demolition and site redevelopment proceed (such as but not limited to foundation removal, services, landscaping, earthworks for new foundations), then an archaeological authority under Section 44 of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act (2014) should be obtained from the Heritage New Zealand prior to any modification of the site. Conditions of an archaeological authority should provide for, but not limited to the following:
 - a. The building should be recorded to a Level 2 standard as defined by Heritage New Zealand (Heritage New Zealand, 2014)
 - b. All subsurface works that may affect an archaeological site should be monitored by an archaeologist. Any archaeological features or recovered material should be appropriately recorded and analysed.
 - c. If at any stage during the redevelopment pre-European material is discovered, local iwi should be consulted in the first instance and Heritage New Zealand alerted. If pre-European material does exist in the area to be developed, damage to this should be minimised. Any pre-European artefacts will be, *prima facie*, property of the Crown and will be submitted to the appropriate institutions.
 - d. A full report on any archaeological material that is found should be prepared and submitted to the Heritage New Zealand within one year of commencement.

2. The original HIA (McStay, 2017) and this addendum, have only assessed plans to demolish the building at 73-81 Dee Street for consenting purposes. An archaeological assessment is also required for the proposed demolition, foundation removal and site redevelopment for the wider project area to accompany an application for an archaeological authority under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act (2014).

8 References

- Heritage New Zealand, (2014). Guidelines for investigation and recording of buildings and standing structures. *Archaeological Guideline Series*. 4 July 2014.
- McStay, A. (2017). *One End of Langland's Block Heritage Impact Assessment for 73-81 Dee Street, Invercargill*
- Newman, T. (2017). ILT announces \$40 million hotel for Invercargill. Retrieved May 9, 2017, from <http://www.stuff.co.nz/business/91686929/ilt-announces-40-million-hotel-for-invercargill>
- Southland Regional Development Strategy: Action Plan 2015-2025. Retrieved June 12th 2018 from http://www.sords.co.nz/site/assets/files/1/sords_action_plan.pdf
- Warren and Mahoney (2018a). Draft Design Statement. May 2018.
- Warren and Mahoney (2018b). Challenges with incorporation of existing façade. 21 May 2018. Rev A
- WT Partnerships (2018). High Level Façade Estimate for Dee Street Hotel. 23rd May 2018.

