



I hereby give notice that an ordinary meeting of the Central Joint Funding Committee will be held on:

Date: Friday, 28 November 2014
Time: 10:30am
Meeting Room: Room 5.2N
Venue: Bledisloe House
24 Wellesley Street
Auckland

Central Joint Funding Committee

OPEN AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson	Member Desley Simpson, JP
Deputy Chairperson	Member Pippa Coom
Members	Member Harry Doig
	Member Bridget Graham, QSM
	Member John Meeuwsen
	Member Christina Spence
	Member Margi Watson

(Quorum 4 members)

Michael Mendoza
Democracy Advisor

25 November 2014

Contact Telephone: +64 21 809 149
Email: michael.mendoza@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

ITEM	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
1	Welcome	5
2	Apologies	5
3	Declaration of Interest	5
4	Confirmation of Minutes	5
5	Leave of Absence	5
6	Acknowledgements	5
7	Petitions	5
8	Deputations	5
9	Public Forum	5
10	Extraordinary Business	5
11	Notices of Motion	6
12	Auckland City Cultural Heritage Allocation 2014/2015 (Round 1)	7
13	Consideration of Extraordinary Items	

1 Welcome

2 Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

3 Declaration of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Central Joint Funding Committee:

- a) confirms the minutes of its ordinary meeting, held on Monday, 8 September 2014, as a true and correct record.

5 Leave of Absence

At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

6 Acknowledgements

At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

7 Petitions

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

8 Deputations

Standing Order 3.20 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Central Joint Funding Committee. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

At the close of the agenda no requests for deputations had been received.

9 Public Forum

A period of time (approximately 30 minutes) is set aside for members of the public to address the meeting on matters within its delegated authority. A maximum of 3 minutes per item is allowed, following which there may be questions from www members.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public forum had been received.

10 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

- (a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and
- (b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-
 - (i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
 - (ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

- (a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-
 - (i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
 - (ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but
- (b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”

11 Notices of Motion

At the close of the agenda no requests for notices of motion had been received.

Discussion

5. The ACCHF is a legacy Auckland City Council contestable fund which is open to the public for applications that seek to conserve, restore and protect aspects of Auckland's cultural heritage for the enjoyment and benefit of current and future generations.
6. The ACCH supports a wide range of projects including:
 - restoration or repair of original heritage fabric relating to historic buildings or structures (such as repairs to masonry, joiner, plaster or glazing) or fencing of archaeological sites
 - protection of heritage items (such as earthquake strengthening or fire protection)
 - professional services (such as research, condition reports, conservation plans, heritage plans, conservation work specifications, management plans or supervision of work).
7. To be eligible for funding, heritage conservation projects must be for:
 - A site or building listed in the Heritage Appendix of the Auckland Council District Plan (Isthmus and Central area Section) or a site that is known to contain an archaeological site recorded on the Auckland Council cultural heritage inventory; or
 - A heritage building or tree not currently listed, but is of sufficient merit to warrant listing; or
 - A site listed in the Schedule of Maori Heritage Sites in the Auckland Council District Plan (Isthmus and Central area Section); or
 - A property that has a heritage tree listed in the Heritage Appendix of the Auckland Council District Plan (Isthmus and Central area Section).
8. Applications to the ACCHF are assessed by Council subject matter experts against the fund criteria stated in the ACCHF guidelines (appended as Attachment A). These include:
 - i. Significance: The project needs to have high heritage significance and regard will be given to whether the resource is scheduled for protection in the Auckland Council District Plan (Isthmus and Central area Section). The project needs to enhance the qualities for which the heritage item is valued.
 - ii. Funding Necessity: Whether funding is important to securing the future of an at risk item/place.
 - iii. Compliance with Best Practice: The extent to which the project reflects best practice as outlined in the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICMOS) New Zealand Charter.
 - iv. Public Access and Educational Value: The degree of physical access, visual access or educational value.
 - v. Extent to which projects recognise Maori perspectives.
9. This assessment forms the basis of funding recommendations that are presented to the committee for their consideration.
10. The current interim approach to community funding, endorsed by the Regional Development and Operations Committee (RDOC) in May 2011, allocated decision-making responsibility over the ACCHF to the Central local boards. In March 2014, the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee endorsed the extension of this interim approach to community funding for the 2014/15 financial year. In total, \$50,000 is available for allocation in the Annual Plan for the 2014/15 financial year.
11. The ACCHF has two funding rounds, closing August 2014 and March 2015. The first funding round for the ACCHF opened for applications on 17 July 2014 and closed on 22 August 2014.

Table One. Summary of ACCHF application closing dates.

	Application closing date	Funding decisions expected
Funding meeting 1	Friday 22 August 2014	October- November 2014
Funding meeting 2	Friday 13 March 2015	May-June 2015

12. The availability of environmental funding and information on the 2014/2015 funding rounds has been promoted through the Auckland Council website, through Auckland Council publications, press advertisements in local print media and email notification to heritage stakeholders.

Consideration

13. Five applications from within the Auckland Isthmus and Central area were received during funding round one that closed on 22 August 2014.
14. All five applications met the scope of works and eligibility criteria for funding and application assessments were completed by the Auckland Council Principal Heritage Advisor (Central). Grant allocation recommendations are made in line with ACCHF assessment criteria and funding policy. An application assessment summary for each application is attached to this report and funding recommendations are presented for the committee's consideration.
15. Following application assessments, it is recommended that all five of the applications received are supported in this funding round with grants totalling \$23,322.93.
16. Finance and resourcing requirements for the delivery of the ACCHF are within current heritage incentive budgets provided in the 2014/2015 annual plan.
17. Annually \$50,000 is available through the ACCHF for allocation by the committee. Current funding recommendations would allocate \$23,322.93 to five applications leaving \$26,677.07 available for allocation in the second funding round.

Local Board Views and Implications

18. This report seeks the view of the affected local boards.

Maori Impact Statement

19. The provision of community funding to support historic heritage initiatives provides opportunities for all Aucklanders to undertake projects, programmes and activities that benefit Maori. The significance of sites to Maori and the extent to which applications recognise Maori perspectives is considered as part of the application assessment process.

General

Implementation Issues

20. No legal and implementation issues have been identified. The fund will be allocated in accordance with the decision of the Central Joint Funding Committee.

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
A	Auckland City Cultural Heritage application assessment report	11

Signatories

Author	Fran Hayton - Environmental Funding Advisor
Authorisers	John Dragicevich - Manager Infrastructure and Environmental Services Adam Milina - Relationship Manager - Albert-Eden & Orakei Local Boards

Item 12

AUCKLAND CITY CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND Applicant Assessments for Funding Round 1 Financial Year 2014/2015			
APPLICANT	Kay Wooff		APPLICATION NO. ACCH14_150003
PROJECT BACKGROUND			
TITLE	Garden Maintenance Project		
LOCATION	26 Clive Road, Mt Eden	LOCAL BOARD	Albert-Eden
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	This is the last stage of the Garden Maintenance Plan which involves formative pruning of trees and shrubs, and tree and noxious weeds removal. The tree work involved in the project is urgent as the Titoki is growing into the foundations of the original garage which the owners are required to keep and restore. There is too much vegetation in the garden which necessitates the removal of some trees and shrubs as they are causing discolouration and dampness to the unsealed concrete of the house (it is a Heritage New Zealand requirement that the walls are left unsealed) and it is also creating the perfect environment for the infestation of borer, which is evident in the house.		
BACKGROUND	<p>Whare Tane, the house, garden and surrounds have a Category 1 listing with Heritage New Zealand and a B listing in the Schedule of Heritage Buildings in the Auckland District Scheme due to its architectural merit, reference to the work of Frank Lloyd Wright, and connection to original owner-Trevor Lloyd. The property also has Maori influenced carvings that decorate the house and gardens. The property is listed in the Maungawhau Heritage Walks brochure, Parnell Trust Epsom Heritage Walk and Ngati Whatua guided Maori walks. The Magnolia tree to the centre front of the property is the largest specimen of it type in Auckland, and the sunken garden is to the front of the property and is very visible.</p>		
COUNCIL FUNDING (LAST TWO YEARS)	ACCHF 2012/13 \$1,600 ACCHF 2013/14 \$2,000		
RISK TO COUNCIL	No risks to Council have been identified.		
FINANCIAL INFORMATION			
TOTAL COST	\$ 3,272.71		
APPLICANT/ OTHER PARTY'S CONTRIBUTION	\$ 1,636.40	DETAIL OF CONTRIBUTION	Tree pruning and removal, and weed removal.
AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$ 1,636.40	DETAIL OF FUNDING REQUESTED	Tree pruning and removal, and weed removal.
APPLICATION ASSESSMENT			
SCORING	SIGNIFICANCE		25/35
	FUNDING NECESSITY		20/25
	COMPLIANCE WITH GOOD PRACTICE		20/20
	PUBLIC ACCESS		4/15
	RECOGNISING MAORI PERSPECTIVES		2.5/5
	TOTAL SCORE		71.5/100
ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	It is recommended that funding be approved to continue the process of conservation of the surrounds to a significant protected residence. While general maintenance (including that of the gardens) is not normally publicly funded, the large extent of this property, and the level of public and iwi value inherent in it, warrant support and funding.		
FUNDING RECOMMENDED	\$ 1,636.40	FUNDING RECOMMENDED FOR	Contribution towards garden maintenance project.

AUCKLAND CITY CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND Applicant Assessments for Funding Round 1 Financial Year 2014/2015			
APPLICANT	St Joseph's Catholic Church Grey Lynn		APPLICATION NO. ACCH14_150006
PROJECT BACKGROUND			
TITLE	Leadlight Renovation for Church Windows		
LOCATION	470 Great North Road, Grey Lynn	LOCAL BOARD	Waitemata
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	This project is one of the smaller projects of the overall restoration project, focusing on addressing the damage caused by water leaking through the church walls. The church has suffered leaks from the stained glass that has come loose over the last 53 years. The window needs to be repaired to avoid structural damage to the church walls.		
BACKGROUND	<p>St Joseph's Parish is celebrating 100 years of faith in Grey Lynn and the building itself is 53 years old. Its artwork workmanship and design is of significant value. The stained glass windows are designed by renowned NZ artist Milan Mrkusich, who also designed windows for Te Papa.</p> 		
COUNCIL FUNDING (LAST TWO YEARS)	N/A		
RISK TO COUNCIL	No risks to Council have been identified.		
FINANCIAL INFORMATION			
TOTAL COST	\$ 7,187.50		
APPLICANT/ OTHER PARTY'S CONTRIBUTION	\$ 3,593.75	DETAIL OF CONTRIBUTION	Leadlight renovation.
AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$ 3,593.75	DETAIL OF FUNDING REQUESTED	Leadlight renovation.
APPLICATION ASSESSMENT			
SCORING	SIGNIFICANCE		30/35
	FUNDING NECESSITY		15/25
	COMPLIANCE WITH GOOD PRACTICE		20/20
	PUBLIC ACCESS		8/15
	RECOGNISING MAORI PERSPECTIVES		0/5
	TOTAL SCORE		73/100
ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	It is recommended that this application be supported. Stained-glass windows are, as in this case, a significant aspect visually and physically of a heritage church. Such leadlighted windows will periodically need significant remedial work if they are to survive, and protect the building in which they exist. They are not open to general progressive maintenance (which would not be eligible for funding). In this case the proposed remedial work is modest and in line with accepted best practice methods		
FUNDING RECOMMENDED	\$ 3,593.75	FUNDING RECOMMENDED FOR	Contribution towards remedial maintenance to leadwork and sealant material.

AUCKLAND CITY CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND Applicant Assessments for Funding Round 1 Financial Year 2014/2015				
APPLICANT	St. Patrick's Cathedral Heritage Foundation		APPLICATION NO.	ACCH14_150002
PROJECT BACKGROUND				
TITLE	Heritage Cast Iron Fence Restoration Project - repair extensive corrosive oxidation			
LOCATION	1 St Patricks Square, Auckland Central	LOCAL BOARD	Waitemata	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	This project seeks to restore a heritage cast iron fence on top of a stone boundary wall. Work will include repairs to the heavily rusted and decayed lower portions of the gates, preparation of the metalwork for repainting, painting of the fence, gates and 2 light standards and replacing missing lead bedding to a baluster bar.			
BACKGROUND	<p>The St. Patrick's Cathedral is scheduled Category A in the Auckland Council District Plan (Central section) and listed as a Category 1 building with Heritage New Zealand.. It is a significant example of brick-built Gothic Revival architecture. The contribution the 1896 cast iron fence makes to the Cathedral, to St. Patrick's Square, to the City generally, and specifically to its immediate surrounds, is historic, aesthetic, functional and technical. Furthermore, it is important to note that the iron fence is a feature of aesthetic significance contributing greatly to the external appearance of the edifice. To the north and the south, it demarcates the boundaries of the Cathedral and is functionally significant in that, in a welcoming way, it adds cohesion to the property as a unit.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;">   </div>			
COUNCIL FUNDING (LAST TWO YEARS)	ACCHF 2013/14 \$4,000 EIF 2012 \$3,000			
RISK TO COUNCIL	No risks to Council have been identified.			
FINANCIAL INFORMATION				
TOTAL COST	\$ 10,185.55			
APPLICANT/ OTHER PARTY'S CONTRIBUTION	\$ 5,092.78	DETAIL OF CONTRIBUTION	Repair to gates and heritage architect fees.	
AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$ 5,092.77	DETAIL OF FUNDING REQUESTED	Repair to gates and heritage architect fees.	
APPLICATION ASSESSMENT				
SCORING	SIGNIFICANCE		30/35	
	FUNDING NECESSITY		25/25	
	COMPLIANCE WITH GOOD PRACTICE		20/20	
	PUBLIC ACCESS		12.5/15	
	RECOGNISING MAORI PERSPECTIVES		0/5	
	TOTAL SCORE		87.5/100	
ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	It is recommended that this application be supported. The lawns, basalt walls, and wrought-iron fences define the 'Close' to St Patricks Cathedral - the venerable concept of a sacred contemplative context insulating the church from the cosmopolitan city around it while still remaining open to public access. The items are listed in the Cathedral's Conservation Plan as an "item of exceptional significance which should be preserved and protected at all costs."			
FUNDING RECOMMENDED	\$ 5,092.77	FUNDING RECOMMENDED FOR	Contribution towards the restoration of corroding metal components.	

AUCKLAND CITY CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND Applicant Assessments for Funding Round 1 Financial Year 2014/2015				
APPLICANT	Emma Pritchard		APPLICATION NO.	ACCH14_150005
PROJECT BACKGROUND				
TITLE	Restoration of rock walls on street frontage of Champtaloup House			
LOCATION	621 Mount Eden Road, Mt Eden	LOCAL BOARD	Albert-Eden	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	This project is a continuation of last year's restoration of the Champtaloup House's rock walls. The front rock walls at Champtaloup House are showing significant movement and have been patched in part to keep them stable. It is clear that there is movement in the front walls (leaning forward) and that collapse is imminent. They hold up the entire foundation of the house and it is critical that the ground remains stabilized around the house.			
BACKGROUND	<p>Champtaloup House is an Arts and Crafts historic home built by William Gummer in 1914. It is a prominent family home in Mt Eden which has a Category II listing with Heritage New Zealand along with its 1/4 acre surroundings. It is one of the few architectural examples like this that is so visible to the community. The owners have put a considerable amount of money into the maintenance and restoration of the house over the past few years, including work on the roof and beams of the house, and the garden.</p>  			
COUNCIL FUNDING (LAST TWO YEARS)	EIF 2014 \$9,892.85 rock wall restoration (pending) ACCHF 2013/14 \$6,000; EIF 2013 \$2,455 rock wall restoration ACCHF 2013/14 \$7,000; EIF 2013 \$2,888 roof restoration ACCHF 2012/13 \$14,337.48 roof restoration and garden reinstatement			
RISK TO COUNCIL	No risks to Council have been identified.			
FINANCIAL INFORMATION				
TOTAL COST	\$ 19,785.75			
APPLICANT/ OTHER PARTY'S CONTRIBUTION	\$ 9,892.85	DETAIL OF CONTRIBUTION	Rock wall restoration.	
AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$ 9,892.85	DETAIL OF FUNDING REQUESTED	Rock wall restoration.	
APPLICATION ASSESSMENT				
SCORING	SIGNIFICANCE		20/35	
	FUNDING NECESSITY		25/25	
	COMPLIANCE WITH GOOD PRACTICE		20/20	
	PUBLIC ACCESS		12.5/15	
	RECOGNISING MAORI PERSPECTIVES		0/5	
	TOTAL SCORE		77.5/100	
ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	It is recommended that this application be partially supported to continue the required maintenance of rapidly-failing rock street walls to Champtaloup House. The property is recognised as a Category II listing with Heritage New Zealand. Work required is unusually extensive and expensive for a private owner, but is critically needed in part to avoid massive failure into the public realm.			
FUNDING RECOMMENDED	\$ 5,000	FUNDING RECOMMENDED FOR	Contribution towards the partial restoration of failing sections of street wall to garden.	

AUCKLAND CITY CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND Applicant Assessments for Funding Round 1 Financial Year 2014/2015				
APPLICANT	Orakei Methodist Parish Trust- St Paul's Remuera		APPLICATION NO.	ACCH14_150007
PROJECT BACKGROUND				
TITLE	Engineering analysis of structural capacity (seismic stability)			
LOCATION	12 St Vincent Avenue, Remuera	LOCAL BOARD	Orakei	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	The project is to conduct an engineering analysis in order to determine whether the seismic stability of the church and the hall buildings are within the requirements of the new building code. Both the church and hall buildings are required to have a minimum seismic stability of 50%. The intended analysis will determine the extent of compliance or deficiency and then, if needed, will subsequently plan any required modifications.			
BACKGROUND	<p>The church building is believed to be one of the earliest New Zealand Methodist churches where interior development was on the basis of beauty rather than the previous purely utilitarian pattern. The church was built in 1920 and is listed as Category B with Heritage New Zealand. The 4 embellished and exposed ceiling beams and 6 stained glass windows made by Whitefriars of London are of particular merit and interest. There is also a triptych window in the foyer which was made by artist Beverly Shore Bennett.</p>			
COUNCIL FUNDING (LAST TWO YEARS)	N/A			
RISK TO COUNCIL	No risks to Council have been identified.			
FINANCIAL INFORMATION				
TOTAL COST	\$ 75,000			
APPLICANT/ OTHER PARTY'S CONTRIBUTION	\$ 39,000	DETAIL OF CONTRIBUTION	Engineering analysis and planning works programme.	
AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$ 36,000	DETAIL OF FUNDING REQUESTED	Engineering analysis and planning works programme.	
APPLICATION ASSESSMENT				
SCORING	SIGNIFICANCE		30/35	
	FUNDING NECESSITY		10/25	
	COMPLIANCE WITH GOOD PRACTICE		20/20	
	PUBLIC ACCESS		8/15	
	RECOGNISING MAORI PERSPECTIVES		0/5	
	TOTAL SCORE		68/100	
ASSESSMENT SUMMARY	Although this proposed work (especially the intended initial engineering assessment) is prudent and good practice, it is not yet strictly required by national statute. This may change, if and, when the Government responds to Council's initiatives in regard to applicable and reasonable earthquake standards relevant to Auckland. Until this response occurs and Auckland has an agreed percentage NBS (New Building Standard) to define seismic upgrade work for existing buildings, the applicable targets for strengthening in the city are in limbo. In the interim, a moderate contribution toward the analysis phase of the proposals may be justified.			
FUNDING RECOMMENDED	\$ 8,000	FUNDING RECOMMENDED FOR	Contribution to initial engineering analysis of the building's seismic resistance.	