
3 Victoria Road,
Devonport

2 The Strand, Takapuna

Future Use Assessment

Report to Devonport Takapuna Local
Board

Draft 9

24 April 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
2.0	LIKELY RECOMMENDATIONS	5
3.0	BRIEF	6
4.0	3 VICTORIA ROAD	7
5.0	2 THE STRAND	7
6.0	COUNCIL USAGE	8
7.0	COMMUNITY NEEDS	9
8.0	HERITAGE CONSIDERATIONS	13
9.0	FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS	16
10.0	CULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	16
11.0	CONCLUSION.....	17

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Devonport Takapuna Local Board has requested this analysis as the Council looks to the future use of two local properties, namely 3 Victoria Road, Devonport and 2 The Strand, Takapuna. This is an interim report intended to inform a Local Board workshop on progress to date on this study. It includes a draft set of recommendations. However the recommendations are subject to any further investigation of community group aspirations for economically feasible use of the buildings. The workshop is intended among other things to discuss any potential community groups.
- 1.2 Both are Council-owned properties, each occupied by scheduled heritage buildings.
- 1.3 3 Victoria Road is the former Devonport Borough Council chambers and offices. It is a category A* scheduled heritage building and strategically located within the Devonport town centre. It is surplus to Council requirements in terms of use and currently occupied as a visitor information centre.
- 1.4 2 The Strand is a category B building. It is the former Takapuna Public Library. The site for the library was gifted to the then Takapuna Council for library purposes. The building is currently vacant and is surplus to Council requirements.
- 1.5 There is no prospective Council occupation of 3 Victoria Road. There is only one possible Council occupation option for 2 The Strand, and that is as Local Board offices and associated staff accommodation. 2 The Strand is one of several options currently under investigation by Auckland Council Corporate Property.
- 1.6 Both buildings have significant seismic issues and will need substantial seismic strengthening regardless of future ownership or use.
- 1.7 At this stage in the review, there is no known community use for 3 Victoria Road and certainly there is no financially sustainable use for a community activity within this heritage building. One of the key purposes of the Board workshop is to identify any groups that the Board wants interviewed as part of this study. So as not to raise unrealistic expectations with the community, it is strongly recommended that we only talk to community groups who have at least a moderate prospect of being able to participate in the adaptive reuse of either of these

buildings, should such a group exist. Later in this report we outline the generic capabilities we believe such a group would need to have.

- 1.8 The only prospective use for 2 The Strand was the Shore Exhibition Centre. However, as reported previously to the Board, an analysis of that proposal in 2017 identified that it was a worthy use, but not economically sustainable.
- 1.9 Both buildings will need significant expenditure to bring them up to Code Compliance standard let alone heritage restoration of the buildings. Furthermore, heritage buildings are somewhat more expensive to maintain and operate than new modern buildings simply because, even following heritage restoration, you are still maintaining a comparatively old building often with detailed materials and trimmings which are no longer in standard supply.
- 1.10 It is clear that the Council does not have the financial ability to undertake full heritage restoration of these buildings given the other Council budget priorities. The Council's prioritisation process is a given in terms of this brief. It is a political decision as to what resources are given to heritage restoration, and not necessary nor appropriate for this report to discuss priorities.
- 1.11 In my view the Local Board should distinguish between:
- (a) the community need for activities to locate within the buildings; and
 - (b) the heritage restoration and preservation of the buildings.
- 1.12 There is no community use that I can identify that is economically sustainable for either building. Furthermore, most community groups would struggle to maintain and operate a heritage building even if the Council paid for the full restoration of the building, without some sort of rate payer subsidy, grant, or economic use within the building itself.
- 1.13 Equally, it is untenable for the demolition of these buildings or to simply sell on the open market, without some form of safeguard. In my view, the best outcome for the Board is to proactively work with Panuku Development Auckland/the Council to find economically sustainable adaptive reuse for the buildings. One that will ensure their faithful restoration preferably to a type of activity that will enable public access and enjoyment of both the exterior and interior of these important heritage buildings.

2.0 LIKELY RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To assist in debate at the workshop, I have set out the recommendations I would make if the study was concluded now. Should the Board identify any willing resourced community group that could operate the building in an economically sustainable manner, then this may change the options available to the Council and hence these recommendations. To be able to undertake adaptive reuse of a heritage building for community activity in an economically sustainable manner, is a very difficult proposition and one that very few community groups have achieved. In my view, the Board needs to be realistic in identifying any groups that should be approached. If the reality is that there are no realistic groups that could achieve the objectives, then it would be preferable to simply acknowledge this and focus on other opportunities to achieve heritage restoration of these buildings.
- 2.2 That the Devonport Takapuna Local Board:
- (a) Note that there is no prospective Council use of 3 Victoria Road.
 - (b) Note that the only prospective Council use of 2 The Strand is an option as Local Board offices.
 - (c) Confirm its request that the Council take no action in terms of leasing or disposal of 2 The Strand until such time as the Local Board office for post-November 2021 is identified.
 - (d) Advise the governing body and the Manager Auckland Property that the Local Board would in principle find 2 The Strand an acceptable location and premises for Local Board offices.
 - (e) Advise the governing body, the Chief Executive, and Panuku Development Auckland that the Devonport Takapuna Local Board considers 3 Victoria Road to be a strategically critical site due to its:
 - (i) heritage A listing;
 - (ii) quintessential association with Devonport due to its original governance functions as first a post office and then the local council chambers;
 - (iii) location on the main street, and the importance of maintaining the character of the Devonport town centre;

- (iv) location on the critical connection between the town centre and the ferry terminal.
- (f) Note that there are no identifiable economically sustainable community uses for the properties this recommendation may change if the Board workshop identifies a viable potential use),
- (g) Request that the Board be fully consulted in the determination of future adaptive use for the two buildings and the ownership strategy (either retention, leasehold or sale) prior to any reporting on the future of these buildings to the Governing Body.
- (h) If 2 The Strand is not to be used for Local Board offices and is leased or disposed, the Council ensure the contracts provide full safeguard to achieve heritage restoration of the building with a sustainable economic ongoing maintenance programme; with a preference for adaptive reuse which allows public access as part of the commercial function to some parts of the building, e.g. restaurant or certain types of office use.
- (i) Request Panuku Development Auckland to seriously investigate an option to retain at least part ownership of 3 Victoria Road and enter a partnership with a suitable party who will achieve a sustainable adaptive reuse of the building with full heritage restoration; and this option be included in any report to the Governing Body. The request for a part ownership and partnership approach for this building compared to 2 The Strand, relates to the added strategic importance and heritage rating of this building.
- (j) Should 2 The Strand be sold, then the proceeds be committed to Council community facilities within the former Takapuna City Council area, in recognition of the original gift of this site to the people of Takapuna.

3.0 BRIEF

- 3.1 Tattico received a broad brief for a high level overview of the two properties to determine whether there are any existing or future community needs for these sites, and to advise on the interests of the Board in terms of the future use of these buildings given the fact they are identified as outside core Council serve needs and could potentially be considered for disposal.
- 3.2 The brief takes the priorities under the Council's budgets as a given. It assumes the Board must work within its own and Council budgets or find other funding mechanisms.

4.0 3 VICTORIA ROAD

- 4.1 3 Victoria Road is a 468m² site comprising the former Devonport Borough Council chambers and offices. The building was originally built as a post office and subsequently converted to Council offices. It is a two storey brick plastered building of approximately 490m². The building occupies 52% of the site with a large (17m x 12m) 204m² rear courtyard. It has a capital value of \$3.5m.
- 4.2 The building achieves significantly less than the 33% minimum under the New Zealand Seismic Code. Heritage buildings are required to achieve a minimum 33% with a preference of 66%.
- 4.3 The building is used as an information centre managed by the Devonport Business Association but with assistance from other North Shore-based associations. The first floor is partly used as offices for the Devonport Business Association, and the Devonport Peninsula Trust.
- 4.4 The Local Board provided some initial assistance to these organisations to allow them to operate from 3 Victoria Road. However, for various reasons, the Peninsula Trust will move to Fort Takapuna, and it is likely the Business Association will relocate from the building.
- 4.5 The building is a category A* heritage building scheduled by both the Auckland Unitary Plan and registered by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. The heritage importance of the building is enhanced by its group association with the Category A esplanade reserve immediately to the south and other heritage and character buildings within the Devonport town centre.

5.0 2 THE STRAND

- 5.1 2 The Strand is a 486m² site comprising the former Takapuna Library. It is a two storey building of approximately 720m². The building occupies 87% of the site.
- 5.2 The building achieves 34% structural rating under the New Zealand Seismic Code. Heritage buildings are required to achieve a minimum 33% with a preference of 66%.
- 5.3 The building is now vacant due to seismic and code compliance issues.
- 5.4 The building is a category B heritage building scheduled by both the Auckland Unitary Plan and registered by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. The site surrounds include the whole building plus the indented parking bays in front of the building.
- 5.5 2 The Strand was originally gifted by a local resident to the then Takapuna Council for a library. Records show a memorandum of transfer recording a donation in 1940 from 'Auckland City

Buildings Limited’ to ‘the Mayor, Councillors and Burgesses of the Borough of Takapuna’ for the purpose of municipal services as and for a site for a public library. There was no prohibition on the sale or exchange of this gifted site. The clear intention was that the value of this land should be for local public benefit. The library has outgrown and expanded from this site.

- 5.6 In terms of section 140(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002, a local authority may sell or exchange endowment property and use the proceeds of the sale for a purpose consistent with the purpose of the endowment. The reality is that Takapuna outgrew the library established by the Borough Council and the library is now in a purpose-built facility across the road from the subject site. The Council might want to consider any return from the sale of 2 The Strand being reinvested for community purposes in the former Takapuna area.

6.0 COUNCIL USAGE

- 6.1 The initial step of this study was to try and determine if there were any prospective Council uses for either of these sites. Any Council department seeking additional land or buildings is required to work through Auckland Corporate Property. They are not aware of any such candidate use. Occasionally groups will go to Panuku Development Auckland to see if they could be part of some commercial usage. No such approaches have been made. Local Board staff are not aware of any use or activity, other than the potential for 2 The Strand to be used for Local Board offices post November 2021. I then looked at the candidate departments that have a more community focus in terms of a use for small to medium premises, recognising that most of the organisation administrative departments of the Council need fairly substantial buildings. I could find no need for the facility from Arts, Culture and Events, Community Facilities or ATEED. It is also a factor that the Council in a period of tight budgets has a broad property strategy to rationalise its administrative offices into fit for purpose buildings which are efficient to operate.
- 6.2 There is no identified Council need for use of the 3 Victoria Road building.
- 6.3 With the one exception, there is no identified need for the building at 2 The Strand.
- 6.4 The one possible exception to this is the future use of the building for Local Board Services. The current Local Board offices’ lease expires in November 2021. The Local Board will need to relocate at or about that date to alternate premises. Based on the information available to date, there is no intention a new purpose-built facility. Rather, relocation will most likely be to an existing Auckland Council premises or leased premises.

- 6.5 2 The Strand remains a good candidate for Local Board offices, although it is disproportionately expensive because of the significant seismic upgrade work and other necessary Code Compliance work to the building that would be required.
- 6.6 In terms of location, size and cultural fit, a restored 2 The Strand would be a good fit for the Local Board. Full seismic upgrade would be a prerequisite. There should also be an expectation of restoration of the building in accordance with the conservation plan. The Local Board offices will need a dedicated facility and this has an economic cost to the Council. There is a funding stream for the ongoing operation of the Devonport Takapuna Local Board office. Obviously this provides at least some potential funding for the adaptive reuse of this building should it end up being used for Local Board offices.
- 6.7 Local Board offices would be a very good adaptive reuse function for this building if the budget can be found.
- 6.8 However, there are a number of other options for Local Board offices. Auckland Council Corporate Property is currently undertaking an analysis of the various options to identify the pros and cons of each and the best fit for Local Board offices. It is not for this report to prejudge that outcome. Nor is it appropriate for the Local Board to state its preferred position until it has seen all options. However, what is recommended is that the Local Board signify that it believes that 2 The Strand would be a suitable location for the Local Board and in principle the Local Board would be happy with such an outcome.

7.0 COMMUNITY NEEDS

- 7.1 It is not possible in a high level assessment like this to exhaustively identify all community needs.
- 7.2 What I can advise is that:
- (a) The Shore Exhibition Centre Trust was wanting a lease of the property at 2 The Strand to create an arts exhibition centre. However, this relied on the Council undertaking the seismic upgrading of the building with the Trust paying for additional enhancements of the building beyond heritage restoration, and reliant on grants and funding from third parties. The initial funding the Trust had secured was not able to continue because of the time delays in decision making on that programme. There was also a difference in opinion between the author and the Trust as to the long-term sustainability of the project.
 - (b) Through that process no other community group was identified that wanted the building. In the intervening period, no other group has come to light. Discussions with Local Board

Services have not identified any realistic candidate groups. From time to time groups have approached the Local Board with requests for assistance. However staff are unaware of any group with the capacity to undertake a proposal of this scale.

- 7.3 Devonport Business Association currently occupies 3 Victoria Road. They have a subsidised rental and are only able to sustain a below market rental. Even then they are downsizing their use of the building.
- 7.4 Neither Local Board Services, Community Facilities or Arts Culture and Events (ACE) were able to identify any other community groups expressing a need for space within Devonport.
- 7.5 Community Groups rely significantly on raising sponsorship and achieving a series of grants or other income base to fund their premises and operation. While generally community groups enjoy the character of a heritage building, and this can add to the value of the community proposition; nevertheless heritage buildings add very significant cost to the group in terms of seismic upgrade and heritage restoration, and then additional operational costs. That is why most community groups in heritage buildings are relying on the Council or third party owners to undertake the full restoration.
- 7.6 Even if there are community groups in Devonport and Takapuna seeking community space in this general location of this size, the heritage building is not the most achievable and economically sustainable option for such groups.
- 7.7 Having said that, there are examples of community groups that have raised funds and taken on heritage buildings.
- 7.8 The Victoria Theatre in Devonport gives one example of a community group which has taken on a heritage building.
- 7.9 In this case:
- A trust was established of local people bringing together a variety of expertise, and a passion and commitment for the project.
 - The Trust obtained a lease of the building, but Council retained ownership.
 - The lease contained some key community objectives essentially designed to restore the original theatre and to operate it for theatre and community uses.
 - There is a peppercorn lease charge.

- The Trust is required to progressively over time undertake the heritage restoration of the building.
- Importantly the Trust has the ability to generate commercial income from the operation of the theatre, the café, and other commercial hirage opportunities.
- The Trust has operated successfully and has benefited from the huge commitment, enthusiasm and energy of the trustees. A key benefit has been the ability to generate a material income which has enabled the Trust to operate and commence the upgrade facilities. The full seismic upgrade remains a significant financial hurdle.

7.10 A second example is the Lopdell House Trust. If you exclude the new build of the new art gallery and the substantial annual Council grant to the gallery, the Lopdell House is a good example of a community group who have leased and managed a heritage project and put it on an economically sustainable footing.

7.11 This entailed:

- A dedicated enthusiastic group who comprised a broad set of skills with a heavy emphasis on economic, business and construction skills.
- Raising essentially two thirds of the funding for the heritage restoration and adaptive reuse, with the Council funding the other third.
- Restoring the three storey building comprising one floor of community uses, a basement conversion to community uses, and two floors of commercial facilities (one floor of a restaurant and one floor of offices).

The grants raised by the Trust and capital funding by the Council, paid for heritage restoration and adaptive reuse of the building. The two commercial floors fund the ongoing operation of the one and a half community floors.

Lopdell House had the benefit of a group who were able to raise two thirds of the heritage restoration cost of the building, and then had enough critical mass within the building to run 60% of the building as a commercial income generating space so as to subsidise the other 40% in community use. Neither The Strand nor 3 Victoria Road has this critical mass.

7.12 The key learning from both these examples is that:

- (a) There was a demonstrable need to which the community group is responding. This is important so as to build practical community investment in a project which a wide sector

fully subscribes too. This as opposed to people simply offering words of support no actual investment of time or resource.

- (b) There was a realistic commercial income which enabled significant funding of operational costs.
- (c) The nature of the project made it a good candidate for obtaining grants from other organisations that provide investment into community assets.
- (d) There was a core group of people with an extensive range of skillsets giving capability and capacity to deliver the desired outcome.
- (e) One of the key considerations with seismic upgrading is inevitably the building needs to be vacant to undertake the work. That affects the income stream and funding of the community group. Upfront funding is the best approach, recognising the disruption and difficulties of establishing and then suspending an adaptive reuse operation. This creates issues in re-establishing the use.

7.13 I have found no indication of a community group that has a demonstrable need for either of these buildings and an economically sustainable opportunity to develop them, but want to explore this further with the Board during the workshop. Furthermore, the limited nature of the size of the buildings means that intuitively it is hard to envisage the opportunity to create enough community floor space and yet have a commercially sustainable use within the building to fund the ongoing operation of that community space. The possible exception to this is 3 Victoria Road where a commercial use could be put in the ground floor and a community use on the first floor. That might pay the ongoing operation if the Council funded the seismic upgrade and heritage restoration of the building. However:

- the Council does not have the budget for the seismic upgrade and heritage restoration; and
- there would be other opportunities within Devonport for the type of community use that only needed a first floor space with limited street access.

7.14 This is not to prejudge the Local Board workshop that might identify candidate groups as potential users. If so there will be meaningful engagement with these groups as part of this study.

8.0 HERITAGE CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 In my view the Local Board needs to distinguish its position on the community needs for this building from the heritage considerations.
- 8.2 Even if there is no Council or community use of the building, there is still the very significant issue of the future of these heritage buildings.
- 8.3 Auckland Council schedules heritage buildings within the Unitary Plan. Buildings are given either an 'A' or 'B' rating. 'A' rating applies to buildings with outstanding heritage significance well beyond the immediate site and area. 'B' relates to buildings of considerable heritage significance, particularly in the locality.
- 8.4 The Unitary Plan applies regulatory controls intended to protect the buildings, but allows for adaptive reuse. For example, demolition of category 'A' buildings is a prohibited activity and category 'B' buildings is a full discretionary activity. Prohibited activity means that you cannot even apply for a resource consent to remove a category 'A' building. This requires a plan change.
- 8.5 Resource consents are required for applications involving partial demolitions or alterations and additions to heritage buildings. Thus the Council has a reasonable degree of control over heritage buildings through its regulatory processes.
- 8.6 Both buildings are scheduled heritage buildings. Both buildings have a direct historic association with the Council, one being a library and one being the Council chamber and offices. Both buildings are suitable for adaptive reuse for a range of uses which are provided for within the town centre/metropolitan zone centre in which they are located. Based on the research done by the Council and various parties to date, both these buildings are suitable and capable of being restored and brought to an economic use but at a significant cost due to the poor seismic rating of both buildings. In addition there is expected to be a number of other code compliance issues to be addressed in any upgrade of the building. Any use will need to be a commercial activity (or Local Board offices) which have a budgeted revenue stream for the buildings to be economically sustainable. This is critical to the ongoing protection of these buildings.
- 8.7 This analysis has identified a higher strategic importance for the 3 Victoria Road building compared to the 2 The Strand building for the following reasons:
- (a) it is a category A building compared to The Strand which is a category B building;

- (b) it is embedded within the character area of the Devonport town centre. The Council's planning strategies and the economic sustainability of Devonport relies on leveraging the "harbourside village" character. Retention of heritage buildings is of fundamental importance to this.
 - (c) The building sits next door to the Esplanade Hotel, another category A building which is quintessential to the identity and character of Devonport.
 - (d) The building is critically located on the retail frontage of the town centre between the centre and the Devonport ferry terminal.
 - (e) If the Council, as owner of important heritage buildings, does not ensure their protection, then it will have little credibility in seeking the private sector to protect other heritage buildings.
- 8.8 The 204m² vacant rear yard of this building gives a significant opportunity for new additions to the building which could give cost-effective commercial space. This will complement and enhance the sustainability of the building.
- 8.9 The Council has no budget for the seismic upgrade and heritage restoration of this building. Any such works will need to be funded by third parties or directly generate an income stream to fund the cost of the upgrade.
- 8.10 There are various examples where the Council has either:
- (a) Budgeted for and undertaken the seismic upgrade and heritage restoration of the building.
 - (b) Retained ownership of the building but entered into long-term partnerships where third parties undertake the seismic upgrade and heritage restoration and operate the building. Sometimes this is with assisted Council funding. Lopdell House would be an example of this.
 - (c) Sell the heritage building but with contractual commitments for the new owner to seismically upgrade and restore the building form identified adaptive reuse. There have been examples where this has worked well, although there is always a risk that the purchaser will not be able to perform. In that case there are few practical penalties.
 - (d) While not aware of any examples from Auckland Council, it would be possible for the Council simply to sell the building on the open market for the highest and best use leaving the new owner to either restore or seek consent to remove the heritage building.

Each of these options bring different outcomes, risk and budget implications.

- 8.11 Due to the strategic importance of 3 Victoria Road, the second option is recommended. It is clear from budgets that the Council cannot afford the seismic upgrade and heritage restoration of the building itself. Equally this site will likely have long-term strategic importance.
- 8.12 Some form of partnership approach which gives the Council an ongoing ownership stake as well as regulatory control is appropriate. Undoubtedly this will negatively impact the Council's return from the building. However, while there is no budgeted expenditure for seismic upgrade and heritage restoration, equally there is no budgeted revenue line. In this case the public good benefit of securing long-term heritage and operation and the contribution of this building to the Devonport streetscape and town centre; is greater than the public good benefit from a higher revenue from this site.
- 8.13 The 2 The Strand building is of lesser significance than 3 Victoria, but is still a significant heritage building. In particular:
- (a) It is scheduled as a category B building. It is a modern heritage building.
 - (b) It is a standalone heritage building, i.e. all the surrounding facilities are modern or utilitarian buildings without any heritage or character note.
 - (c) It is not a core part of the Takapuna town centre and main street.
- 8.14 In my view, the first decision milestone is to determine whether or not the building is the preferred location for the Devonport Takapuna Local Board offices and associated staff facilities. If the answer to that is yes then this building is obviously retained by the Council and will become an important and valuable part of the Council's heritage portfolio.
- 8.15 If the building is not to be used for Local Board Services, then the Council does need to find an adaptive reuse for this building, and a third party who can purchase and restore the building to agreed high heritage standards. There are many very successful examples of this. The Mt Eden Borough Council offices and fire station is a recent highly successful adaptive reuse of former public buildings. This development won awards for its architectural merit as well as its heritage integrity.
- 8.16 The inevitable reality is that the Council will not be able to afford to partner and retain all of its heritage buildings. If it is to facilitate seismic upgrade and heritage restoration through third party funding, then it is inevitable that a number of buildings will need to be sold relying on contractual commitments to achieve heritage restoration.

9.0 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 The LTP does not provide any budget for the heritage restoration of either building. Nor is there a general budget for seismic upgrade of buildings or heritage restoration.
- 9.2 Equally, there is no anticipated revenue from the disposal or leasing of either of these buildings.
- 9.3 There is an ongoing budgeted item for accommodation costs associated with Devonport Takapuna Local Board.
- 9.4 No detailed budgeting has been done for the seismic upgrading of either building. However, preliminary indications of required budgets are being obtained. They were not available at the time of writing this interim report. This will be the seismic upgrade cost only. It cannot practically include costs associated with the heritage restoration and adaptive reuse of the buildings, until the use is known.
- 9.5 It is clear that the Local Board cannot afford to undertake this work from its own budgets, or even fund the operational costs of a community group to cover the seismic upgrade and heritage restoration costs.
- 9.6 It is inevitable that this work will require third party funding (unless 2 The Strand is committed to Local Board offices). The seismic upgrade and heritage restoration of buildings of this size are inevitably multi-million dollar projects.

Some preliminary work is being undertaken on the seismic upgrade and heritage restoration costs of the two buildings. This is a high level exercise designed to input into the decision making process. At the time of writing this report for the workshop the costings were not available. Some relative examples will be available for the Board meeting.

The key issue is that these are material sums which will be hard to sustain through philanthropic gifts or fundraising. A commercial approach to adaptive reuse of heritage buildings is more realistic.

10.0 CULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 10.1 There is no indication of any Maori cultural significance with either site. There is European cultural significance but this is outlined in terms of the heritage aspects of these buildings.

11.0 CONCLUSION

11.1 The conclusions of this analysis are that:

- (a) There is no prospective Council use of 3 Victoria Road.
- (b) The only possible use of 2 The Strand is Local Board offices. It is one of several options being investigated. If not used for Local Board offices, there is no other potential Council use.
- (c) Given the financial constraints of the Council and the LTP prioritisation, any community use of either building will have to be financially sustainable. This makes it a particularly expensive proposition for any community group because of the required seismic upgrade costs of bringing the buildings up to Code Compliance heritage restoration of the buildings.
- (d) There is no identifiable community need for the buildings. However one of the purposes of the workshop is to see if there are community groups that should be approached.
- (e) These are two important heritage buildings, particularly 3 Victoria Road. The Council should put in place mechanisms to ensure the long-term protection and the economically sustainable adaptive reuse of the buildings. The 3 Victoria Road building in particular has high strategic value. For this building the Council should enter some form of appropriate partnership arrangement so that it retains property rights as well as regulatory rights to ensure an exemplary adaptive reuse of this building. The strategic location of this site and the large vacant land to the rear should give the Council the opportunity to achieve its objectives of seismic upgrade, heritage restoration and adaptive reuse of the building, albeit that it will take a material reduction in the commercial return it could achieve from other disposal options. Nevertheless it is felt that the public good elements of this building should rest in favour of ensuring ongoing protection and appropriate use of the building rather than maximising financial return.
- (f) Any disposal of 2 The Strand should ensure the seismic upgrade, restoration and quality adaptive reuse of this building.