

BUILT HERITAGE SPECIALIST MEMO

19 August 2016

To: Angela Taganahan, Planner, Central Resource Consenting and Compliance, Auckland Council

From: Blair Hastings, Consultant Built Heritage Adviser, for and on behalf of Auckland Council

Subject: R/LUC/2016/3407 – 7 Arthur Street, Freemans Bay

Dear Angela

Thank you for forwarding this application for Built Heritage assessment. Please note, this memo is provided for internal use only. Do not hesitate to contact the author and/or the Heritage Unit for any clarification or further discussion you may require.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The existing house at number 7 Arthur Street may date to the earliest subdivisions in Freemans Bay. It may evidence an atypical micro-pattern of development, to site houses 'back-to-front' - in order it is presumed, to preference the view rather than the street, as was generally more common in the surrounding area and across the zone more broadly.

The proposal to remove and/or demolish the house will result in the loss of its unusual 'back-to-front' siting (facing east) combined with the inevitable loss of some heritage fabric through demolition, which together will have a moderate effect on the historical form and pattern of the streetscape and neighbourhood. However, a combination of other factors, including a lack of any direct historical associations of significance, and most importantly, the building's current lack of physical integrity has led us to conclude that although the proposal will involve some loss of heritage fabric it is considered that the effects on the heritage values of the streetscape arising from demolition will be minor.

We note though that one of the criterion under which the removal or demolition is assessed regards any replacement building, and whether its design, quality, purpose and amenities would positively contribute to the neighbourhood character. In this particular instance, a suitable replacement building will be essential to mitigate the effects of demolition to an acceptable level.

Having assessed the proposal against the criteria relating to the construction of any new building in the Residential 1 zone we are of the opinion (referring to our full review in section 8 below) that the new house will not positively contribute to the neighbourhood character, and we therefore cannot support the application.

2. PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The applicant seeks to remove an existing dwelling and construct a new dwelling at 7 Arthur Street, Freemans Bay.

3. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 The subject site is on the eastern side of Arthur Street in the block between Pember Reeves Street and Franklin Road.
- 3.2 The existing dwelling, garage and shed currently on the subject site are proposed for removal. It is proposed to construct a new three level, four-bedroom dwelling and a swimming pool within the same site.
- 3.3 The following statements describing 7 Arthur Street are paraphrased from the AEE (with which we concur):

'The subject site is approximately 620m², is of a skewed rectangular shape and is located on the eastern side of Arthur Street. An existing dwelling is located on the front half of the property, while a garage and sleep out is located within the south eastern corner of the property. A small shed is located to the rear of the garage/sleep-out adjacent to the eastern property boundary. The land within the building platform of the existing dwelling and the garage are of a level gradient, however the north eastern corner of the site falls slightly towards the rear property boundary.'

'The rear half of the property behind the house is grassed with a concrete tiled terrace and several trees. Decking is provided from the rear of the dwelling and also north of the sleep-out.'

'The existing dwelling is setback approximately 5m from the front property boundary. A front verandah spans the full width of the dwelling and a set of stairs is located centrally providing access to the front doorway. The existing footprint of the dwelling is approximately 131m² which includes two storeys; the lower level is a basement below street level.'

- 3.4 The following statements about the history of 7 Arthur Street are paraphrased from the DPA Heritage Impact Statement:

'The property on which the present dwelling stands was originally purchased by Crown Grant in 1845 and formed part of Allotment 20, Section 8 of the Suburbs of Auckland. In 1873, Lot 29 was purchased by Colonel William H Kenny. Evidently there was a building on the property at or around this time, when he and his wife Mary were living there. It is unclear as to whether part of the current building may have been the one occupied by the Kenny's or whether it is a 'new' building possibly dating from the early 20th century.'

'A third-generation officer in the British army, Henry entered the 73rd Regiment in 1828, serving in Canada. Kenny brought the first detachment of New Zealand Fencibles to Auckland, serving as their commanding officer from 1849 and was heavily involved in averting the threatened invasion of Auckland by the Ngātipoua. Kenny was a commanding officer in the Waikato War (1860s) and was subsequently appointed Colonel of the New Zealand Militia and Inspector of Volunteers for the North Island.'

'While the Kenny's resided mainly in Onehunga, their later years were spent in Ponsonby and Arthur Street. Kenny died in 1880 at Ponsonby, Auckland with Mary Kenny passing in 1889. At the time of her death, the dwelling was put up for sale. Described as "six rooms and out-offices in good order" the property was purchased in March 1890 by Thomas and Annie Ashley, who owned the property until Annie Ashley's death in c. 1909.'

'In 1919 the property was purchased by artist, Frank Wright who resided in the house until his death in 1923. Wright was to have shared a studio with his brother Walter who inherited the property but did not necessarily live in the building, renting it to a number of tenants before his death in 1950.'

- 3.5 It is therefore unclear when the existing house was built. The applicant rightly points out that the house in effect faces away from the road, or that it is 'back to front' in terms of the standard villa typology. The applicant questions whether the house was not perhaps 'relocated' onto this site from elsewhere, and does not acknowledge that it may have been built 'back to front'.
- 3.6 The 1908 Auckland map however shows what is very likely the same house – facing away from the street. The map actually shows a number of houses on Arthur Street facing east – in order we presume to face the city and the view, as the falling topography presented this opportunity. The extract from the map below shows the house adjacent at number 5, similarly facing east.
- 3.7 Aerial photographs from the 1950s and later architectural plans seem to match the footprint shown in the 1908 map, although the records are not entirely conclusive about whether this was [and is] the original house – or at least one that dates pre 1908.
- 3.8 What we do know however, as matter of some background importance is that in terms of the development pattern along Arthur Street at or around the turn of the twentieth century, it was not uncommon to see villas built facing east – or away from the street.
- 3.9 The existing house at number 7 Arthur Street may well then represent one of the few remaining houses that evidence that historic development pattern.



1908 Auckland Map - Number 7 Arthur Street outlined in red. Both it and number 5 (immediately south) face east.¹ Note also that the site at [what is now] number 3 was vacant, as part of the large land holding at number 5.

¹ 1908 Auckland Map: http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/dbtw-wpd/exec/dbtwpub.dll?AC=PREV_RECORD&XC=/dbtw-wpd/exec/dbtwpub.dll&BU=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.aucklandcity.govt.nz%2Fdbtw-wpd%2FCityArchives%2F1908Map%2Fsearch1908map.htm&TN=1908Map&SN=AUTO6273&SE=938&RN=1&MR=20&TR=0&TX=100



1955 - Number 7 Arthur Street circled in red. The house faces east. The lean-to facing the street is a typical component of the rear façades of early Auckland villas.²



1949 – As examples of other buildings on Arthur Street that similarly face away from the street – From left to right, numbers 33, 31 and 23 all face east.³

3.10 Also as a matter of background importance, the house has been extensively modified – both externally, and courtesy of the DPA Heritage Impact Statement, we understand, internally. The early or original lean-to part of the building that faced west has been

[0&ES=0&CS=1&XP=&RF=Map+Results&EF=&DF=Map+Description&RL=0&EL=0&DL=0&NP=2&ID=&MF=WPEngMsg.ini&MQ=&TI=0&DT=&ST=0&IR=0&NR=0&NB=0&SV=0&SS=0&BG=&FG=&QS=&OEX=ISO-8859-1&OEH=ISO-8859-1](http://natlib.govt.nz/records/23526037)

² View south along Ponsonby Road, Auckland City, with residential and commercial buildings, to Albert Park and Mt Eden beyond. Whites Aviation Ltd :Photographs. Ref: WA-38875-F. Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand. <http://natlib.govt.nz/records/23526037>

³ Palmer Collins and Whittaker, Ponsonby Road, Auckland. Whites Aviation Ltd :Photographs. Ref: WA-21136-G. Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand. <http://natlib.govt.nz/records/23225706>

removed. In its place a stylised veranda has been added, to otherwise respect the typical character of what might be construed as square-fronted street facing villa. A large lean-to was added to the south-eastern corner of the house, presumably replacing the original porch, adjacent to what is assumed to be the original east-facing hipped bay. All of the original windows have now been replaced and the basement has been excavated to include further accommodation space. It is likely that the building has been reclad.

- 3.11 We agree with the DPA report that there appears to be no [or very little] original [or pre-1940] heritage fabric remaining. Internally, we accept that the space has been considerably reconfigured from its original form.

4. INFORMATION ASSESSED

- 4.1 Our assessment (referring to section 8 below) is based on our review of the following materials received by Auckland Council:

- 4.1.1. An 'AEE' prepared by Code Planning, dated July 2016;
- 4.1.2. A Heritage Impact Statement prepared by Dave Pearson Architects (DPA), dated July 2016;
- 4.1.3. A Design Statement prepared by McKinney + Windeatt Architects, undated;
- 4.1.4. Architectural drawings prepared by McKinney + Windeatt Architects, dated June 2016; and
- 4.1.5. Auckland Council pre-application minutes dated May 2016.

- 4.2 Our assessment (referring to section 8 below) is based on our review of the Objectives, Policies, and Assessment criteria contained within the Auckland Council District Plan (Auckland City Isthmus Section) 2011 (the District Plan), in particular, under:

- 4.2.1. 7.6.1.1: Objective - To ensure the survival of the form and pattern of subdivision, buildings and streetscape in Auckland's early established residential neighbourhoods;
- 4.2.2. 7.6.1.1: Policy - By requiring renovation and new building construction in a manner which maintains the historical form, pattern, intensity and grain of buildings and streetscape in the areas to which the zone is applied;
- 4.2.3. 7.6.1.1: Policy - By imposing provisions which seek to maintain and as appropriate enhance the amenity of the streetscape appearance of these areas through controlling structures in the front yard and through road maintenance and improvements compatible with the character of the vicinity;
- 4.2.4. 7.6.1.1: Policy - By encouraging, where practical, the construction of garages and carports to the rear of, underneath (where appropriate in terms of topography), or alongside the building on the site to ensure the front garden and façade remain visible to the streetscape;
- 4.2.5. 7.6.1.1: Policy - By controlling the demolition/removal of buildings constructed prior to 1940 where they contribute positively to the special character of the streetscape;

- 4.2.6. 7.7.4.3: U. Demolition or removal of buildings (more than 30% by volume and excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1 zone; and
- 4.2.7. 7.7.4.3: R. Construction or relocation of residential units or any new building or accessory building in the Residential 1 zone.
- 4.3 Our assessment (referring to section 8 below) is also based on our site visit 11 August 2016.

5. OPERATIVE PLAN STATUS

- 5.1 7 Arthur Street, Freemans Bay is located in the Residential 1 Zone of the District Plan.
- 5.2 Resource consent is sought as a restricted discretionary activity under rule 7.7.1 for 'The total or substantial demolition or removal (more than 30% by volume) of any building (excluding accessory buildings) constructed on the site prior to 1940 in the Residential 1 zone.
- 5.3 Resource consent is also sought as a restricted discretionary activity under rule 7.7.1 for 'Construction and/or relocation of residential units or any new building (including accessory buildings).

6. PROPOSED AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN DECISIONS VERSION (PAUP) STATUS

- 6.1 7 Arthur Street, Freemans Bay is located in the Special Character overlay (Isthmus A) in the PAUP. However, assessment against the PAUP criteria has not been provided in this memo because the PAUP Decisions Version was released after this application was lodged. An assessment against the PAUP criteria will be provided separately, if needed.

7. OVERALL PLAN STATUS

- 7.1 As the most restrictive activity status applies under the Resource Management Act, the application is being assessed as a Discretionary Activity – as a result of other rule infringements not directly associated with this heritage assessment.

8. HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Demolition Assessment criteria:

- 8.1 Under 7.7.4.3: U. Demolition or removal of buildings (more than 30% by volume and excluding accessory buildings) constructed prior to 1940 in the Residential 1 zone. In considering an application to demolish (either totally or substantially) or remove any building (excluding any accessory building) constructed prior to 1940, the Council will restrict its discretion to the following criteria;
- 8.1.1. "The legacy character and value of the existing building and contribution it makes to the legacy form and pattern of the streetscape and neighbourhood;"

- 8.1.1.1. Built Heritage assessment: We generally agree with the applicant's historic and current integrity assessments – That the house has been highly altered and its historical and contextual associations are not particularly notable. The intrinsic character and value of the existing building as it relates to its integrity is low.
- 8.1.1.2. Built Heritage assessment: The orientation however is an interesting anomaly – which as alluded to above may well evidence some form of early atypical subdivision patterning – in order to preference the view to the east, rather than the street to the west. In this regard the house may well represent a remaining element of this micro-patterning as it were, that appears to have been in evidence along this side of Arthur Street on the early Auckland maps. While the reasoning behind it is unproven, this 'anomaly' may well represent an interesting, if atypical, early development pattern – that will be lost with the building's removal and/or demolition.
- 8.1.1.3. Built Heritage assessment: While then the architectural integrity of the house is today low, its siting (facing east) combined with the inevitable loss of some heritage fabric through demolition, leads us to conclude that the removal of the house will have a moderate effect on the historical form and pattern of the streetscape and neighbourhood.
- 8.1.2. "Whether the demolition or removal of the building itself will detract from the special character of the streetscape and neighbourhood as a whole. To demonstrate this, a site and context analysis shall be submitted which shows the extent to which the existing building shares the dominant original form and design features with other buildings in the street."
- 8.1.2.1. Built Heritage assessment: We generally agree with the applicant that the character of the streetscape is varied - with a combination of various housing typologies, ages (even across the 'modern' spectrum), and cladding types. Many of the surrounding dwellings on Arthur Street have undergone alterations and more contemporary buildings have been constructed including a series of apartments and town houses. This has resulted in a varied streetscape with little or no immediate cohesive character or architectural form.
- 8.1.2.2. Built Heritage assessment: Despite the varied character of the streetscape, the building's siting (facing east) is similar to the siting of other buildings in the street. As described above, this may well represent a remaining element of the micro-patterning of back-to-front villa orientation that appears to have been in evidence along this side of Arthur Street on the early Auckland maps.
- 8.1.2.3. Built Heritage assessment: If the subject dwelling were less modified then its removal would have more of an impact – as it is however, it is barely recognisable as a villa. The added porch (street-side) to what is otherwise the rear of the original house adds only limited 'character' and no historic heritage value.
- 8.1.2.4. Built Heritage assessment: We consider the impact of the demolition or removal of the building on the special character of the streetscape and neighbourhood as a whole will be moderate. The subject building's lack of integrity reduces its contribution to the streetscape, but the loss of any

authentic historic buildings will further erode the already varied character of Arthur Street.

8.1.3. “Whether the building has retained its basic original (or restored) design features relating to the overall form, mass, proportion and materials (i.e. its integrity) so that restoration/renovation of the building is practicable and reasonable, such that it makes a positive contribution to the legacy form and pattern of the streetscape and neighbourhood. When determining what is practical and reasonable, regard shall be had to:

- i. Achieving current Building Code compliant standards
- ii. Providing modern day/living/amenity standards.”

8.1.3.1. Built Heritage assessment: The scale and roof form of the dwelling from the roadside remains consistent with older dwellings in the area, and therefore does contribute to the streetscape. That it is ‘back to front’ is an interesting feature that is shared by many early buildings along this side of Arthur Street, but it is not one that necessarily enhances the anticipated ‘character’ of the wider area. The zone is typically defined by the rhythm of similar housing, oriented towards the street. While the ‘reversal’ may be the direct result of planned subdivisions and makes a modest contribution to the historical form and pattern of the streetscape, it does not enhance the immediate ‘visual’ character of the zone.

8.1.3.2. Built Heritage assessment: The applicant remarks that ‘the dwelling has been so extensively modified that its original form is unable to be determined with any accuracy. Restoration of the building is neither practicable nor reasonable.’ We don’t strictly agree with this – the form can be determined with at least some certainty from the records and photographs we have, and it would be possible to reinstate its original form. We agree however that the extent of the current alterations combined with the inherent modesty (in size) of the original form, may render restoration if not impossible then perhaps not reasonable, particularly when compared to the applicant’s apparent spatial needs.

8.1.4. “In the event that there is a concurrent application for a replacement building, whether its design, quality, purpose and amenities would positively contribute to the neighbourhood character in accord with assessment in criteria R [below].”

8.1.4.1. Built Heritage assessment: We consider that the impact of the new building will not positively contribute to the neighbourhood character – Referring to the assessment in 8.2 below.

New Building Assessment criteria:

8.2 Under 7.7.4.3: R. Construction or relocation of residential units or any new building or accessory building in the Residential 1 zone. When assessing an application for a resource consent for a new building (be it a residential unit, new building or an accessory building), the Council must be satisfied that the relevant objectives and policies for the zone have been met, and that:

- 8.2.1. “The form, mass, proportion and scale of the building shall be compatible with the original architectural style predominant in the street, and shall not ignore, compete with, or dominate that character.”
- 8.2.1.1. Built Heritage assessment: In our opinion none of the form, mass, proportion and scale are compatible with the original architectural style predominant in the street.
- 8.2.1.2. Built Heritage assessment: Appreciating the relatively small size of the site, the topography and the spatial needs of the applicant, the proposed building appears to have been designed to maximise the allowable building envelope rather than as an attempt to appropriate historic shape, form, mass and proportioning. The objective of the zone is to: ensure the survival of the form and pattern of subdivision, buildings and streetscape in Auckland's early established residential neighbourhoods. This is about replicating or appropriating original patterns of scale and mass – not about maximising each and every development control.
- 8.2.1.3. Built Heritage assessment: While we accept to a degree that the pitch of the roof [as seen from the road] is somewhat consistent with that of the surrounding villas, the roofs (as there appear to be a number of them) are in our opinion however too much of an abstraction to not compete with or dominate original character. We note that these comments regard the comparison with ‘original form’ only – as required under the district plan - and we are not critiquing the architectural merit or otherwise of the building as a stand-alone object.
- 8.2.1.4. Built Heritage assessment: So while we appreciate the design efforts made such that the new form will not completely ignore the original character predominant in the area – and also that the single storey scale (read from the road) is not so extreme by comparison with the original housing stock – we consider that the physical and aesthetic qualities of the building will undoubtedly dominate.
- 8.2.1.5. Built Heritage assessment: The new building will not be compatible with the original architectural style predominant in the street, and we are of the opinion that it will dominate that character.
- 8.2.2. “Materials used shall be in sympathy and shall have a clear relationship to the traditional character and materials of buildings along the street.”
- 8.2.2.1. Built Heritage assessment: The Heritage Impact Statement remarks that ‘contemporary materials have been chosen for the proposed dwelling including blockwork masonry walls and seamed metal roofing and wall cladding. The majority of the buildings in the street are clad in timber weather-boards; however, as the architectural style, forms and colour palettes are extremely varied between the surrounding dwellings no visual continuity is achieved. The selected materials will therefore have a less than minor effect on the heritage values of the streetscape.’
- 8.2.2.2. Built Heritage assessment: These proposed materials are contemporary – and have no (or very little) relationship with the traditional character and materials of buildings along the street. While we agree with the applicant that

the architectural typologies and styles along the street are now varied – there is (as is noted by the applicant) still a predominant use of timber weather-boarding. Notwithstanding the nature of change that has occurred along the street, further removal of heritage fabric, without proposing to rebuild in materials without any associative connection to the original villa (or the broader original character of the area) can only worsen or lessen the special character of the zone.

8.2.2.3. Built Heritage assessment: The materials proposed will not be in sympathy with traditional character.

8.2.3. “Parts of the building which are highly visible to the street shall maintain a window to wall ratio visible from the street that is similar to that predominant or the surviving original character buildings in the street.”

8.2.3.1. Built Heritage assessment: The proportion of glazing proposed across the front of the house does not appear to be commensurate with the traditional villa. It is however quite possibly close – and if the proportion of glazing is higher than for the original building, it will most definitely better meet the modern amenity needs of the applicant.

8.2.3.2. Built Heritage assessment: The applicant notes that ‘as the original character of the streetscape has been largely modified the level of glazing will not have an impact on the architectural character of the surrounding streetscape.’ We do not entirely agree with this statement.

8.2.3.3. Built Heritage assessment: The proposed design uses a single large expanse of glazing, rather than distinct openings punched into solid walls as was typical of the traditional villa. We see the proportioning of window to wall as less of an issue in the composition of the overall design. That the garage (an inherently inactive space) presents blankly is however more of a problem – and is addressed further below.

8.2.4. “Buildings shall be located on a site so that the siting of the building reflects the original subdivision and development patterns existing in the street, particularly in situations where development is occurring on an amalgamated site. This ensures the ‘grain’ of the area (in terms of the size, spacing and rhythm of street-front buildings) is maintained.”

8.2.4.1. Built Heritage assessment: The DPA statement notes ‘the proposed building remains in a similar location to the existing building and also maintains the average yard setback of the surrounding properties. The proposed building is wider than the existing dwelling and the distance from the north and south boundaries smaller than the existing footprint. However, the majority of the dwellings on Arthur Street are positioned in close proximity to their respective boundaries. This change in building footprint is seen to have a less than minor effect on the spacing and rhythm of the streetscape.’

8.2.4.2. Built Heritage assessment: We partially agree with this – in that the setback is similar to the existing house, and most probably to early or original subdivision patterns. We agree also that changes across the street have meant that original ‘spacings’ have been compromised. An assessment of this criterion in

the strictest sense however, leads me to conclude that the 'grain' of the area (in terms of the size and spacing of the new-build, when compared to original patterns of development) will not be maintained.

8.2.4.3. Built Heritage assessment: The 'grain' of the area (especially in terms of the size of the building and the spacing created between the subject building and numbers 5 and 7 Arthur Street) will not be maintained.

8.2.5. "Buildings shall also be located on a site so that they do not detract from the continuity of the front façade alignment of residential dwellings in the street."

8.2.5.1. Built Heritage assessment: Following on from comments above, we generally accept the setback in terms of maintaining the historic rhythm. We do not however accept as appropriate the dominance of the garage in terms of a) its presence as the most forward of all building elements and b) its setback dimension that does not appear to allow a car to park wholly in front of the garage without encroaching over the footpath.

8.2.5.2. Built Heritage assessment: The alignment of the façade may not upset any continuity that has developed across the street. Nor is it likely to detract from any original setback rhythm. Notwithstanding this, the dominance of the garage in the composition (its presence as the most forward building element) and its actual setback dimension are both problematic.

8.2.6. "Any existing traditional fencing along the front boundary shall be preserved or reinstated at the completion of development."

8.2.6.1. Built Heritage assessment: We agree with the applicant - A simple timber fence is currently located along half of the front boundary. The fence is not a traditional fence and does not contribute to the character of the streetscape.

8.2.7. "Buildings shall preserve the sense of original visual frontage access and interactivity between houses and the street, and shall not present blind or near-blind facades to the street."

8.2.7.1. Built Heritage assessment: While we agree with the DPA statement that the proposal will maintain an openness and a level of activity and interaction between the house and the street, the 'blankness' and inactive nature of the garage will do nothing to preserve the sense of original house to street interfacing.

8.2.8. "Buildings shall maintain the predominance of traditional pitched roof forms in the vicinity of the site."

8.2.8.1. Built Heritage assessment: As mentioned above, while the proposed roof forms may provide both an interesting architectural feature compositionally and also provide light into internal spaces, their shape, pitching and location is more of an abstraction than is anticipated within the zone.

8.2.8.2. Built Heritage assessment: The proposed building will not maintain the predominance of traditional pitched roofs.

8.2.9. “Garages and carports shall allow good visibility of the existing building from the street, and shall where possible, be located to the rear of, underneath (where appropriate in terms of topography), or alongside, the building on the site (particularly in relation to double garages/carports). The council may consent to the location of a garage or carport in the front yard where it is satisfied that:

- i. No practical location is available elsewhere on the site
- ii. Any structure associated with the parking provisions is minimal in scale and is designed in a manner which is coherent with the original architectural character of any buildings on the site
- iii. The garage or carport will not significantly obscure the visibility of the existing building from the street.”

8.2.9.1. Built Heritage assessment: Regarding i: We would need to be convinced that no other options are available in order to reduce the garage’s streetscape dominance. For example, it appears that the garage could be ‘relocated’ under the ‘living’ floor – within the proposed ‘ground floor’.

8.2.9.2. Built Heritage assessment: Regarding ii: The garage as proposed is neither minimal in size nor has it any architectural association with any original building on site. Although it is most probably of a ‘standard’ size for a double garage, the design guidelines in Appendix 13 repeatedly mention that it is unlikely that a double garage can be accommodated at the front of a property in this zone without detracting from the character of the streetscape. Accepting however that as proposed it is ‘integral with’ or part of the overall architectural composition, direct assessment against this criterion is less valid than assessment against i above and iii below.

8.2.9.3. Built Heritage assessment: Regarding iii: The garage is a dominant element in the composition of the façade – it is in effect blank or inactive and forward of other spaces within the architectural form. From certain streetscape perspectives it will significantly obscure the visibility of the ‘remainder’ of the house.

8.2.9.4. Built Heritage assessment: The garage as proposed does not allow good visibility of the remainder of the new-build when travelling north along Arthur Street. Nor is it proposed to be located underneath the building – if in fact this were possible.

Residential 1 Zone Objectives and Policies:

8.3 “7.6.1.1: Objective - To ensure the survival of the form and pattern of subdivision, buildings and streetscape in Auckland’s early established residential neighbourhoods;”

8.3.1.1. Built Heritage assessment: Having assessed the existing building under 7.7.4.3: U above, we concluded that the current lack of architectural integrity outweighed any contribution the house makes to the survival and recognition of the early development patterns in the area.

8.3.1.2. Built Heritage assessment: Given however that the existing house’s form, scale and location on the site is still a moderate contributor to the existing character of the area, it is important that the design, quality, purpose and amenities of any replacement building reflect this, in order to positively contribute to the neighbourhood character.

8.4 “7.6.1.1: Policy - By requiring renovation and new building construction in a manner which maintains the historical form, pattern, intensity and grain of buildings and streetscape in the areas to which the zone is applied;”

8.4.1.1. Built Heritage assessment: Following on from 8.3 above we are of the opinion that the proposed new building does not sufficiently maintain the historical form, pattern, intensity and grain of buildings and streetscape in the area.

8.4.1.2. Built Heritage assessment: Notwithstanding the ‘current’ character of the street, which we acknowledge is varied, and the applicant’s architectural references to the existing villa, the new house is considered to be too much of an abstraction for it to maintain the character sought by the zone.

8.5 “7.6.1.1: Policy - By encouraging, where practical, the construction of garages and carports to the rear of, underneath (where appropriate in terms of topography), or alongside the building on the site to ensure the front garden and façade remain visible to the streetscape;”

8.5.1.1. Built Heritage assessment: As proposed the garage is a dominant element in the composition of the façade – it is both blank or inactive, and forward of other spaces within the architectural form. From certain streetscape perspectives it will significantly obscure the visibility of the ‘remainder’ of the house. The effect of this may be to further disassociate the new house with the form and layout patterns of the early subdivisions in the area.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 Referencing our Assessment in 8 above and our Executive Summary in 1 above it is considered that the design of the new house is not appropriate from a built heritage perspective and it can not be supported.

9.2 In this respect, noting 7.7.4.3 U of the District Plan: ‘In the event that there is a concurrent application for a replacement building, whether its design, quality, purpose and amenities would positively contribute to the neighbourhood character in accord with 7.7.4.3 R of the same plan, we cannot support the demolition either. Given that the existing building makes a moderate contribution to the historical form and pattern of the streetscape, a suitable replacement building will be essential in order to mitigate the effects of demolition to an acceptable level.

Yours sincerely,
 Blair Hastings

Consultant Built Heritage Adviser, BArch (Hons)
 Acting for and on behalf of Auckland Council
 Heritage Unit | Plans and Places Department | Auckland Council CPO