

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: an application by Ryman Healthcare Limited for
resource consent to establish and operate a
comprehensive care retirement village at 100-104 Park
Terrace and 20 Dorset Street and 78 Park Terrace,
Christchurch

between: **Ryman Healthcare Limited**
Applicant

and: **Christchurch City Council**
Consent Authority

Statement of evidence of **Philip Hunter Mitchell** on behalf of
Ryman Healthcare Limited

Dated: 6 January 2021

Reference: Luke Hinchey (luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com)
Nicola de Wit (nicola.dewit@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com
T +64 9 357 9000
F +64 9 357 9099

PO Box 2206
Auckland 1140
New Zealand

Auckland
Wellington
Christchurch



STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF PHILIP HUNTER MITCHELL ON BEHALF OF RYMAN HEALTHCARE LIMITED

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Philip Hunter Mitchell.
- 2 I am a Partner with Mitchell Daysh Limited, an environmental consulting practice with offices in four locations around New Zealand. Mitchell Daysh Limited was formed through the merger between Environmental Management Services Limited and Mitchell Partnerships Limited, which I established in July 1997. Previously, I was the Managing Director of Kingett Mitchell & Associates Limited, a firm that I co-founded in 1987.
- 3 I hold the degrees of Bachelor of Engineering (Hons) and Doctor of Philosophy, both from the University of Canterbury.
- 4 I am a past president of the Resource Management Law Association and a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I was a recipient of the New Zealand Planning Institute's Distinguished Service Award in 2015.
- 5 I have practised in the resource management field for over 30 years and I have had a lead resource management role in many significant projects throughout New Zealand during that time. My specialist areas of practice include providing resource management advice to the private and public sectors, facilitating public consultation processes, undertaking planning analyses, managing resource consent acquisition projects, and developing resource consent conditions.
- 6 I am an accredited Hearings Commissioner (with a Chair's endorsement) and have acted as a Hearings Commissioner on numerous occasions, many in the role of Hearing Chair. Of some relevance to this hearing, I was appointed jointly by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery and the Christchurch City Council (*Council*) as a Hearings Commissioner for the replacement of the Christchurch District Plan (now the Operative Christchurch District Plan).
- 7 I have been engaged by Ryman Healthcare Limited (*Ryman*) to provide resource management and planning advice in respect of its resource consent application to construct and operate a comprehensive care retirement village (*Proposed Village*) at 100-104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street, and 78 Park Terrace, Christchurch (*Site*). In this statement of evidence, I describe the parcel of land at 78 Park Terrace as the 'Peterborough Site', and the parcel of land at 100 - 104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street as the 'Bishopspark Site'. I refer to the Peterborough Site and the Bishopspark Site together as the "Sites".

- 8 My firm was responsible for preparing the resource consent applications and Assessment of Environmental Effects (*AEE*) for the Proposed Village that were lodged with the Council in March 2020. My firm was also responsible for assisting with Ryman's various request for further information responses provided to the Council on 18 May, 13 July and 17 November 2020. I also attended Ryman's presentation to the Urban Design Panel on 2 October 2019.
- 9 In preparing this evidence I have read the evidence filed by Ryman and its technical advisors, as well as the Council Officer's Report by Ms Louisa Armstrong on behalf of the Council (along with the accompanying technical peer reviews), and the submissions received by the Council.
- 10 I have visited the Site and its surroundings on several occasions. I am also familiar with the relevant statutory planning documents that apply to the Site and the Proposed Village.

CODE OF CONDUCT

- 11 Although these proceedings are not before the Environment Court, I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note (2014), and I agree to comply with it as if these proceedings were before the Court. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying upon the specified evidence of another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 12 In my evidence I will:
- 12.1 Discuss the statutory planning requirements that apply to the Proposed Village;
 - 12.2 Summarise the key potential environmental effects associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Village;
 - 12.3 Respond to the matters raised in submissions relevant to my expertise;
 - 12.4 Respond to the Council Officer's Report by Ms Armstrong;
 - 12.5 Consider the Proposed Village against the requirements of section 104 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), and against Part 2 of the RMA;
 - 12.6 Discuss the recommended resource consent conditions; and

12.7 Provide an overall conclusion.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 13 Ryman proposes to establish and operate a comprehensive care retirement village on Park Terrace in Central Christchurch.
- 14 In my opinion, the Proposed Village offers an opportunity to develop a high quality, purpose built, secure, comprehensive care retirement village across two unique Sites within the well-established residential community of Central Christchurch that is close to existing infrastructure and amenities.
- 15 I consider that the Proposed Village has been designed to integrate with the surrounding residential environment. Where exceedances of the built form standards do occur, it is considered that any potential effects will be appropriate in the context of the character of the surrounding environment and the development expectations for the Residential Central City Zone.
- 16 The Proposed Village will result in significant positive effects by providing a much-needed comprehensive care retirement village within the established community of Central Christchurch, and economic benefits through creating construction and operational jobs and demand for services.
- 17 I have also concluded that the Proposed Village will be consistent with the outcomes sought in the relevant objectives and policies, particularly those in the Christchurch District Plan (*District Plan*).
- 18 In my opinion, I can see no impediment to granting consent to this application.

PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Christchurch District Plan

- 19 The Site is zoned Residential Central City in the District Plan.
- 20 The Residential Central City Zone is identified in the District Plan¹ as an area to be utilised for the provision of a range of housing types. The zone seeks to provide for attractive, high density living opportunities – as evidenced by, amongst other things, the 14 m height allowance that applies generally across the zone and the 20 m height allowance that applies specifically at the Peterborough Site. The zone also seeks to support the potential for living, working, and playing near the commercial centre of Christchurch. Within the zone, there is also an expectation that the character,

¹ Table 14.2.1.1a of the District Plan.

scale and intensity of non-residential activities is to be controlled in order to mitigate effects on the character and amenity of the inner-city residential areas.

- 21 Objective 14.2.8, which applies to residential development in the Central City, provides further context regarding the specific planning expectations for the Residential Central City Zone. It seeks a predominantly residential environment offering a range of residential opportunities, including medium to high density living, within the Central City to support the restoration and enhancement of a vibrant centre. Further, it expects built development in the zone that enables change to the existing environment, while contributing positively to the amenity and cultural values of the area, and to the health and safety, and quality and enjoyment, for those living within the area.
- 22 The Site is also subject to the following overlays in the District Plan:
 - 22.1 Central City Building Setbacks (along the boundary with Park Terrace);
 - 22.2 Category 3: Lower Noise Level Area (Bishopspark Site only);
 - 22.3 Central City Outer Zone;
 - 22.4 Central City Building Height 14 m Overlay;²
 - 22.5 Liquefaction Management Area;
 - 22.6 Flood Management Area (Bishopspark Site only);
 - 22.7 Heritage Item #1305 and Heritage Setting #470 (Bishopspark Site only);³ and
 - 22.8 Significant Individual Tree (Peterborough Site only).⁴
- 23 A detailed analysis of the resource consents required for the Proposed Village in accordance with the District Plan is reproduced in **Appendix A** to my evidence, as well as in the Council Officer's Report by Ms Armstrong.⁵ Recent changes to the District Plan (Plan Changes 4 to 6) do not have any implications for the resource consents required for the Proposed Village.

² I note also that the Peterborough Site is subject to a 20 m built form standard under Rule 14.6.2.1 of the District Plan.

³ Former Bishop's Chapel and Setting, Group 1 – Highly Significant.

⁴ A Common Lime Tree (T271).

⁵ Page 7 of the Council Officer's Report.

- 24 Overall, I consider that resource consent is required for the following aspects of the Proposed Village as a restricted discretionary activity:
 - 24.1 Buildings that infringe the height, daylight recession planes and setback standards for the Residential Central City Zone;
 - 24.2 The establishment of signage along the frontage with Park Terrace;
 - 24.3 Vehicle crossings that infringe the relevant transport design standards (Peterborough Site only);
 - 24.4 Heritage upgrade works for earthquake strengthening of the former Bishop's Chapel, as well new buildings within the heritage setting of the chapel (Bishopspark Site only);
 - 24.5 Earthworks; and
 - 24.6 Works within the dripline and pruning of a significant tree (Peterborough Site only).
- 25 I note that both Ms Siiri Wilkening and Ms Stout (in her peer review appended to the Council Officer's Report) identify that construction noise from the Site could exceed the relevant limits in *NZS6803:1999 Acoustic Standard for Construction Noise* at times. Ms Wilkening comments that any exceedances of the relevant limits will be limited in duration (approximately four days) at a small number of receivers immediately adjacent to the Site. As such, Rule 6.1.6.1.3 (RD2) is also applicable (which is also a restricted discretionary activity).
- 26 This minor point aside Ms Armstrong and I agree on the resource consents required for the Proposed Village.
- 27 The relevant matters of discretion in the District Plan for the consideration of the resource consents required for the Proposed Village are set out in full in **Appendix B** to my evidence. For context, I have summarised my understanding of the key matters of discretion relevant to this Proposed Village into the following topics:
 - 27.1 Residential amenity and urban design effects (which are taken from the general matters of discretion that apply to retirement villages and the matters of discretion related to the exceedance of particular built form standards), including:
 - (a) Engagement with adjacent streets and public open spaces, and the response to the surrounding context;
 - (b) Compatibility with the scale of other buildings in the surrounding area;

- (c) Residential amenity for neighbours (i.e. outlook, privacy, noise, odour, light spill, and access to sunlight);
- (d) Integration of access and parking areas;
- (e) Response to existing character buildings or established landscape features on the Site;
- (f) The ability to provide adequate parking and manoeuvring space; and
- (g) The ability to provide opportunities for planting.

27.2 General construction effects, including:

- (a) Nuisance effects (i.e. dust, sediment, construction traffic, flooding and drainage);
- (b) The stability of adjoining land;
- (c) Amenity effects from changes in ground levels; and
- (d) Effects on historic heritage values.

27.3 Construction noise effects, including:

- (a) The level, duration and character of the noise on nearby receivers;
- (b) Whether the noise levels are a threat to the health and wellbeing of people; and
- (c) Mitigation and alternative construction methodologies.

27.4 Heritage effects, including; and

- (a) Whether the Proposed Village will maintain the heritage values of the heritage item;
- (b) The compatibility of new buildings in a heritage setting with the heritage fabric of the heritage item;
- (c) The methodologies to protect the heritage item during construction (including the use of a temporary protection plan); and
- (d) Re-use of the heritage item.

27.5 Arboriculture effects, including:

- (a) The extent of modification or damage to the significant tree (including impacts on its health); and
- (b) The appropriateness of the arboricultural practices to be employed (including adherence to internationally accepted standards and practices).

28 I also note that retirement villages in the Residential Central City Zone are subject to a specific matter of discretion (Rule 14.15.9), that is intended to recognise the unique design and development considerations that apply to proposals such as this one. Rule 14.15.9 applies to all retirement village proposals in Christchurch, irrespective of which residential zone they are located in and irrespective of activity status. As such, it is my opinion that the weight to be given to each of the matters over which discretion is reserved needs to be informed by the zoning provisions that apply in a particular locality – the point being that different areas have different characteristics and different expected environmental outcomes.

Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011

29 A land use consent is also required for a restricted discretionary activity for the disturbance of soil in accordance with Regulation 10 of the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health Regulations 2011 (NES).

30 The key matters of discretion available to decision-makers relate to the adequacy of the site investigations, the suitability of the land for the proposed use, the approach to the remediation of the Site and the site management plan, and the transport / disposal of material from the Site.

Overall Activity Status and Bundling

31 Overall, Ms Armstrong and I agree that the Proposed Village is a restricted discretionary activity.

32 In accordance with section 104C of the RMA, discretion in considering this application is limited to the matters set out under the relevant rules in the District Plan and NES. These matters are repeated in full in **Appendix B** to my evidence.

ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS

The Existing Environment

33 An assessment of the actual and potential effects of an activity should be made having determined the relevant receiving

environment. It is, therefore, important to understand the receiving environment within which an activity is proposed to locate and what activities would be permitted to occur on the Site, and adjoining sites as of right.

- 34 A description of the existing environment around the Site is provided in the AEE, as well as the evidence on behalf of Ryman and the Council Officer's Report by Ms Armstrong.
- 35 By way of summary, the Bishopspark Site is irregular in shape with limited street frontage to Park Terrace and Dorset Street relative to its size (which is approximately 12,267 m²). It previously contained a retirement village that ceased operation following the earthquakes, and the former buildings were recently demolished. The Peterborough Site is a vacant corner site (approximately 5,082 m²) with strong frontage to both Park Terrace and Salisbury Street. As noted by Ms Armstrong in her Council Officer's Report,⁶ it was previously occupied by the 'Terrace on the Park' apartments – with the tallest building on the Site being 31 m in height.
- 36 Ms Rebecca Skidmore and Mr Andrew Burns both state that the built character of the surrounding neighbourhood is varied. Along the corridor of Park Terrace there is a predominantly residential focus. Further east towards Victoria Street, the activity mix transitions to a more commercial focus. The variation in building scale and character has been exacerbated by the destruction caused by the earthquakes, with subsequent redevelopment of many properties. Additionally, a new multi-storey development is currently under construction at 108 Park Terrace and a new commercial hotel development is also currently being constructed on 28 Dorset Street and 155 Victoria Street (although this site is zoned Commercial Central City Business and Residential Central City).
- 37 Overall, the surrounding environment is starting to transition via a diversification of housing stock and increase in density. This transition aligns with the expectations for the Residential Central City Zone in the District Plan, as noted in Objective 14.2.8 – which I discussed at paragraph 21.
- 38 Mr David Pearson has described the heritage values associated with the former Bishop's Chapel on the Bishopspark Site in his evidence. He notes that the chapel essentially remains in its original form, although some changes have occurred, particularly following the earthquakes. He also acknowledges the location of the Dorset Street Flats (*Flats*), which are also listed as a Group 1 – Highly

⁶ Page 5 of the Council Officer's Report.

Significant heritage site / setting in the District Plan. The flats are located immediately to the north of the Bishopspark Site.

- 39 Also, of relevance to understanding the existing environment is the changing demographics of the population of Canterbury, as discussed in the evidence of Mr Jeremy Moore. In this regard, there are currently estimated to be 323,700 people in New Zealand aged 75+ years. This age group is expected to rise to over 698,000 nationally within the next 20 years. In Christchurch, the 75+ population is predicted to grow from 25,803 people in 2018 to 68,820 (high-growth projection) people in 2043. I understand from the evidence of Mr Moore that this age group are the most likely primary occupants for Ryman's retirement villages.
- 40 In summary, the Bishopspark Site is a large site with limited street frontage in a high-density residential zone. While the Peterborough Site is not as large, it is a vacant brownfield site that was specifically identified through the hearings on the Christchurch Replacement District Plan as being able to support considerable additional height given its corner frontage. Collectively the two Sites (which cumulatively comprise approximately 17,349 m²) form a uniquely large Site available to be redeveloped within Central Christchurch – noting also that the Peterborough Site is largely able to operate independently given it solely comprises independent living apartments. This, together, with the close proximity to public transport, key pedestrian routes and large areas of open space make the Site an ideal location for a comprehensive care retirement village. Its qualities also dictate that it be developed efficiently.

Permitted Baseline

- 41 Section 104(2) of the RMA specifies that when forming an opinion of the potential effects on the environment of allowing an activity, a consent authority may disregard an adverse effect of the activity on the environment if a national environment standard or the plan permits an activity.
- 42 I agree with Ms Armstrong that there is no applicable permitted baseline in the District Plan relevant to this Proposed Village.

Retirement Use

- 43 It is relevant to note that retirement village uses are permitted activities in the Residential Central City Zone in accordance with Rule 14.6.1.1 (P6) of the District Plan and it is, therefore, only the buildings that require consent. In my opinion, this negates those

submissions⁷ which have questioned whether the Site is an appropriate location for a retirement village.

- 44 I am also aware that some submitters⁸ consider the Proposed Village to be more akin to a hotel and not consistent with what is considered a retirement village. A retirement village is defined in the District Plan as:

means any land, building or site that:

- a. is used for accommodation predominantly for persons in their retirement, or persons in their retirement and their spouses or partners; and*
- b. satisfies either of the following:*
 - i. it is registered as a retirement village under the Retirement Villages Act 2003 or will be so registered prior to it being occupied by any resident; or*
 - ii. it is a rest home within the meaning of s58(4) of the Health and Disability Services (Safety) Act 2001; and*
- c. includes not less than two residential units; and*
- d. may include any or all of the following facilities or services for residents on the site:*
 - i. a care home within a retirement village;*
 - ii. a hospital within a retirement village;*
 - iii. nursing, medical care, welfare, accessory non-residential and/or recreation facilities and/or services.*

- 45 In my opinion, the Proposed comfortably fits within this definition. The primary purpose of the Proposed Village is to provide a variety of accommodation options for persons in their retirement, and consistent with all of Ryman's retirement villages, the Proposed Village will be registered as a retirement village under the Retirement Villages Act 2003 prior to it being occupied.

- 46 Additionally, some submitters⁹ have also expressed concern that the additional facilities to be provided as part of the Proposed Village mean that it is not a residential activity or a retirement village – and is more akin to a commercial operation. Again, I disagree because clause (d) of the definition of a retirement village clearly anticipates

⁷ For example, the submissions of S O'Connor, M Rinaldo, R Bluett and V Zanetti.

⁸ For example, the submissions of S O'Connor and G MacKinnon.

⁹ For example, the submissions of G Bennett, C Bennett, D & A McLean, B & M Logan, R Bluett and S O'Connor.

that retirement villages, such as this Proposed Village, can have supporting non-residential and / or recreational services and facilities on site. In relation to this Proposed Village, the non-residential and / or recreational services and facilities will include a swimming pool, gymnasium, theatre, library, hair salon and a shop that sells incidentals. All of these services and facilities are typical of the comprehensive care retirement villages developed by Ryman and is consistent with the definition in the District Plan – noting also that they are facilities that are not providing commercial services to the wider public.

Relevance of Built Form Standards

- 47 With respect to the overall planning context for the Site, the built form standards in the District Plan provide some important context with respect to the scale and degree of retirement village that could be anticipated to occur in the Residential Central City Zone. The applicable standards are:

- 47.1 **Building height** – 14m (Bishopspark Site) and 20m (Peterborough Site);
- 47.2 **Daylight recession planes** – recession plane envelopes apply 2.3m above internal boundaries and at angles determined from Appendix 14.16.2C, with exceptions for boundaries abutting an access lot or access strip (e.g. Westwood Terrace) and where buildings on adjoining sites have a common wall;
- 47.3 **Road boundary building setback** – 4.5m (Park Terrace) and 2m (Dorset Street);
- 47.4 **Building setback from internal boundaries** – 1.8m, with some exceptions for an access lot or access strip, accessory buildings, where buildings on adjoining sites have a common wall, and basements; and
- 47.5 **Minimum balcony or window setback** – balconies or windows of a living area at first floor or above generally shall not be located within 4m of an internal boundary of a site.

- 48 Any retirement village which complies with these built form standards would be a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 14.6.1.3 (RD4) of the District Plan, and while the Council would be required to consider a range of potential effects on the environment – including effects on the wider streetscape and the residential amenity of adjacent neighbours – public or limited notification would not be required. Accordingly, I consider that these built form standards provide very helpful guidance on the scale of building development that is generally considered to be appropriate.

- 49 Policy 14.2.8.2 also states that minimum standards have been prescribed for residential development in the Residential Central City Zone, that are intended to protect the amenity for residents, integrate development with the adjacent and wider neighbourhood, and provide for a range of current and future residential needs. In effect, I consider the built form standards assist in providing a general understanding of the degree of change that is anticipated in, and around Park Terrace – noting that any proposal will still require an assessment of potential effects on adjacent properties and the surrounding environment.

Actual and Potential Effects

- 50 An assessment of the actual and potential effects of the Proposed Village is provided in the AEE, the further information responses provided to the Council in May, July and November 2020, and as summarised in the evidence of the witnesses on behalf of Ryman. The Council Officer's Report, and accompanying peer reviews, provides further analysis of the actual and potential effects associated with the Proposed Village.
- 51 Likewise, the submissions on the application provide further understanding to the potential effects of the Proposed Village in the opinion of submitters.
- 52 Based on all of the above, and the matters of discretion applicable under the District Plan, the key potential effects that are ultimately determinative for this application fall into the following topics:
- 52.1 Residential amenity and urban design effects;
- 52.2 Heritage effects;
- 52.3 Transportation effects;
- 52.4 Construction effects; and
- 52.5 Arboricultural effects.
- 53 I provide my analysis on these matters, from a planning perspective, in the following paragraphs.

Residential Amenity and Urban Design Effects

- 54 The potential effects of the Proposed Village on the residential amenity of adjacent properties and the urban design attributes of the surrounding streetscape / environment is a key matter raised in submissions, as well as in the Council Officer's Report. In this regard, submitters have questioned the appropriateness of the scale, bulk, and character of the Proposed Village relative to their own properties and in relation to the general environment around Park Terrace / Hagley Park.

- 55 The matters raised generally fall within the scope of the matters of discretion under Rules 14.15.9, 14.15.27, 14.15.28, 14.15.29 and 14.15.30 of the District Plan – as documented in **Appendix B** to my evidence.
- 56 As noted in **Appendix C** to my evidence, the District Plan seeks the following relevant outcomes with respect to development in the Residential Central City Zone:
- 56.1 A predominantly residential environment offering a range of residential opportunities, including medium to high density living;¹⁰
 - 56.2 Built development that enables change to the existing environment, while contributing positively to the amenity and cultural values of the area, and to the health and safety, and quality and enjoyment, for those living within the area;¹¹
 - 56.3 The protection of the amenity of inner-city residential neighbourhoods;¹²
 - 56.4 The provision of housing options for older persons, with recognition that such housing can require higher densities than typical residential developments;¹³
 - 56.5 The contribution of individual developments to high quality residential environments through design that reflects context, character and scale of buildings anticipated in the neighbourhood;¹⁴
 - 56.6 Provision for different maximum building heights in areas of the Residential Central City Zone, with some areas requiring a reduced height compatible with the existing predominant character;¹⁵
 - 56.7 Minimum standards for residential development which are consistent with higher density living, protecting amenity

¹⁰ Objective 14.2.8 (a) of the District Plan.

¹¹ Objective 14.2.8 (b) of the District Plan.

¹² Policy 14.2.1.3 (a)(iii) of the District Plan.

¹³ Policy 14.2.1.8 (b) and (c) of the District Plan.

¹⁴ Policy 14.2.4.1 of the District Plan.

¹⁵ Policy 14.2.8.1 of the District Plan.

values for residents and integrating development with the adjacent / wider neighbourhood; and¹⁶

- 56.8 Recognition that built form standards may not always support the best design outcomes for medium density developments.¹⁷
- 57 Inherent in the above, is the tension between providing higher density residential development due to the operational needs of retirement villages and the development expectations for the Residential Central City Zone with the need to manage amenity / streetscape considerations.
- 58 With this in mind, the potential residential amenity and urban design effects of the Proposed Village are traversed in detail in the evidence of Ms Skidmore and Mr Burns on behalf of Ryman, and also the peer reviews by Ms Schroder and Ms Dray as part of the Council Officer's Report. I do not propose to repeat their respective analysis.
- 59 I largely agree with the overall assessment of Ms Armstrong regarding the potential residential amenity and urban design effects of the Proposed Village. Regarding my opinion, the Proposed Village will provide for high density development on the Site and diversify the residential living options in the Central City. This outcome is consistent with Objective 14.2.8 and Policies 14.2.1.3 and 14.2.1.8 of the District Plan. Additionally, and while some submitters will not agree, the reality of the zoning introduced in 2017 is such that the character and amenity of the environment around the Site is expected to change from that which has existed previously.
- 60 With respect to the visual and architectural quality of the Proposed Village, explained in detail in the evidence of Mr Richard McGowan, I agree with Ms Armstrong that the overall quality of the buildings is high. Ms Armstrong does express some concerns about the façade treatments of Building B02 (north and south), Building B07 (east) and Building B08 (west). These design elements are addressed in the evidence of Mr McGowan, Ms Skidmore and Mr Burns who consider that changes to the facades in these locations would potentially result in overlooking / privacy effects for neighbouring properties given the extent of internal boundaries. As such, I consider that the Proposed Village can achieve the outcomes of Objective 14.2.4 and Policies 14.2.4.1 and 14.2.4.2 in terms of providing high quality development that contributes to the quality of the street scene.

¹⁶ Policy 14.2.8.2 of the District Plan.

¹⁷ Policy 14.2.4.3 of the District Plan.

- 61 Shading and privacy / overlooking effects are one of the key residential amenity concerns of those submitters who live adjacent to the Site in terms of residential amenity considerations (and neighbouring amenity is also noted in the matters of discretion under Rule 14.15.9). The evidence of Ms Skidmore and Mr Burns provides an analysis of the potential residential amenity effects of the Proposed Village, as does the peer review of Ms Schroder.
- 62 Ms Skidmore has updated her shading analysis to clarify that her assessment does not utilise the built form standards for the Site as a baseline for assessing the acceptability of shading effects, although I agree with her that the standards are still relevant considerations in any assessment. In my opinion, the assessment undertaken by Ms Skidmore and Mr Burns is thorough and while there will be some shading on adjacent properties at certain times of the year, the overall conclusion is that the level of shading for individual properties will be acceptable – with effects ranging from less than minor to minor.
- 63 Overall, it is my opinion that the shading and privacy / overlooking effects of the Proposed Village, based on the assessments of the relevant experts, will be acceptable and generally consistent with the expectations for the Residential Central City Zone in terms of providing for density whilst protecting amenity values (Policy 14.2.8.2).
- 64 It is apparent that there is disagreement between Mr Dixon, Ms Skidmore and Mr Burns with the Council peer reviewers regarding the necessity and appropriateness of the tree planting along the boundary of the Site to mitigate potential effects on the character of the surrounding environment / streetscape. Based upon the peer reviews of Ms Schroder and Ms Dray, Ms Armstrong comments in the Council Officer's Report that she does not consider that the proposed landscaping will reflect the context and character of the area, nor will it contribute to a high-quality street scene. She does, however, consider that this could be achieved with changes to the tree species and methodology. She refers to Objective 14.2.4 and Policy 14.2.4.1 to support her assessment.
- 65 In contrast, Mr Dixon has provided his assessment on the landscaping strategy for the Site and Ms Skidmore notes that the proposed specimen trees to be used will create a vegetated structure that complements the building forms and will be used to filter views to the Proposed Village from adjacent residential properties and contribute to the streetscape of Park Terrace. In my opinion, the need for trees to 'offset' visual effects (as suggested by Ms Schroder) is not consistent with the expectations for the Residential Central City Zone. The zone is expected to accommodate high density residential developments. While there is a need to consider the contribution of boundary treatments to adjacent streets and public open spaces, there is no direction that

large trees that are capable to grow to their full height are expected or necessary in this location to address visual effects. Buildings of the scale proposed by Ryman should, in my opinion, be reasonably expected to be seen in this location.

- 66 Notwithstanding this, Mr Dixon has proposed a number of changes to the tree planting strategy for the Site to directly address the concerns raised through the Council Officer's Report. As such, I consider that the tree planting strategy for the Site can achieve Objective 14.2.4 and Policy 14.2.4.1 of the District Plan in terms of contributing to the street scene and enhancing local character.
- 67 In addition to the above, Ms Schroder would prefer the retention of existing mature trees on the Site. I acknowledge that Rule 14.15.9(a)(iii) identifies that account should be taken to the response to existing landscape features on a site – including mature trees. However, as I have already discussed, Rule 14.15.9 applies to the assessment of all retirement village proposals across all residential zones in Christchurch. In the Residential Central City Zone, where there is an expectation for higher density development, the provision of basement parking is effectively necessary for proposals such as this one.
- 68 In addition, retaining mature trees on the Site would in Ms Skidmore's view, impact upon the ability to achieve a suitable site layout that meets the functional and operational needs of the Proposed Village and provides a clear and logical structure.
- 69 Finally, I agree with Ms Armstrong and the evidence of Ms Skidmore and Mr Burns that matters related to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (*CPTED*) have been well resolved. Likewise, consideration of environmental efficiency measures in the design and operation of the Proposed Village were addressed in the section 92 response provided to the Council in November 2020.
- 70 While I discuss the relevant objectives and policies relevant to residential amenity and urban design effects in more detail later in my evidence, it is my assessment that the Proposed Village has been suitably designed such that it fits with the expectations for the Site under the District Plan and appropriately protects residential amenity for neighbouring residents.

Heritage Effects

- 71 The key potential heritage effects identified through the submissions, the Council Officer's Report of Ms Armstrong and the evidence of Mr Pearson are the potential impact of the Proposed Village on the heritage values of the former Bishop's Chapel on the Bishopspark Site, and the heritage values of the Flats – which is also a Group 1 - Highly Significant heritage item in the District Plan.

- 72 The potential effects of the Proposed Village on the former Bishop's Chapel are able to be considered under the relevant matters of discretion for Rules 9.3.5.1 and 9.3.6.1 in the District Plan. With respect to the Flats, Ms Armstrong notes that the heritage effects of buildings on adjacent sites do not fall within the available matters of discretion of the District Plan (Rules 9.3.5.1 and 9.3.6.1) and have only been considered under the framework of neighbouring residential amenity. I agree with Ms Armstrong that potential effects on the heritage values of the Flats do not fall to be considered under Rules 9.3.5.1 and 9.3.6.1. They should only be considered in relation to urban design and amenity matters in the context of Chapter 14 of the District Plan.
- 73 I set out below my planning analysis of how the potential effects on heritage values should be considered.
- 74 The District Plan seeks the following outcomes with respect to Christchurch's heritage (which are also documented in **Appendix C** to my evidence):
- 74.1 The overall contribution of historic heritage to Christchurch's character and identity is maintained through the protection and conservation of significant historic heritage;¹⁸
- 74.2 Provision for the ongoing use and adaptive re-use of scheduled historic heritage in a manner that is sensitive to their heritage values;¹⁹
- 74.3 Protection of the particular heritage values of heritage items from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.²⁰
- 75 With respect to the former Bishops' Chapel, the evidence of Mr Pearson and the peer review by Ms Richmond for the Council Officer's Report, both assess the potential effects of the Proposed Village. Their focus is on the works necessary to restore the condition of the chapel and the establishment of new buildings within the heritage setting of the chapel.
- 76 I understand that Mr Pearson and Ms Richmond generally agree that the heritage values of the former Bishop's Chapel will be enhanced as a result of the proposed restoration work and that positive outcomes of the proposed work will more than compensate for any potentially negative impacts – which are considered to be minor at worst. This conclusion is also reached by Ms Armstrong.

¹⁸ Objective 9.3.2.1.1 of the District Plan.

¹⁹ Policy 9.3.2.2.5 of the District Plan.

²⁰ Policy 9.3.2.2.3 of the District Plan.

- 77 The submission by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (*HNZPT*) also supported the resource consent application, subject to appropriate conservation methods for the restoration of the chapel and the imposition of consent conditions requiring appropriate scale, design, and environs to ensure that the chapel retains a context and setting recognising its heritage values and significance. Ryman proffered consent conditions to address the concerns of HNZPT, which have been accepted by HNZPT (see correspondence attached as **Appendix D** to my evidence). The consent conditions agreed with HNZPT form the basis for the condition set attached as **Appendix E** to my evidence.
- 78 Given the assessments by Mr Pearson and Ms Richmond, it is my opinion that the Proposed Village will clearly provide for the ongoing use and adaptive re-use of the former Bishop's Chapel in a manner that is sensitive to its heritage values. The proposed consent conditions proffered by Ryman in relation to the restoration of the chapel, including via the use of a Temporary Protection Plan, will also ensure that works are undertaken in a sensitive and careful manner.
- 79 The Proposed Village will also ensure that the contribution of the historic heritage of the former Bishop's Chapel to the character and identity of Christchurch is maintained.
- 80 With respect to the Dorset Street Flats, I understand that Ms Richmond considers there is a notable visual impact on the heritage values of the Flats, and that this visual impact is experienced both when viewing the primary elevation of the flats from Dorset Street and in terms of views to the south from within the Site. In contrast, Mr Pearson comments that the Proposed Village does not try to emulate its older neighbours (although it adopts some design inspiration from the previous use of the Bishopspark Site), and that this is an appropriate response to the surrounding context. He also notes that when viewed from the street, the Flats will not be overshadowed or dominated by the Proposed Village.
- 81 I also note that HNZPT did not identify any concerns with the relationship of the Proposed Village with the Flats in their submission, or during their discussions with Ryman regarding consent conditions.
- 82 In my opinion, neither the relevant matters of discretion or the objectives and policies of the District Plan anticipate an assessment of effects of an activity outside of the extent of a heritage item or setting. In this regard, the District Plan is focussed on considering the impact of activities directly on heritage items (i.e. their modification or demolition) or within heritage settings. Further, the District Plan does not alter the built form standards (e.g. height or boundary setbacks) or introduce rules for activities that are located

near, or adjacent to, historic items or heritage settings. As I have already noted above, there are no specific matters of discretion for retirement villages in the Residential Central City Zone that require consideration of significant heritage features in the wider environment.

- 83 Given the above, I do not consider the Proposed Village to be inappropriate in the context of its relationship with the Flats for the purposes of Objective 9.3.2.1.1 of the District Plan.

Transportation Effects

- 84 A number of submitters have raised concerns regarding the potential transportation effects associated with the Proposed Village. Matters raised in the submissions that I have identified include traffic and pedestrian safety on Salisbury Street, the shared use of Westwood Terrace, increased traffic on the surrounding road network, and the entranceway to the Site being dangerous.
- 85 I address potential construction traffic effects later in this evidence.
- 86 The relevant matters of discretion in relation to transportation matters are documented in the Council Officer's Report and are limited to the access design for the Peterborough Site²¹ and the integration of access, parking areas and garages in a way that is safe for pedestrians and cyclists (Rule 14.15.9).
- 87 With respect to the overarching policy direction that applies to transportation matters, the District Plan seeks the following outcomes (which are also documented in **Appendix C**):
- 87.1 An integrated transport system for Christchurch District that is safe and efficient;²²
- 87.2 To provide vehicle access and manoeuvring compatible with the road classification, and which ensures the safety and efficiency of the transport system; and²³
- 87.3 To enable activities to provide car parking spaces and loading spaces, whilst minimising any adverse effects on the efficiency and safety of the transportation networks.²⁴
- 88 I understand that both Mr Leo Hills and Mr Mike Calvert agree that the proposed access design to the Peterborough Site is acceptable.

²¹ Paragraph 213 of the Council Officer's Report.

²² Objective 7.2.1 of the District Plan.

²³ Policy 7.2.1.3 of the District Plan.

²⁴ Policy 7.2.1.4 (b) of the District Plan.

- 89 With respect to the secondary service access via Dorset Street for loading vehicles at the Bishopspark Site, the Council Officer's Report recommends (in response to the peer review of Mr Calvert) that loading vehicles be required to reverse into this access in order to improve safety. I understand that the ability for rubbish collection providers to undertake this manoeuvre has been confirmed by Ryman, and that this recommendation can be accommodated. I also support Ms Armstrong's recommendation for this to be addressed as a consent condition.
- 90 Several submissions have opposed the use of Westwood Terrace by pedestrians and vehicles on an ongoing basis. I understand that 13 property owners obtain legal right to their properties via Westwood Terrace, including Ryman.
- 91 I am aware that the estimate of pedestrian movements has been revised from that provided by Ryman in its Further Information Response in November 2020 (and which is referenced by Ms Armstrong in her Council Officer's Report). Ryman now anticipate 30 pedestrian movements per day.
- 92 Mr Hills considers that Westwood Terrace can be appropriately used by pedestrians as a link to the footpaths on Salisbury Street, as well as an operational servicing link between the two Sites (which will include limited vehicle movements associated with the maintenance of the retirement village). Mr Culvert has recommended the layout of Westwood Terrace be reviewed if it is to be used as a pedestrian access point, although this was on the basis of his understanding that there would be between 150 – 200 pedestrian movements per day.
- 93 Based on the evidence of Mr Hills and peer review from Mr Culvert, I consider that the road accesses for the Proposed Village can be undertaken in a manner that is safe, does not inappropriately impinge on the transport network and suitably integrates the movement of people and vehicles – in accordance with the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan.
- 94 I also note that this Proposed Village is not a high trip generating activity. As such, I do not consider that effects on the surrounding transport network are able to be considered under the relevant matters of discretion. That said, Mr Hills has provided an analysis of the potential traffic generation from the Proposed Village and concludes that the Proposed Village will have a minimal effect on the safe and efficient operation of the surrounding road network and will create less traffic than a medium density residential development on the Site.
- 95 Finally, and as noted by Mr Hills, the parking and manoeuvring areas within the Proposed Village will comply with the relevant standards in the District Plan. As such, I consider the outcomes

sought by the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan regarding the safe and efficient utilisation of parking areas can also be achieved.

Construction Effects

- 96 A number of submitters have raised concerns regarding the potential construction effects associated with the establishment of the Proposed Village. The key matters appear to relate to construction noise, construction traffic and land stability at the boundary during the construction of basements.²⁵
- 97 As noted in **Appendix C**, the District Plan seeks the following key outcomes with respect to the management of construction effects:
- 97.1 Adverse noise effects on amenity values and the health of people are managed to levels consistent with outcomes for the receiving environment;²⁶
- 97.2 Ensure the transportation of construction material to, and from, a site is safe and minimises adverse transport network and local amenity value effects;²⁷
- 97.3 The avoidance of earthworks that will create a significant risk to people and property through subsidence, inundation, siltation or overland flows; and²⁸
- 97.4 Require any proposal to develop contaminated land to apply a best practice approach to the remediation of contaminated land.²⁹
- 98 Mr Ajay Desai, Ms Wilkening, Mr Pierre Malan, Mr Paul Walker and Mr Hills have all addressed the key potential construction effects associated with the Proposed Village and responded to the matters raised in submissions. I also note that Mr Moore has confirmed that the 36 – 40-month construction period does not represent a period of maximum construction effort on the Site – construction works will move around both Sites during this period and intensity of construction activity will change as the buildings are established. That is, I understand the later stages of construction of each building involve less intensive activities. This expectation is reflected in Ms Wilkening’s detailed analysis of the potential noise and vibration impacts of the various stages.

²⁵ For example, D & A McLean, B Alexander & M Logan, and J Stratford & G Waddy.

²⁶ Objective 6.1.2.1 of the District Plan.

²⁷ Policy 8.2.5.3 of the District Plan.

²⁸ Policy 8.2.4.1 of the District Plan.

²⁹ Policy 4.2.2.1.1 of the District Plan.

99 Of particular relevance to the management of construction effects in line with the expectations in the District Plan are the following points:

- 99.1 Mr Hill considers that the implementation of a well-prepared Construction Traffic Management Plan, consistent with the draft already prepared, should be provided to the Council for certification prior to construction commencing on the Site. This will ensure construction traffic is safely managed and that disruptions are minimised;
- 99.2 In relation to Westwood Terrace, Ryman proposes to accept the recommendation of Mr Culvert that it not be used for construction purposes – therefore avoiding any potential safety and amenity effects for other users of the accessway;
- 99.3 Ms Wilkening concludes that construction noise that may exceed the construction noise standards will be limited to a short number of days at the nearest receivers (approximately 4 days). She notes a number of alternative construction methodologies that have been proposed in order to limit any potential noise exceedances, so as to be the best practicable option. A Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan is also proposed to manage these effects – which again would need to be certified by Council prior to the commencement of works on the Site;
- 99.4 Ms Wilkening considers any potential vibration during construction to be of a low level;
- 99.5 Mr Desai considers that the potential for sediment run-off from the Site during construction activities will be minimised by way of a detailed and site-specific Erosion and Sediment Control Plan;
- 99.6 With respect to dust, Mr Desai notes that the excavations will be predominately carried out below the water table (after water is extracted), and therefore the effects of dust nuisance will be minor due to the excavated materials being wet. Any potential effects of dust during construction will be mitigated through the Environmental Management Plan;
- 99.7 Further, Mr Desai notes that grades have been designed to direct overland flow paths to the neighbouring street network. As such, Mr Desai does not anticipate any boundary effects will arise from the grading design;
- 99.8 Mr Malan notes that the potential for instability of adjacent land caused by the Proposed Village will be mitigated by the design of the retention system. The presence of continuous propping in both the temporary and permanent cases will

provide a very stable and robust system that does not have a credible risk of causing instability of adjacent land. Ryman have also proffered conditions requiring pre- and post-construction building condition surveys for adjacent property owners; and

99.9 Mr Walker has identified the measures to be implemented, which are typical for developments around residential environments, to ensure that the remediation of contaminated land is managed in a manner that protects the environment and health of people.

100 The Council Officer's Report concludes that potential construction effects can be appropriately managed through the imposition of consent conditions and the utilisation of standard management plans to manage construction activities on a day-to-day basis. That said, I note that Mr Calvert has recommended that Westwood Terrace be excluded from use by heavy construction vehicles and has expressed uncertainty about the suitability of the road surface to support these vehicles. As noted already, this recommendation has been accepted by Ryman and the consent condition drafted by Ms Armstrong to this effect is accepted.

101 Based on the evidence for Ryman, the conclusions of the peer reviews attached to the Council Officer's Report, and the proposed consent conditions attached to my evidence, I consider that the potential construction effects can be appropriately managed. As such, the outcomes sought in the District Plan regarding the management of construction effects on amenity values and the utilisation of adjacent property can be achieved. I discuss the proposed consent conditions later in this evidence.

Arboricultural Effects

102 As discussed in the evidence of Mr Alan Parker, the Proposed Village involves works within the dripline, and pruning, of a significant tree under the District Plan (being a Common Lime Tree). These works have also been identified as a matter of concern for some submitters.

103 As noted in **Appendix C**, the District Plan seeks the following key outcomes with respect to the management of effects on significant trees:

103.1 Maintain and enhance the contribution of the Christchurch District's significant trees³⁰; and

³⁰ Objective 9.4.2.1.1(a) of the District Plan.

103.2 Protect significant trees from inappropriate physical works.³¹

- 104 The proposed methodology for managing the works around the significant tree is discussed in detail in the evidence of Mr Parker, as well as in the peer review by Mr Thornton as part of the Council Officer's Report. A number of measures are proposed by Mr Parker and Mr Thornton to manage construction works around the significant tree – a matter which I return to later in this evidence.
- 105 Mr Thornton expresses concern about the extent of works in close proximity to the significant tree, although this concern predated the root mass investigation that has subsequently been undertaken by Mr Parker. Mr Parker notes that the root mass identified within the basement construction area is insignificant and the potential effects of the basement works will be negligible.
- 106 Ms Armstrong has recommended a consent condition to the effect that, if that tree dies within 10 years of the works being undertaken on the Site, replacement trees would be provided. I would recommend revisiting the need for this condition once Mr Thornton has had an opportunity to review Mr Parker's evidence.
- 107 Overall, I consider that there are straightforward management measures available, to ensure that the significant tree on the Peterborough Site is retained.

Summary of Environmental Effects

- 108 Based on the technical evidence on behalf of Ryman, the information provided with the AEE, and the technical reviews in Council Officer's Report, it is my opinion that the Proposed Village is appropriate development within the Residential Central City Zone, and will provide for the diversification of the available housing stock in the community in response to the changing population demographics in Christchurch.
- 109 Consistent with the conclusion of Ms Armstrong in the Council Officer's Report, I agree that the Proposed Village will bring considerable change to the area – but note that the District Plan anticipates change in the Residential Central City Zone due to its expectation for higher density living environments. There will be changes in shading and new substantial buildings relatively close to some properties³² which are immediately adjacent to the Site and who have enjoyed the amenity of a vacant site neighbour for some time. But I consider that these effects are, overall, in line with what would be expected at this location.

³¹ Policy 9.4.2.2.3 of the District Plan.

³² For example, 15 Peterborough Street.

- 110 In response to the comments from Ms Armstrong, Ms Dray and Ms Schroder, Mr Dixon has proposed changes to the tree planting strategy that he is satisfied addresses those concerns.
- 111 Overall, the actual or potential environmental effects associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Village can be appropriately avoided, remedied, or mitigated through the consent conditions that are proposed by Ryman (and which are largely agreed with the Council).

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

- 112 The Council Officer's Report provides a comprehensive summary of the matters of concern raised in submissions, all of which have been addressed in Ryman's evidence. I comment as follows.

Height, Daylight Recession Planes and Setback Standards

- 113 A number of submissions³³ express opposition to the Proposed Village simply on the basis that it exceeds the height, daylight recession plane and setback standards in the District Plan.
- 114 As will be appreciated, the built form standards are not an absolute determinant of whether a proposal is appropriate or not and Ms Skidmore and Mr Burns conclude that the height and bulk-related effects of the Proposed Village are acceptable and in line with what is anticipated in this area. The built form standards are not bottom lines for residential development in the Residential Central City Zone.
- 115 In my opinion, the Proposed Village has been designed to be sensitive to its surrounding environment and this is discussed in detail in the evidence of Ms Skidmore and paragraphs 54 to 70 of my evidence.

Use of Westwood Terrace

- 116 A number of submitters have raised concerns regarding the utilisation of Westwood Terrace during construction and operation of the Proposed Village.³⁴
- 117 This matter has been addressed above. For brevity, I will not repeat my conclusions but note that I have recommended consent conditions to manage construction activities on Westwood Terrace.

³³ For example, D & L Worthington, M Cottle and Centro Roydvale Limited.

³⁴ For example, T Best and G Dewe.

Insufficient Information with the Application

- 118 Some submitters³⁵ have raised issues about the lack of information provided in the AEE, or that the AEE fails to adequately consider the effects of the Proposed Village on the commercial properties along Victoria Street.
- 119 All I can say is that the Residential Central City Zone anticipates the development of retirement villages within the zone, and as stated in the AEE and by Ms Skidmore and Mr Burns, the magnitude of amenity effects on commercial properties is considered negligible. Sufficient information has been provided to provide an understanding of the potential effects of the Proposed Village.

Issues with Notification

- 120 G MacKinnon's submission, amongst others, states that there was a lack of consultation with affected neighbours. Also, Mr Mackinnon has stated that it is not possible to ascertain the true nature of the Proposed Village due to the massive scale of the documentation to go through and understand.
- 121 Notwithstanding the views expressed about the adequacy of consultation, the application has been publicly notified and members of the public have been able to express their opinions and have them considered by the Commissioners.
- 122 Overall, I am satisfied that the effects of the Proposed Village, including those raised in submissions, have been comprehensively addressed.

Consistency with the District Plan

- 123 Some submitters consider that the character, intensity and scale of the Proposed Village is inappropriate for the Residential Central City Zone.
- 124 I address the consistency of the Proposed Village with the objectives and policies of the District Plan later in this evidence, and in detail in **Appendix C**. However, it is my conclusion that the Proposed Village is consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan – which is also the overall conclusion reached by Ms Armstrong in her Council Officer's Report.

RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OFFICER'S REPORT

- 125 I largely concur with the assessment of Ms Armstrong with respect to the extent of actual and potential effects of the Proposed Village

³⁵ For example, Dorset St Flat Owners Group and Centro Roydvale Ltd.

on the environment and have addressed those few points of disagreement earlier in my evidence.

SECTION 104 RMA ASSESSMENT

126 Section 104 states:

104 Consideration of applications

- (1) When considering an application for a resource consent and any submissions received, the consent authority must, subject to Part 2, have regard to—*
 - (a) any actual and potential effects on the environment of allowing the activity; and*
 - (ab) any measure proposed or agreed to by the applicant for the purpose of ensuring positive effects on the environment to offset or compensate for any adverse effects on the environment that will or may result from allowing the activity; and*
 - (b) any relevant provisions of—*
 - i. a national environmental standard;*
 - ii. other regulations;*
 - iii. a national policy statement*
 - iv. a New Zealand coastal policy statement;*
 - v. a regional policy statement or proposed regional policy statement;*
 - vi. a plan or proposed plan; and*
 - (c) any other matter the consent authority considers relevant and reasonably necessary to determine the application.*
- (2) When forming an opinion for the purposes of subsection (1)(a), a consent authority may disregard an adverse effect of the activity on the environment if the plan permits an activity with that effect.*
- (2A) ...*

127 I consider the relevant matters under section 104 of the RMA in the subsections below.

Actual and Potential Effects

128 The actual and potential effects of the Proposed Village on the environment are given detailed consideration in the AEE, as well as in the evidence on behalf of Ryman. Further, the peer reviews that form part of the Council Officer's Report have also addressed relevant matters to be given regard when considering a resource consent application under section 104 of the RMA.

129 My evidence also provides commentary on the key potential effects of the Proposed Village on the environment, as well as the matters of disagreement between the various parties. I also provide comment on the potential measures that are being proposed by

Ryman to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the actual and potential effects of the Proposed Village on the environment.

- 130 Overall, it is my opinion that the Proposed Village represents an appropriate use within the Residential Central City Zone. While it will bring considerable change to the area, such change is anticipated in the Residential Central City Zone. There will be some shading and overlooking effects at some properties immediately adjacent to the Site, but I consider that these effects are, overall, in line with what is expected at this location under the District Plan.

Relevant Planning Documents

- 131 The AEE has assessed the Proposed Village was against the provisions of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (*NPSUDC*), Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (*RPS*), and the District Plan.

National Policy Statement on Urban Development (2020)

- 132 The National Policy Statement on Urban Development (*NPSUD*) was gazetted on 23 July 2020 and replaces the *NPSUDC* 2016, and therefore requires consideration. The key objectives of the *NPSUD* can be summarised as seeking the following:

132.1 Well-functioning urban environments that enable people and communities and communities to provide for their wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future;

132.2 Improvement in housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets;

132.3 Regional policy statements and district plans which enable more people to live and work in or near employment centres, in areas well-served by public transport, and areas where this is a high demand for housing; and

132.4 The development and change of urban environments, including their amenity values, over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people and communities.

- 133 The policies in the *NPSUD* focus on planning decisions (which include decisions on resource consent applications) and the amendment of regional policy statements and district plans that provide for well-functioning urban environments that enable a diversity of housing stock, and significant increases in building height and density across city centre and metropolitan zones.

- 134 Ms Armstrong notes that a plan change has not yet been prepared by the Canterbury Regional Council or the Council to give effect to the *NPSUD*, such that she does not consider that significant consideration should be given to the *NPSUD* – other than to note the direction in Policy 6(b) that the planned urban built form may

involve significant changes to an area, and those changes may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values appreciated by other people.

- 135 I agree with Ms Armstrong that the NPSUD will largely be delivered through plan changes to regional policy statements and district plans. However, I would caution against dismissing its applicability until such time as a plan change is proposed by the Council. The NPSUD is intended in part to drive urban environments such as Christchurch towards providing for additional building height and density. This particularly applies in locations such as Park Terrace, which is close to civic and public amenities, commercial premises and is well-connected to public transport and where the existing zoning already encourages high density living.
- 136 In my opinion, the Proposed Village is consistent with, and gives effect to, the development expectations of the NPSUD as it provides for a diversification of housing stock and increased density in the Residential Central City Zone.

Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

- 137 As noted in the AEE, the RPS provides an overview of the resource management issues in the Canterbury Region, as well as the objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of natural and physical resources. These methods include directions for provisions in district and regional plans.
- 138 In my opinion, the RPS is of limited relevance to the consideration of the resource consent applications for the Proposed Village given that the District Plan has recently given effect to its overarching directives. That is, the District Plan is considered to implement the outcomes sought by the RPS with respect to the integration of land use and infrastructure, and the recovery and rebuilding of Greater Christchurch.
- 139 Notwithstanding this, and in line with the analysis provided in the AEE, I consider that the Proposed Village is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies of the RPS.

Christchurch District Plan

- 140 The Proposed Village is considered in detail against the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan in **Appendix C** to this evidence. Consistent with that analysis, and the commentary I provide above, my key conclusions with respect to the residential provisions in Chapter 14 of the District Plan are:

140.1 The Proposed Village will provide an increase in the supply of housing and provide variety of housing types that are

available for the elderly population and will provide residential living options for the elderly;³⁶

140.2 The Proposed Village is located within an area that is identified for residential development, and which accords with the overall high-density residential development sought for the Central City – noting also that the District Plan recognises that retirement villages may require higher densities than typical residential developments;³⁷

140.3 The Proposed Village will have some shading and overlooking effects for some immediately adjacent properties. However, based on the low scale of effects that will be generated, and the expectation for changes in the character and density of the Residential Central City Zone, it is my opinion that the amenity values of the surrounding area will be appropriately protected;³⁸

140.4 The Proposed Village has been comprehensively designed and will provide a high level of amenity for residents. It will also provide a range of housing options and amenities for the elderly population, allowing for residents to change their living arrangements as their care needs change over time; ³⁹

140.5 The Proposed Village will not adversely affect any strategic infrastructure;⁴⁰

140.6 The retirement village will be of a character and scale that is appropriate for the area; and⁴¹

140.7 The Proposed Village will provide a high-quality street scene along the adjacent roads through the design of the buildings and the (revised) tree planting strategy recommended by Mr Dixon. Further, CPTED principles have been considered in the overall master planning of the Proposed Village by Warren and Mahoney, which is reflected in the orientation of buildings towards the street.⁴²

³⁶ Objective 14.2.1 and Policy 14.2.1.1 of the District Plan.

³⁷ Policy 14.2.1.1. of the District Plan.

³⁸ Policy 14.2.1.3 of the District Plan.

³⁹ Policy 14.2.1.8 of the District Plan.

⁴⁰ Policy 14.2.3.1 of the District Plan.

⁴¹ Policies 14.2.4.1, 14.2.4.7 and 14.2.1.3 of the District Plan.

⁴² Policy 14.2.4.1 of the District Plan.

- 141 Regarding the other relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan:
- 141.1 The Proposed Village will provide for safe and efficient access to the Site for residents, visitors, and deliveries. The proposed consent conditions will ensure that the Dorset Street loading area will operate in a safe manner;⁴³
- 141.2 Earthworks will be managed to minimise sediment run-off and dust from the Site;⁴⁴
- 141.3 Construction effects will be managed to minimise potential effects on the amenity values of adjacent properties, particularly in relation to noise and traffic.
- 141.4 The historic heritage values of the former Bishop's Chapel will be protected through the repair works proposed by Ryman, and the chapel will remain a focal point within the Proposed retirement village;⁴⁵ and
- 141.5 The significant tree at the Peterborough Site will be retained and construction can be undertaken in a manner that will ensure the health and integrity of the tree is not compromised.
- 142 Overall, my analysis concludes that the construction and operation of the Proposed Village will be consistent with the overall outcomes sought by the District Plan that are relevant to the determination of this application as a restricted discretionary activity.

Other Matters

- 143 With respect to 'other matters' requiring consideration in accordance with section 104(1)(c) of the RMA, I note that the Council Officer's Report by Ms Armstrong refers to the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 – and the need to consider the consistency of consent applications with Recovery Plans and Regeneration Plans.
- 144 I agree with the assessment of Ms Armstrong in relation to this matter. The Proposed Village will not conflict with the visions of the Plan.

⁴³ Objective 7.2.1 and Policies 7.2.1.3, 7.2.1.4 and 7.2.1.5 of the District Plan.

⁴⁴ Objective 8.2.4 and Policies 8.2.4.1 and 8.2.4.4. of the District Plan.

⁴⁵ Objective 9.3.2.1.1 and Policy 9.3.2.2.3 of the District Plan.

Part 2 Considerations

Section 5

145 I understand that a consent authority is not required to consider Part 2 of the RMA beyond its expression in the relevant statutory planning documents unless it is appropriate to do so. Where a plan has been competently prepared under the RMA, reference to Part 2 generally will not add anything to the evaluative exercise. In this case, I consider that the overall planning context is clear and the Proposed Village aligns well with the relevant planning directions, acknowledging that the new NPSUD has not been given effect to and raises matters which are material to the current planning regime under consideration.

146 Nevertheless, for completeness and surety of assessment, I briefly consider the relevant matters under Part 2 of the RMA, noting that this assessment does not alter my conclusions regarding the appropriateness of the Proposed Village.

147 I note that the purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, which is defined as:

In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while—

- (a) sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
- (b) safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and*
- (c) avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.*

148 In my opinion, the Proposed Village will enable people and communities (including future generations) to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing through providing purpose-built accommodation options for the elderly. At the same time, the Proposed Village does not compromise the surrounding community's social, economic, and cultural wellbeing.

149 Furthermore, the construction and operation of the Proposed Village will not affect the safeguarding of the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems. Likewise, several measures are proposed as part of the construction of the retirement village to assist in ensuring that the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Village are appropriately avoided, remedied, or mitigated.

Sections 6, 7, and 8

- 150 Section 6 of the RMA contains matters of national importance that shall be recognised and provided for. In particular, section 6(f), 6(h) 7(b) and 7(c) are relevant to the Proposed Village.
- 151 Section 6(f) of the RMA seeks to ensure the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate development. This matter is addressed in the evidence of Mr Pearson and in my assessment of the District Plan in relation to Chapter 9.
- 152 With respect to Section 6(h) of the RMA, appropriate consideration has been given to the management of the potential risks from natural hazards on the Site (i.e. flooding from overland flow paths and liquefaction) in the design and construction methodologies for the Proposed Village. This is discussed in the evidence of Mr Malan.
- 153 With respect to 7(b) of the RMA, the Proposed Village will enable the efficient use of natural resources (being land) via the development of an integrated residential development on a site that enables the accommodation of an elderly population.
- 154 With respect to 7(c) of the RMA, the design of the retirement village has been undertaken in a manner that, as far as practicable, complies with the built form standards in the Residential Central City Zone, and is appropriate to the characteristics of the Site and the surrounding environment. As such, it is considered that the overall amenity values and the quality of the environment will be maintained.
- 155 Finally, I note that section 8 of the RMA requires all persons exercising functions and powers under the Act to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. While section 8 of the RMA is not directly relevant to Ryman (as it is not a person exercising functions and powers under the RMA), I am not aware of any matters relating to the principles of Treaty of Waitangi that would preclude Christchurch City Council granting the various resource consents for the retirement village.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 156 A set of proposed consent conditions were provided by Ryman as part of its further information response to the Council in November 2020. These consent conditions have been reviewed and updated by Ms Armstrong as part of the Council Officer's Report.
- 157 Overall, I consider that the proposed consent conditions recommended by Ms Armstrong to be extensive and robust. I do, however, make the following comments on the conditions attached as **Appendix E** and am able to provide further discussion on the conditions in the hearing:

- 157.1 Condition 2 should be made explicit that any of the management plans required under the resource consent may be prepared for all or part of the works across the Site – in recognition that the construction programme may differ across the Bishopspark and Peterborough Sites;
- 157.2 Condition 5 should recognise that the Construction Management Plan provided by Ryman in November 2020 was a draft, and that provision should be made for an updated version to be certified by Council prior to construction activities commencing on either Site (noting that it should apply to construction activities, not just filling and excavation work – which is not consistent with terminology used in the District Plan);
- 157.3 Conditions 7 and 8 seek to ensure that any changes in ground levels on the Site do not cause flooding, drainage or stability issues for neighbouring properties. I agree with the premise of the condition, but the drafting requires improvement so that it is linked to the works on the Site authorised by this condition not causing such effects. The conditions cannot protect against future activities or ground level changes not induced by the activities that are part of this Proposed Village;
- 157.4 Based on the evidence of Mr Malan, I agree that Condition 20 should clarify that the need for evidence of building consents for retaining wall works should be linked to the commencement of bulk earthworks on either Site – not more minor earthworks necessary for contaminated land remediation;
- 157.5 The potential need for Condition 45 (now deleted in track changes, regarding the potential replacement of the Common Lime Tree in the event of death, should be revisited once Mr Thornton has considered the root mass investigation that has been undertaken;
- 157.6 Condition 46 has been amended to reflect the evidence of Mr Pearson regarding the need for sand blasting to the exterior of the former Bishops' Chapel, and the fact that water blasting should not be undertaken;
- 157.7 Condition 51 has been amended in line with the agreement reached between Ryman and HNZPT to ensure that all works on the former Bishop's Chapel are undertaken by suitably qualified tradespeople (as well as being overseen by a structural engineer and heritage professional); and
- 157.8 In light of the revised landscaping strategy proposed by Mr Dixon, I consider that Condition 63 can be deleted as the

design changes sought by the Council have now largely been addressed; and

CONCLUSIONS

- 158 Ryman proposes to establish and operate a comprehensive care retirement village across two Sites at 100 - 104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street, and 78 Park Terrace, Christchurch in order to provide a continuum of care village for Christchurch's elderly.
- 159 In my opinion, the Proposed Village offers an opportunity to develop a high quality, purpose built, secure, comprehensive care retirement village across two unique Sites within the well-established residential community of Central Christchurch that is close to existing infrastructure and amenities.
- 160 The Proposed Village has been designed to integrate with the surrounding residential environment. Built form standards are generally met. The effect of the breaches are generally negligible or low. The effects of the village more generally will be appropriate in the context of the character of the surrounding environment and the development expectations for the area.
- 161 The Proposed Village will result in significant positive effects by providing a much-needed retirement village within the established community of central Christchurch, and economic benefits through creating construction and operational jobs and demand for services.
- 162 I have also concluded that the Proposed Village will be consistent with the outcomes sought in the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan. It certainly cannot be said that the Proposed Village is contrary, or repugnant to the objectives and policies of the District Plan.
- 163 In my opinion there is no impediment to granting consent to these applications.

Philip Mitchell
6 January 2021

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A – RESOURCE CONSENT REQUIREMENTS

CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT PLAN

Rule	Resource Consent Required	Activity Status	Standard not Met	Commentary
14.6.1.3 RD5	A land use consent for a retirement village that does not meet more than one of the building form standards.	Restricted Discretionary	<p>Any new building, or alteration or addition to an existing building for a retirement village that does not meet one or more of the following built form standards:</p> <p>14.6.2.1 Building Height</p> <p>14.6.2.2 Daylight Recession Planes</p> <p>14.6.2.3 Road Boundary Building Setback</p> <p>14.6.2.4 Minimum Building Setbacks from Internal Boundaries</p>	<p>Any new building, or alteration or addition to an existing building for a retirement village that does not meet one or more of the following built form standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 14.6.2.1 Building height; ➤ 14.6.2.2 Daylight recession planes; ➤ 14.6.2.3 Road boundary building setback; and ➤ 14.6.2.4 Minimum building setbacks from internal boundaries. <p>Building Height Bishopspark Site - The maximum building height proposed is 19.495 m (exceeding the 14 m building height standard). Peterborough Site - The maximum building height proposed is 25.002 m (exceeding the 20 m building height standard).</p> <p>Daylight Recession Planes Bishopspark Site – Parts of Buildings B01, B02, B03 and B04 will exceed the recession plane standard. Peterborough Site – Parts of Buildings B07 and B08 will exceed the recession plane standard.</p> <p>Road Boundary Building Setback Bishopspark Site - Building B02 is setback 3.7 m from Park Terrace (encroaching the 4.5 m setback from road boundary standard). Bishopspark Site – Building B03 is setback 1.8 m from Dorset Street (encroaching the 2 m setback from road boundary standard).</p> <p>Minimum Building Setback from Internal Boundaries Bishopspark Site – Building B03 is setback 0 m from the eastern boundary for a length of 20.83 m (encroaching the 1.8 m setback at this boundary). Building B04 is setback 1 m</p>

Rule	Resource Consent Required	Activity Status	Standard not Met	Commentary
				<p>from the eastern boundary for a length of 38.17 m and 0 m from the eastern boundary for a length of 10.06 m (encroaching the 1.8 m setback at this boundary).</p> <p>Living area windows are required to be set back 4 m from internal boundaries where they are above the first floor. The living room windows on the northern boundary of Building B01 on the Bishopspark Site are set back 3.244 m from the Site boundary.</p>
6.1.6.1.3 (RD2)	A land use consent for construction noise exceeding the maximum permitted levels.	Restricted Discretionary	6.1.6.1.1(P2) – Construction activities shall meet relevant noise limits in Tables 2 and 3 of NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics - Construction Noise, when measured and assessed in accordance with that standard.	Rule 6.1.6.1.1 (P2) requires compliance with the noise limits of Tables 2 and 3 of NZS 6803:1999 “Acoustics – Construction Noise”. The proposed construction has the potential to exceed daytime noise limit for the construction of the basement at adjacent properties, as identified in the evidence of Ms Wilkening.
6.8.4.1.3 RD1	A land use consent for signage exceeding the maximum permitted area.	Restricted Discretionary	6.8.4.2.6 Free Standing Signs – the maximum total area of a sign on each site shall be 0.2 m². A sign of 1.68 m² is proposed on each site frontage	<p>The permitted maximum total area of a free-standing sign under Rule 6.8.4.2.6 is 0.2 m².</p> <p>The proposed retirement village signs outside of the main entrances to both Sites will be approximately 1.68 m².</p>
7.4.2.3 RD1	A land use consent for access width not meeting the minimum width requirement.	Restricted Discretionary	7.4.3.7 Access Design	<p>Under Rule 7.4.3.7, Appendix 7.5.7 requires a minimum legal width of 6.5 m and a 5.5 m formed width.</p> <p>The access to the Peterborough Site from Park Terrace will have an access width and formed width of 4 m (given that it is a one-way access).</p>
8.9.2.3 RD1	A land use consent for earthworks in a residential zone exceeding the maximum volume and depth.	Restricted Discretionary	8.9.2.1 P1 a. Earthworks volume and depth b. Depth of earthworks c. Earthworks gradient	<p>Under Rule 8.9.2.1, Table 9, the maximum volume of permitted earthworks is 20 m³ per site</p> <p>The Proposed Village requires 61,500 m³ at the Bishopspark Site and 25,000 m³ at the Peterborough Site.</p> <p>The proposed earthworks for the Proposed Village will also exceed the 0.6 m maximum depth, as detailed in the evidence of Mr Desai.</p>

Rule	Resource Consent Required	Activity Status	Standard not Met	Commentary
9.3.4.1.2 C1	A land use consent for heritage upgrade works to a Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items.	Controlled	Heritage upgrade works for Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items.	Heritage upgrade works to the former Bishops' Chapel located on the Bishopspark Site are required.
9.3.4.1.3 RD2	A land use consent for a new building within a heritage setting.	Restricted Discretionary	New buildings in a heritage setting.	New buildings are proposed within the heritage setting of the former Bishops' Chapel on the Bishopspark Site.
9.4.4.1.3 RD1	A land use consent for pruning of a significant tree.	Restricted Discretionary	Any pruning of any significant tree listed in Appendix 9.4.7.1.	On the Peterborough Site, it is proposed to carry out the pruning of a Significant Tree (Common Lime Tree T271) listed in Appendix 9.4.7.1.
9.4.4.1.3 RD5	A land use consent for works within the dripline of a significant tree.	Restricted Discretionary	Any works within the dripline of a significant tree listed in Appendix 9.4.7.1	On the Peterborough Site, it is proposed to carry out works within the dripline of a Significant Tree (Common Lime Tree T271) listed in Appendix 9.4.7.1.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B – MATTERS OF DISCRETION

CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT PLAN

Rule	Standard not Met	Matters of Discretion
14.6.1.3 RD5	Any new building, or alteration or addition to an existing building for a retirement village that does not meet one or more of the following built form standards:	<p>Retirement villages – Rule 14.15.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Whether the developments, while bringing change to existing environments, is appropriate to its context taking into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. engagement with, and contribution to, adjacent streets and public open spaces, with regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. fencing and boundary treatments; B. sightlines; C. building orientation and setback; D. configuration of pedestrian entrances; E. windows and internal living areas within buildings; and F. if on a corner site is designed to emphasise the corner; i. integration of access, parking areas and garages in a way that is safe for pedestrians and cyclists, and that does not visually dominate the development, particularly when viewed from the street or other public spaces; ii. retention or response to existing character buildings or established landscape features on the site, particularly mature trees, which contribute to the amenity of the area; iii. appropriate response to context with respect to subdivision patterns, visible scale of buildings, degree of openness, building materials and design styles; iv. incorporation of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, including effective lighting, passive surveillance, management of common areas and clear demarcation of boundaries and legible entranceways; v. residential amenity for neighbours, in respect of outlook, privacy, noise, odour, light spill, and access to sunlight, through site design, building, outdoor living space and service/storage space location and orientation, internal layouts, landscaping and use of screening; vi. creation of visual quality and interest through the separation of buildings, variety in building form, distribution of walls and openings, and in the use of architectural detailing, glazing, materials, and colour; and vii. where practicable, incorporation of environmental efficiency measures in the design, including passive solar design principles that provide for adequate levels of internal natural light and ventilation. b. Where the site is within the Akaroa Heritage Area, the matters set out in Rule 9.3.6.3. c. For the avoidance of doubt, this is the only matter of discretion that applies to retirement villages. <p>Building height – Rule 14.15.27</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Compatibility with the scale of other buildings in the surrounding area, and the extent to which building bulk is out of character with the local environment. b. Any effect of increased height on the amenity of neighbouring properties, including through loss of privacy, outlook, overshadowing or visual dominance of buildings.
	14.6.2.1 Building height	

Rule	Standard not Met	Matters of Discretion
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C. insulation or enclosure of machinery; D. mounding or screen fencing/walls; E. hours of operation; F. in the Central City, the management of outdoor areas, including by closing outdoor serving areas, turning off outdoor heaters, turning off outdoor speakers, and minimising the size of outdoor areas; G. in the Central City, the management of external doors and windows and other avenues for noise to emanate from within a building; and H. in the Central City, any other management required to address issues such as rubbish and recycling disposal. iv. Outside the Central City, the adequacy of measures to address the adverse effects of noise on the natural character of the coastal environment. v. The value and nature of entertainment activities and their benefit to the wider community, having regard to the frequency of noise intrusion and the practicality of mitigating noise, or utilising alternative sites. vi. The extent to which achieving the standard is appropriate where the existing noise environment is subject to significant noise intrusion from road traffic, or Transport Zone activities in the Central City. vii. Any relevant standards, codes of practice or assessment methods based on sound acoustic principles, including those which address the reasonableness of the noise in terms of community health and amenity and/or sleep protection. viii. In the Central City, the level of noise from the activity in relation to ambient noise in its vicinity. ix. In the Central City, the reasonableness of the noise in terms of recommendations and guidelines for community health and amenity and sleep protection, including guidance given by the World Health Organisation. x. Additional criteria where sound insulation is required by the rules: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The extent to which a reduced level of acoustic insulation may be acceptable due to mitigation of adverse noise impacts through other means, e.g. screening by other structures, or distance from noise sources. B. The ability to meet the appropriate levels of acoustic insulation through alternative technologies or materials. C. The provision of a report from an acoustic specialist which provides evidence that the level of acoustic insulation is appropriate to ensure the amenity of present and future residents of the site. D. In the Central City, the impact of any residential accommodation or education activity that does not provide the required noise insulation on the ability of existing or future permitted business activities to operate or establish without undue constraint. E. In the Central City, the location of any nearby business activities and the degree to which the amenities of the sensitive activities may be adversely affected. F. Outside the Central City, the appropriateness of a legal instrument to be registered against the title that is binding on the owner and the owner's successors in title, containing a 'no complaint' clause relating to the noise of aircraft using Christchurch International Airport. xi. In the case of shooting ranges, whether the shooting range and associated activities will adversely affect the captive bird breeding programme within the Peacock Springs Conservation Area (identified in Chapter 17 Appendix 17.12.1) in terms of noise disturbance.

Rule	Standard not Met	Matters of Discretion
6.8.4.1.3 RD1	6.8.4.2.6 Free standing signs – the maximum total area of a sign on each site shall be 0.2 m ² . A sign of 1.68 m ² is proposed on each site frontage	<p>Rule 6.8.5.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Whether the scale, design, colour, location and nature of the signage will have impacts on the architectural integrity, amenity values, character, visual coherence, and heritage values of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the building and the veranda on which the signage is displayed and its ability to accommodate the signage; ii. the surrounding area (including anticipated changes in the area); iii. residential activities; and iv. heritage items or heritage settings, open spaces, protected trees or areas possessing significant natural values. B. Whether the extent of the impacts of the signage are increased or lessened due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the design, dimensions, nature and colour of the sign or support structure; ii. the level of visibility of the sign; and iii. vegetation or other mitigating features. C. Whether the signage combines with existing signage on the building, the site or in the vicinity, to create visual clutter or set a precedent for further similar signage. D. Whether there are any special circumstances or functional needs relating to the activity, building, site or surroundings, which affect signage requirements, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. operational, safety, directional, and functional requirements; ii. its size, scale, or nature; and iii. the length of the road frontage. E. Whether the signage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. enlivens a space or screens unsightly activities; ii. will result in an orderly and co-ordinated display; and iii. relates to the business or activity on the site and the necessity for the business or activity to identify and promote itself. F. For small-scale, grouped poster signage, the nature and extent of any management and maintenance regime in place including keeping the posters current, and the posters and sites on which they are installed clean and free of graffiti. G. The potential of the signage to cause distraction or confusion to motorists and/or adversely affect traffic safety due to its location, visibility, and/or content, including size of lettering, symbols or other graphics. H. Where the site is within the Akaroa Heritage Area, the matters set out in Rule 9.3.6.3.
7.4.2.3 RD1	7.4.3.7 Access Design	<p>Rule 7.4.4.10 Vehicle Access Design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The following are matters of discretion for Rule 7.4.3.7 a.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Whether the driveway serves more than one site and the extent to which other users of the driveway may be adversely affected. ii. Whether there are any adverse effects on the safety and amenity values of neighbouring properties and/or the function of the transport network. iii. The effects on the safety and security of people using the facility.

Rule	Standard not Met	Matters of Discretion
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Whether the access disrupts, or results in conflicts with, active frontages, convenient and safe pedestrian circulation and cycling flows or will inhibit access for emergency service vehicles where on-site access is required. v. Whether the safety of pedestrians, particularly the aged and people whose mobility is restricted, will be compromised by the length of time needed to cross a wider driveway. vi. Whether the legal width of access is restricted by the boundaries of an existing site and/or an existing building. vii. Where the access exceeds the maximum gradient standards, in addition to i. to vi. above: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. whether the gradient will make the use of the access impracticable, including inhibiting access for emergency service vehicles where on-site access is required. b. whether the drainage facilities are adequately designed and will not cause adverse effects on neighbouring sites.
8.9.2.3 RD1	8.9.2.1 P1 a. Earthworks volume and depth b. Depth of earthworks c. Earthworks gradient	<p>The matters of discretion applying to the activity will be extended to include:</p> <p>8.9.4.1 – Nuisance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The extent to which any potential dust nuisance, sedimentation and water or wind erosion effects can be avoided or mitigated. B. The extent to which effects on neighbouring properties, and on the road network, of heavy vehicle and other vehicular traffic generated as a result of earthworks can be avoided or mitigated. C. The extent to which any potential changes to the patterns of surface drainage or subsoil drains can be avoided or mitigated if those changes would put the site or adjoining land at higher risk of drainage problems, inundation run-off, flooding, or raise that site's or adjoining land's water table. D. Whether any change in ground level would be likely to impact on trees in terms of access to water and drainage. E. The extent of any potential adverse effects on the quality of groundwater and whether any such can be avoided or mitigated. F. The extent to which any adverse effects from noise and vibration associated with earthworks and land improvement can be avoided or mitigated, and the effectiveness of any methods to mitigate such effects. G. The extent to which earthworks in the Open Space Avon River Precinct (Te Papa Ōtākaro) Zone have an adverse effect on the Avon River and its margins. <p>8.9.4.2 - Resources and assets (versatile soils);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Whether versatile soils would be lost to production or have their physical and biochemical qualities compromised. B. In relation to National Grid transmission lines and electricity distribution lines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the risk to the structural integrity of the National Grid or electricity distribution lines; ii. compliance with NZECP 34:2001; iii. any implications arising from technical advice provided by the utility operator;

Rule	Standard not Met	Matters of Discretion
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. the effects on the ability of the utility operator to operate and upgrade and develop the National Grid and/or electricity distribution lines, including on-going safe and direct access; and v. the effects on the ability of the utility operator to operate, upgrade and develop its utility, including on-going safe and direct access. <p>8.9.4.3 - Land stability;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Whether the earthworks affect the stability of adjoining land and its susceptibility to subsidence or erosion upon excavation taking place. B. The extent of any alteration to natural ground levels in the vicinity and, consequently, to the height and bulk of buildings that may be erected on the site. C. Whether the earthworks affect the future development potential of land for permitted activities, taking account of the nature of filling material proposed and the degree of compaction. <p>8.9.4.6 – Amenity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The level of alteration to existing ground levels and the degree to which the resultant levels are consistent with the surrounding environment. B. The resultant effects that result from the earthworks in terms of visual amenity, landscape context and character, views, outlook, overlooking and privacy. <p>8.9.4.7 - Indigenous biodiversity, natural character and landscape features (Rule 9.1.5.2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The extent to which the nature, scale, intensity and location of the proposed activity will adversely affect indigenous biodiversity and ecosystems taking into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. any loss of, or effects on, indigenous vegetation or habitats of indigenous fauna, including wetlands, ecological corridors and linkages; ii. indigenous ecosystem integrity and function; iii. Ngāi Tahu values associated with indigenous biodiversity; iv. where relevant, any effects on areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in Sites of Ecological Significance listed in Schedule A of Appendix 9.1.6.1; and v. where relevant, any effects on indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna in the coastal environment. B. The extent to which areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in Sites of Ecological Significance listed in Schedule A of Appendix 9.1.6.1 will be protected to ensure no net loss of indigenous biodiversity; C. The extent to which adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity and Ngāi Tahu values will be managed to ensure indigenous biodiversity in the Christchurch District is maintained and enhanced; D. Any social, economic, environmental and cultural benefits resulting from the proposed activity including the extent to which the activity may protect, maintain or enhance any ecosystems or indigenous biodiversity offsets, including through the use of biodiversity offsets, covenants and/or restoration and enhancement;

Rule	Standard not Met	Matters of Discretion
		<p>E. The risk of the increase in weed and pest species, and proposed management of pests; and</p> <p>F. Any locational, technical or operational requirements of the proposed activity and the practicality of avoiding indigenous vegetation, including the viability of alternatives.</p> <p>8.9.4.8 - Historic heritage (Rule 9.3.6.1);</p> <p>A. The nature and extent of damage incurred as a result of the Canterbury earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 including the costs of repair and reconstruction.</p> <p>B. The level of intervention necessary to carry out the works, including to meet the requirements of the Building Act and Building Code, and alternative solutions considered.</p> <p>C. Whether the proposal will provide for ongoing and viable uses, including adaptive reuse, of the heritage item.</p> <p>D. Whether the proposal, including the form, materials and methodologies are consistent with maintaining the heritage values of heritage items and heritage settings, and whether the proposal will enhance heritage values, particularly in the case of Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items and heritage settings and in particular have regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the form, scale, mass materials, colour, design (including the ratio of solid to void), detailing (including the appearance and profile of materials used), and location of the heritage item; ii. the use of existing heritage fabric; iii. the extent of earthworks necessary as part of the proposal; iv. the necessity of the removal or transplanting of mature trees; v. the impact on public places; and vi. within a heritage setting, the relationship between elements, such as layout and orientation, form and materials. <p>E. The extent to which the works are in accordance with the principles in Policy 9.3.2.2.3(b), and whether the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. is supported by a conservation plan or expert heritage report; and ii. the extent to which it is consistent with the Heritage Statement of Significance and Conservation Plan and the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010). <p>F. Whether the proposed work will have a temporary or permanent adverse effect on heritage fabric, layout, form or heritage values and the scale of that effect, and any positive effects on heritage fabric, fabric, form or values.</p> <p>G. The extent to which the heritage fabric has been damaged by natural events, weather and environmental factors and the necessity of work to prevent further deterioration.</p> <p>H. Whether Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga has been consulted and the outcome of that consultation.</p> <p>I. Whether the site has cultural or spiritual significance to Tangata Whenua and the outcome of any consultation undertaken with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Papatipu Rūnanga.</p> <p>J. The extent to which mitigation measures are proposed to be implemented to protect the heritage item. Such mitigation measures include but are not limited to the use of a temporary protection plan.</p> <p>K. The extent of photographic recording which is necessary to document changes, including prior to, during the course of the works and on completion, particularly in the case of Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items, the need for a high level of photographic recording throughout the process of the works, including prior to the works commencing.</p>

Rule	Standard not Met	Matters of Discretion
		<p>L. For new buildings, structures and/or features in heritage items which are open spaces, whether the building, structure or feature will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. be compatible with the heritage fabric, values and significance of the heritage item including design, detailing and location of heritage item(s) within the open space; ii. impact on views to or from the heritage item(s), and reduce the visibility of heritage item(s) from public places; and iii. the relationship between elements, such as the layout and orientation, form, and materials within the open space. <p>M. For the relocation of a heritage items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. whether the new location and orientation of the heritage item will maintain the heritage values of the heritage item; ii. whether alternative solutions have been considered, including repairs, reconstruction, heritage upgrade works, and restoration in situ; and iii. the potential damage to heritage fabric during relocation and whether repairs will be required, and what mitigation measures are proposed, including the use of temporary protection plan. <p>N. For temporary event structures in heritage items which are open spaces and in heritage settings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the duration the temporary event structure will remain within the heritage item or heritage setting; and ii. whether the temporary event structures will impact on views to or from the heritage item(s) or heritage setting, and reduce the visibility of heritage item(s) from public places. <p>O. For signage on heritage items and in heritage settings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. whether the sign (including its supporting structure and methods of attachment to the heritage item) is compatible with the architectural form, features, fabric and heritage values of the heritage item or heritage setting; ii. the extent to which any moving, or flashing signs detract from the heritage values of the heritage item and/or heritage setting; and iii. whether the sign is temporary or permanent, and if temporary, the duration of the signage. <p>P. For utilities the functional need to be located in or in proximity to heritage items and heritage settings.</p>
9.3.4.1.2 C1	Heritage upgrade works for Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items.	<p>Rule 9.3.5.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The form, materials, and methodologies to be used to maintain heritage values, including integration with, and connection to other parts of the heritage item; B. The methodologies to be used to protect the heritage item during heritage upgrade works, reconstruction and restoration; C. Documentation of change during the course of works, and on completion of work by such means as photographic recording; and D. Whether Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga has been consulted and the outcome of that consultation.

Rule	Standard not Met	Matters of Discretion
9.3.4.1.3 RD2	New buildings in a heritage setting.	<p>Rule 9.3.6.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The nature and extent of damage incurred as a result of the Canterbury earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 including the costs of repair and reconstruction. B. The level of intervention necessary to carry out the works, including to meet the requirements of the Building Act and Building Code, and alternative solutions considered. C. Whether the proposal will provide for ongoing and viable uses, including adaptive reuse, of the heritage item. D. Whether the proposal, including the form, materials and methodologies are consistent with maintaining the heritage values of heritage items and heritage settings, and whether the proposal will enhance heritage values, particularly in the case of Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items and heritage settings and in particular have regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the form, scale, mass materials, colour, design (including the ratio of solid to void), detailing (including the appearance and profile of materials used), and location of the heritage item; ii. the use of existing heritage fabric; iii. the extent of earthworks necessary as part of the proposal; iv. the necessity of the removal or transplanting of mature trees; v. the impact on public places; and vi. within a heritage setting, the relationship between elements, such as layout and orientation, form and materials. E. The extent to which the works are in accordance with the principles in Policy 9.3.2.2.3(b), and whether the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. is supported by a conservation plan or expert heritage report; and ii. the extent to which it is consistent with the Heritage Statement of Significance and Conservation Plan and the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010). F. Whether the proposed work will have a temporary or permanent adverse effect on heritage fabric, layout, form or heritage values and the scale of that effect, and any positive effects on heritage fabric, fabric, form or values. G. The extent to which the heritage fabric has been damaged by natural events, weather and environmental factors and the necessity of work to prevent further deterioration. H. Whether Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga has been consulted and the outcome of that consultation. I. Whether the site has cultural or spiritual significance to Tangata Whenua and the outcome of any consultation undertaken with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Papatipu Rūnanga. J. The extent to which mitigation measures are proposed to be implemented to protect the heritage item. Such mitigation measures include but are not limited to the use of a temporary protection plan. K. The extent of photographic recording which is necessary to document changes, including prior to, during the course of the works and on completion, particularly in the case of Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items, the need for a high level of photographic recording throughout the process of the works, including prior to the works commencing. L. For new buildings, structures and/or features in heritage items which are open spaces, whether the building, structure or feature will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. be compatible with the heritage fabric, values and significance of the heritage item including design, detailing and location of heritage item(s) within the open space;

Rule	Standard not Met	Matters of Discretion
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. impact on views to or from the heritage item(s), and reduce the visibility of heritage item(s) from public places; and iii. the relationship between elements, such as the layout and orientation, form, and materials within the open space. <p>M. For the relocation of a heritage items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. whether the new location and orientation of the heritage item will maintain the heritage values of the heritage item; ii. whether alternative solutions have been considered, including repairs, reconstruction, heritage upgrade works, and restoration in situ; and iii. the potential damage to heritage fabric during relocation and whether repairs will be required, and what mitigation measures are proposed, including the use of temporary protection plan. <p>N. For temporary event structures in heritage items which are open spaces and in heritage settings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the duration the temporary event structure will remain within the heritage item or heritage setting; and ii. whether the temporary event structures will impact on views to or from the heritage item(s) or heritage setting, and reduce the visibility of heritage item(s) from public places. <p>O. For signage on heritage items and in heritage settings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. whether the sign (including its supporting structure and methods of attachment to the heritage item) is compatible with the architectural form, features, fabric and heritage values of the heritage item or heritage setting; ii. the extent to which any moving, or flashing signs detract from the heritage values of the heritage item and/or heritage setting; and iii. whether the sign is temporary or permanent, and if temporary, the duration of the signage. <p>P. For utilities the functional need to be located in or in proximity to heritage items and heritage settings.</p>
9.4.4.1.3 RD1	Any pruning of any significant tree listed in Appendix 9.4.7.1.	<p>Rule 9.4.6 - Effects of activity/works on the tree(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The character and degree of modification, damage, or destruction of the values that make the tree/s significant; B. The extent to which the works will or may adversely affect the health or structural integrity or visual appearance of the tree; C. Whether the works will be undertaken in a manner consistent with internationally accepted arboricultural standards, practices and procedures; D. The duration and frequency of the activity and the effect on the tree; E. Whether the tree is resilient, including structural soundness and health and the irreversibility of effect on the tree; F. The degree of impact on landscape character, and ecological, cultural, heritage and neighbourhood amenity values; G. In relation to a scheduled group of trees, the extent to which the works will or may adversely affect the health, structural integrity or amenity values of the wider group; H. Whether any proposed compensation for the loss of the significant tree/s fully mitigates the loss of landscape and environmental benefits within 15 – 20 years.
9.4.4.1.3 RD5	Any works within the dripline of a significant tree listed in Appendix 9.4.7.1	

Rule	Standard not Met	Matters of Discretion
		<p>Extent of benefit or need for activity/works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. The need for the work to deal with an emergency situation, or to avoid significant risk of effects on human health and safety, or significant impacts on infrastructure, including the strategic transport network; J. The extent of benefits associated with the use and development of the site for activities anticipated by the zoning for the site, including the use of the site for residential development, taking into account the cumulative effect of multiple protection provisions (eg. setbacks from water bodies, heritage items); K. For proposed activities in connection with a recovery activity in the Flat Land Recovery Zone, the extent to which the proposal would maintain the contribution of any significant trees, and trees in road corridors, parks, reserves and public open space.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C – STATUTORY ASSESSMENT

CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT PLAN

Objectives and Policies	Commentary
Chapter 4 - Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land	
<p>Objective 4.2.2.1 - Contaminated land - managing effects</p> <p>a. Land containing elevated levels of contaminants is managed to protect human health and the environment, which includes significant natural and Ngāi Tahu cultural values from the adverse effects of subdivision, development and use of contaminated land and natural hazards, including from site investigations, earthworks and soil disturbance, and to enable the land to be used in the future.</p> <p>Policy 4.2.2.1.1 - Best practice approach</p> <p>a. Require any proposal to subdivide, use or develop contaminated land or potentially contaminated land to apply a best practice approach to investigate the risks, and either remediate the contamination or manage activities on contaminated land to protect people and the environment.</p> <p>Policy 4.2.2.1.2 – Remediation</p> <p>a. Remediation of contaminated land should not pose a more significant risk to human health or the environment than if remediation had not occurred.</p>	<p>As noted in the evidence of Mr Paul Walker, contaminants have been detected above the applicable land use standards on the Site.</p> <p>Mr Walker concludes that suitable measures are proposed to remediate the Site and any potential effects from the disturbance of the contaminated material on the environment and human health can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>Given the conclusions of Mr Walker, I consider that the Proposed Village will be consistent with Objective 4.2.2.1 and its associated policies.</p>
Chapter 5 – Natural Hazards	
<p>Objective 3.3.6 - Natural hazards</p> <p>a. New subdivision, use and development (other than new critical infrastructure or strategic infrastructure to which paragraph b. applies):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. is to be avoided in areas where the risks from natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure are assessed as being unacceptable; and ii. in all other areas, is undertaken in a manner that ensures the risks of natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure are appropriately mitigated. <p>b. New critical infrastructure or strategic infrastructure may be located in areas where the risks of natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure are otherwise assessed as being unacceptable, but only where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. there is no reasonable alternative; and II. the strategic infrastructure or critical infrastructure has been designed to maintain, as far as practicable, its integrity and form during natural hazard events; and 	<p>Objective 3.3.6 and its associated policies in Chapter 5 of the District Plan seek to ensure new subdivision, use and development is undertaken in a way that avoids or mitigates the risks of natural hazards to people, property, and infrastructure – with development being avoided where the risks are unacceptable.</p> <p>I understand that the potential natural hazard risks at the Site relate to flooding and liquefaction.</p> <p>As noted in the Council Officer’s Report and the evidence of Mr Desai, a small corner of the Bishopspark Site is subject to a Flood Management Area in the District Plan. However, based on the evidence of Mr Ajay Desai it is not considered that any earthworks on the Bishopspark Site will impact on flooding patterns.</p> <p>The Site is also subject to the Liquefaction Management Area in the District Plan, as is all of the Central City. The evidence of Mr Pierre Malan notes liquefaction effects can be</p>

<p>III. the natural hazard risks to people, property and infrastructure are appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>c. There is increased public awareness of the range and scale of natural hazard events that can affect Christchurch District.</p> <p>d. The repair of earthquake damaged land is facilitated as part of the recovery.</p> <p>5.2.2.1.1 Policy - Avoid new development where there is unacceptable risk</p> <p>a. Avoid new subdivision, use and development, including new urban zonings, where the risk from a natural hazard is assessed as being unacceptable.</p> <p>5.2.2.1.2 Policy - Manage activities to address natural hazard risks</p> <p>a. Manage activities in all areas subject to natural hazards in a manner that is commensurate with the likelihood and consequences of a natural hazard event on life and property.</p> <p>Policy 5.2.2.2.1 – Flooding</p> <p>a. Map hazard risk for the Flood Management Area based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. a modelled 0.5% AEP (1 in 200-year) rainfall event plus a 5% AEP (1 in 20-year) tide event plus 250mm freeboard; OR a modelled 5% AEP (1 in 20-year flood event) plus a 0.5% AEP (1 in 200-year) tide event plus 250mm freeboard; OR 11.9m above Christchurch City Council Datum (the maximum 200-year tidal contour) plus 250mm freeboard; whichever is the greater; and ii. allowance for 1 metre of sea level rise and an increase in rainfall intensity by 16% through to 2115 as a result of climate change; and iii. a maximum buffer extension of the modelled rainfall event areas by 60 metres in a north/south and east/west direction. <p>b. In the High Flood Hazard Management Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. provide for development of a residential unit on residentially zoned land where the flooding risk is predominantly influenced by sea-level rise and where appropriate mitigation can be provided that protects people's safety, well-being and property from unacceptable risk; and ii. within the Specific Purpose (Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor) Zone, provide for structures in accordance with Policy 13.14.2.1.8. iii. in all other cases, avoid subdivision, use or development where it will increase the potential risk to people's safety, well-being and property. <p>c. Avoid activities locating where they could undermine the integrity of the Waimakariri River primary stopbank system, and restrict activities locating where they could undermine the integrity of the Waimakariri River secondary stopbank system.</p>	<p>appropriately mitigated by an appropriately designed foundation system, which for this Proposed Village involves a concrete rigid elements into dense layers, combined with the basement slab and a base isolated structure.</p> <p>Overall, I consider that appropriate consideration has been given to the management of the potential risks from natural hazards on the Site in the design and construction methodologies for the Proposed Village, and such risks will be managed to an acceptable level.</p> <p>As such, I consider that the Proposed Village will be consistent with Objective 3.3.6 and its associated policies in Chapter 5 of the District Plan.</p>
--	--

<p>d. Maintain the flood storage capacity and function of natural floodplains, wetlands and ponding areas, including the Hendersons Basin, Cashmere Stream Floodplain, Hoon Hay Valley, Cashmere-Worsleys Ponding Area, Cranford Basin and Lower Styx Ponding Area¹.</p> <p>e. Except for filling required to meet minimum floor levels, ensure that filling in urban areas at risk of flooding in a major flood event does not transfer flooding risk to other people, property, infrastructure or the natural environment.</p> <p>f. Reduce potential flood damage by ensuring floor levels for new buildings or additions to buildings, except those unlikely to suffer material damage, are above flooding predicted to occur in a major flood event, including an allowance for appropriate freeboard.</p> <p>Policy 5.2.2.3.1 - Management of liquefaction risk</p> <p>a. Map the Liquefaction Management Area based on a district-wide assessment of where damaging liquefaction is more likely to occur.</p> <p>b. Provide for rezoning, subdivision, use and development on flat land where liquefaction risk has been appropriately identified and assessed, and can be adequately remedied or mitigated.</p>	
<p>Chapter 6 – General Rules and Procedures</p> <p>Objective 6.1.2.1 - Adverse noise effects</p> <p>a. Adverse noise effects on the amenity values and health of people and communities are managed to levels consistent with the anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment.</p> <p>Policy 6.1.2.1.1 - Managing noise effects</p> <p>a. Manage adverse noise effects by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> limitations on the sound level, location and duration of noisy activities; requiring sound insulation for sensitive activities or limiting their location relative to activities with elevated noise levels. <p>Policy 6.1.2.1.2 - Noise during night hours</p> <p>a. Achieve lower noise levels during night hours to protect sleep, and the amenity values of residential and other sensitive environments, so far as is practicable.</p>	<p>With respect to construction noise, Ms Siiri Wilkening notes that it can generally comply with the relevant limits during construction of the Proposed Village. Some activities have the potential to exceed those limits for brief periods, when high noise works occur in close proximity to multi storey neighbouring buildings, that cannot be shielded by temporary barriers. Such exceedances would occur for only a few days for each building as construction of the piles moves along the perimeter.</p> <p>Overall, Ms Wilkening considers that construction noise effects can be managed in accordance with the best practicable option through preparation and implementation of a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan.</p> <p>Ms Wilkening also predicts that operational noise levels from the Site can comply with the relevant limits in the District Plan at all times.</p> <p>In light of the above, I consider that construction and operation noise associated with the Proposed Village can be managed in a manner that suitably ensures the amenity values and health of people – consistent with Objective 6.1.2.1 and its associated policies.</p>
<p>Objective 6.8.2.1 - Signage</p> <p>a. Signage collectively contributes to Christchurch’s vitality and recovery by:</p>	<p>As explained in the AEE, signage will be established along the frontage with Park Terrace outside the main entrances to both Sites. The signage will measure approximately 160 cm</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. supporting the needs of business, infrastructure and community activities; ii. maintaining public safety; and iii. enhancing the visual amenity values and character of the surrounding area, building or structures. <p>Policy 6.8.2.1.2 - Controlling signage in sensitive locations</p> <p>a. Ensure the character and amenity values of residential, open space and rural zones are protected from adverse visual and amenity effects from large areas or numbers of signs, or off-site signs within these zones.</p> <p>Policy 6.8.2.1.3 - Managing the potential effects of signage</p> <p>a. In considering Policies 6.8.2.1.1 and 6.8.2.1.2, ensure that the size, number, height, location, design, appearance and standard of maintenance of signs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. do not detract from, and where possible contribute to, the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area and public realm; ii. integrate within the façade of the building, do not detract from the integrity of the building design, and maintain the building as the primary visual element; iii. are in proportion to the scale of buildings and the size of the site; and iv. enhance the Central City. <p>Policy 6.8.2.1.4 - Transport safety</p> <p>a. Ensure that signs do not cause obstruction and/or distraction for motorists and pedestrians and other road users.</p>	<p>by 80 cm, similar to signage used by Ryman at other retirement villages around New Zealand. The scale and design of the signage are discrete and in proportion to the scale of the Site, therefore it will not adversely affect the visual amenity or character of the surrounding environment.</p> <p>Given that the signage will be appended to the fences along the Park Terrace frontage of both Sites, and will simply identify the name of the retirement village, it is not considered that it will adversely impact the safety of pedestrians or motorists.</p> <p>As such, I consider that the Proposed Village will be consistent with the outcomes sought by Objective 6.8.2.1 and its associated policies.</p>
<p>Chapter 7 – Transport</p> <p>Objective 7.2.1 - Integrated transport system for Christchurch District</p> <p>a. An integrated transport system for Christchurch District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. that is safe and efficient for all transport modes; ii. that is responsive to the current recovery needs, future needs, and enables economic development, in particular an accessible Central City able to accommodate projected population growth; iii. that supports safe, healthy and livable communities by maximising integration with land use; iv. that reduces dependency on private motor vehicles and promotes the use of public and active transport; v. that is managed using the one network approach. <p>Policy 7.2.1.3 - Vehicle access and maneuvering</p>	
	<p>The objective and policies relating to transportation seek an integrated transport system, which promotes public modes of transportation and supports safe, healthy, and livable communities by maximising the integration with land use.</p> <p>The evidence of Mr Leo Hills concludes that the Proposed Village satisfies most of the transport standards in the District Plan, except for the width of access points on the Peterborough Site and vehicle loading provision for the Peterborough Site. Mr Hills concludes that the width of the vehicle crossings for the Peterborough Site is acceptable given the one-way operation – and this is agreed by Mr Culvert for the Council.</p> <p>The loading provision for the Peterborough Site requires a loading vehicle to block internal circulation while loading. However, given the frequency of occurrence and availability of queuing space, Mr Hills consider this an acceptable arrangement (as does Mr Culvert).</p>

<p>a. Provide vehicle access and manoeuvring, including for emergency service vehicles, compatible with the road classification, which ensures safety, and the efficiency of the transport system.</p> <p>Policy 7.2.1.4 - Requirements for car parking and loading</p> <p>a. Outside the Central City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Require car parking spaces and loading spaces which provide for the expected needs of an activity in a way that manages adverse effects. ii. Enable a reduction in the number of car parking spaces required in circumstances where it can be demonstrated that: iii. the function of the surrounding transport network and amenity of the surrounding environment will not be adversely affected; and/or iv. there is good accessibility by active and public transport and the activity is designed to encourage public and active transport use; and/or v. the extent of the reduction is appropriate to the characteristics of the activity and its location; and/or vi. the extent of the reduction will maintain on-site parking to meet anticipated demand. <p>a. Within the Central City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Enable activities to provide car parking spaces and loading spaces, whilst minimising any adverse effects on the efficiency and safety of the transportation networks, including public transport, to the extent practicable. ii. Manage the development of commercial car parking buildings and parking lots within the Central City so that they: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) support the recovery of the Central City; (b) are easily accessible for businesses within the Central City; (c) minimise any adverse effects on the efficiency and safety of the transportation networks of all users, to the extent practicable; (d) protect the amenity values of the Central City; (e) reduce the need for activities to provide their own on-site parking; (f) do not significantly adversely affect the demand for public transport to, from or within the Central City. iii. Allow for temporarily vacant sites to be used for car parking areas within the Central City until 30 April 2018. <p>Policy 7.2.1.5 - Design of car parking areas and loading areas</p> <p>a. Require that car parking areas and loading areas are designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. operate safely and efficiently for all transport modes and users; 	<p>With respect to construction effects, Mr Hills considers that the construction traffic effects of the Proposed Village can be appropriately managed with a Construction Traffic Management Plan (as proposed as part of the conditions of consent). Ryman have also accepted the consent condition recommended by Mr Culvert that Westwood Terrace not be used as an access for construction purposes.</p> <p>Given the above, and the fact that the operation of all accesses will comply with the District Plan, I consider that the Proposed Village is consistent with the outcomes sought by Objective 7.2.1 and its associated policies in that the safety and efficiency of the transport network will be maintained.</p>
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. function and be formed in a way that is compatible with the character and amenity values of the surrounding environment; and iii. be accessible for people whose mobility is restricted. 	
Chapter 8 – Subdivision, Development and Earthworks	
<p>Objective 8.2.4 - Earthworks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Earthworks facilitate subdivision, use and development, the provision of utilities, hazard mitigation and the recovery of the district. <p>Policy 8.2.4.1 - Water quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ensure earthworks do not result in erosion, inundation or siltation, and do not have an adverse effect on surface water or groundwater quality. <p>Policy 8.2.4.4 - Amenity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ensure, once completed, earthworks do not result in any significant shading, visual impact, loss of privacy or other significant detraction from the amenity values enjoyed by those living or working in the locality. 	<p>Objective 8.2.4 and its associated policies seek to minimise potential adverse effects associated with earthworks on the Site.</p> <p>With respect to earthworks and stormwater management on the Site, this will be subject to an Erosion and Sediment Control Management Plan. All the sediment and erosion controls will be designed in accordance with the technical requirements/specifications of the Canterbury Regional Council’s Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury. These measures will ensure that sediment run-off is minimised and surface / groundwater quality is not impacted.</p> <p>In addition, the earthworks will not result in changes in ground level that result in a detraction of amenity values for neighbouring landowners. In this regard, the Site will be retained with a flat contour at the boundaries.</p> <p>In light of the above, I consider that the Proposed Village gives effect to the outcomes sought by Objective 8.2.4 and its associated policies.</p>
Chapter 9 – Natural and Cultural Heritage	
<p>Objective 9.3.2.1.1 - Historic heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The overall contribution of historic heritage to the Christchurch District’s character and identity is maintained through the protection and conservation of significant historic heritage across the Christchurch District in a way which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. enables and supports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the ongoing retention, use and adaptive re-use; and (b) the maintenance, repair, upgrade, restoration and reconstruction; (c) of historic heritage; and ii. recognises the condition of buildings, particularly those that have suffered earthquake damage, and the effect of engineering and financial factors on the ability to retain, restore, and continue using them; and iii. acknowledges that in some situations demolition may be justified by reference to the matters in Policy 9.3.2.2.8. <p>Policy 9.3.2.2.3 - Management of scheduled historic heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Manage the effects of subdivision, use and development on the heritage items, heritage settings and heritage areas scheduled in Appendix 9.3.7.2 and 9.3.7.3 in a way that: 	<p>The objectives and policies relating to historic heritage seek to protect, conserve, and maintain the significant historic heritage across Christchurch, by managing the effects of subdivision, use, and development on the heritage items, settings, and areas.</p> <p>With respect to the former Bishops’ Chapel, the evidence of Mr David Pearson and the peer review by Ms Richmond for the Council Officer’s Report, both assess the potential effects of the Proposed Village. Their focus is on the works necessary to restore the condition of the chapel and the establishment of new buildings within the heritage setting of the chapel.</p> <p>Mr Pearson and Ms Richmond generally agree that the heritage values of the former Bishop’s Chapel will be enhanced as a result of the proposed restoration work and that positive outcomes of the proposed work will more than compensate for any potentially negative impacts – which are considered to be minor at worst. This conclusion is also reached by Ms Armstrong.</p> <p>Given the above, it is my opinion that the Proposed Village will clearly provide for the ongoing use and adaptive re-use of the former Bishop’s Chapel in a manner that is sensitive</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. provides for the ongoing use and adaptive reuse of scheduled historic heritage in a manner that is sensitive to their heritage values while recognising the need for works to be undertaken to accommodate their long term retention, use and sensitive modernisation and the associated engineering and financial factors; ii. recognises the need for a flexible approach to heritage management, with particular regard to enabling repairs, heritage investigative and temporary works, heritage upgrade works to meet building code requirements, restoration and reconstruction, in a manner which is sensitive to the heritage values of the scheduled historic heritage; and iii. subject to i. and ii., protects their particular heritage values from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. <p>b. Undertake any work on heritage items and heritage settings scheduled in Appendix 9.3.7.2 in accordance with the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. focus any changes to those parts of the heritage items or heritage settings, which have more potential to accommodate change (other than where works are undertaken as a result of damage), recognising that heritage settings and Significant (Group 2) heritage items are potentially capable of accommodating a greater degree of change than Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items; ii. conserve, and wherever possible enhance, the authenticity and integrity of heritage items and heritage settings, particularly in the case of Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items and heritage settings; iii. identify, minimise and manage risks or threats to the structural integrity of the heritage item and the heritage values of the heritage item, including from natural hazards; iv. document the material changes to the heritage item and heritage setting; v. be reversible wherever practicable (other than where works are undertaken as a result of damage); and vi. distinguish between new work and existing heritage fabric in a manner that is sensitive to the heritage values. <p>9.3.2.2.5 Policy - Ongoing use of heritage items and heritage settings</p> <p>a. Provide for the ongoing use and adaptive re-use of heritage items and heritage settings scheduled in Appendix 9.3.7.2 (in accordance with Policy 9.3.2.2.3), including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. repairs and maintenance; ii. temporary activities; iii. specific exemptions to zone and transport rules to provide for the establishment of a wider range of activities; 	<p>to its heritage values. The proposed consent conditions proffered by Ryman, including via the use of a Temporary Protection Plan, will also ensure that works are undertaken in a sensitive and careful manner.</p> <p>As discussed in the body of my evidence, and the Council Officer's Report by Ms Armstrong, I do not consider that heritage effects on the Dorset Street Flats form part of the assessment matters for this Proposed Village.</p> <p>In light of the above, the Proposed Village will also ensure that the contribution of the historic heritage of the former Bishop's Chapel to the character and identity of Christchurch is maintained – consistent with Objective 9.3.2.1.1 and its associated policies. It cannot be said that the Proposed Village to be inappropriate in the context of its relationship with the Dorset Street Flats for the purposes of Policy 9.3.2.2.3 of the District Plan.</p>
--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. alterations, restoration, reconstruction and heritage upgrade works to heritage items, including seismic, fire and access upgrades; v. signs on heritage items and within heritage settings; and vi. new buildings in heritage settings. 	
<p>Objective 9.4.2.1.1 – Trees</p> <p>a. Maintain and enhance the contribution of the Christchurch District’s significant trees listed in Appendix 9.4.7.1, and trees in road corridors, parks, reserves and public open space, to community amenity through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. landscape character and amenity; ii. heritage and cultural values; iii. purification of air and rainwater; iv. releasing oxygen and storing carbon; v. cooling of the built environment and waterways; vi. stormwater and erosion management; and vii. biodiversity protection and enhancement; <p>while providing for the reasonable use and enjoyment of property and landowner responsibilities.</p> <p>Policy 9.4.2.2.3 – Tree Protection</p> <p>a. Protect from inappropriate physical works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. trees that are listed in Appendix 9.4.7.1, particularly those trees identified as having exceptional values; and ii. trees in road corridors, parks, reserves and public open space where they provide amenity value and/or collectively contribute to the character and environmental quality of the Christchurch District, to the extent consistent with maintaining the multiple functions of road corridors, parks, reserves and public open space. <p>Policy 9.4.2.2.4 – Tree Maintenance</p> <p>a. To enable the maintenance and management of trees that are listed in Appendix 9.4.7.1 and trees in the road corridors, parks, public open space and reserves in recognition that such works may be necessary to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. ensure the continuing health, structural integrity and amenity value of the trees; ii. enable the reasonable use and enjoyment of the property and surrounds; and iii. minimise the risk from the trees to public safety, property, buildings, strategic infrastructure and electricity distribution lines. 	<p>The objectives and policies relating to trees seeks to ensure the contribution of significant trees within Christchurch to community amenity is maintained and enhanced. In particular, Policy 9.4.2.2.3 seeks to protect significant trees from inappropriate physical works.</p> <p>The evidence of Mr Alan Parker, along the peer review by Mr Thornton, considers the measures that will be implemented in order to ensure that construction works in, and around, the significant tree do not compromise its health and condition. A series of consent conditions are proposed in order to regulate these works.</p> <p>While Mr Thornton has residual concerns about the impact of the works, and has recommended a condition requiring replacement tree planting in the event that the significant tree dies within 10 years of the works, this opinion was formed without the benefit of the root mass investigation undertaken more recently.</p> <p>I consider that the works can be undertaken in a manner that sustains the health and condition of the significant tree in line with the expectations of Objective 9.4.2.1.1 and its associated policies. The need for ‘conditional’ mitigation will need to be further considered at the hearing.</p>

Chapter 14 – Residential Zone	
<p>Objective 14.2.1 – Housing Supply</p> <p>a. An increased supply of housing that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. enable a wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities, in a manner consistent with Objectives 3.3.4(a) and 3.3.7; ii. meet the diverse needs of the community in the immediate recovery period and longer term, including social housing options; and iii. assist in improving housing affordability. <p>Policy 14.2.1.1 - Housing distribution and density</p> <p>a. Provide for the following distribution of different areas for residential development, in accordance with the residential zones identified and characterised in Table 14.2.1.1a. in a manner that ensures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. new urban residential activities only occur in existing urban areas or in greenfield priority areas identified in Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement; ii. high density residential development in the Central City, that achieves an average net density of at least 50 households per hectare for intensification development; iii. ... <p>Policy 14.2.1.3 – Residential development in the Central City</p> <p>a. To restore and enhance residential activity in the Central City by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. providing flexibility for a variety of housing types which are suitable for a range of individual housing needs; ii. providing for a progressive increase in the residential population of the Central City in support of Policy 14.2.1.1.a.ii.; iii. assisting in the creation of new inner-city residential neighbourhoods and the protection of amenity of inner city residential neighbourhoods; and iv. encourage the comprehensive redevelopment of sites that are no longer required for non-residential purposes. <p>Policy 14.2.1.8 – Provision of housing for an aging population</p> <p>a. Provide for a diverse range of independent housing options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons throughout residential areas.</p> <p>b. Provide for comprehensively designed and managed, well-located, higher density accommodation options and accessory services for older persons and those requiring care or assisted living, throughout all residential zones.</p>	<p>The objective and policies seek that the residential areas of Christchurch be developed to provide a range of housing types at a range of densities, considering that this will meet the diverse need of the communities. Higher-density residential development is also earmarked for areas within and close to the Central City, where residential activity should be restored and enhanced.</p> <p>The Proposed Village will diversify the housing stock in the Central City and assist in meeting the needs of the elderly population of Christchurch. The Proposed Village has been comprehensively designed and will provide a high level of amenity for residents.</p> <p>The Proposed Village is located within the Residential Central City Zone in an area that is intended to be intensified for residential development, and which accords with the overall high-density residential development sought for the Central City. It is also consistent with the expectations set out in Policy 14.2.1.8 – in terms of recognising that housing for older persons can require higher densities.</p> <p>In light of the above, I consider that the Proposed Village will be consistent with Objective 14.2.1 and its associated policies.</p>

<p>c. Recognise that housing for older persons can require higher densities than typical residential development, in order to be affordable and, where required, to enable efficient provision of assisted living and care services.</p>	
<p>Objective 14.2.3 – Strategic Infrastructure</p> <p>a. Development of sensitive activities does not adversely affect the efficient operation, use, and development of Christchurch International Airport and Port of Lyttelton, the rail network, the National Grid and the identified 66kV and 33kV electricity distribution lines and the Heathcote to Lyttelton 11kV electricity distribution line, the state highway network, and other strategic infrastructure.</p> <p>Policy 14.2.3.1 – Avoidance of adverse effects on strategic infrastructure</p> <p>a. Avoid reverse sensitivity effects on strategic infrastructure including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Christchurch International Airport; ii. the rail network; iii. the major arterial road and minor arterial road network; iv. the Port of Lyttelton; v. the National Grid and the 66kV and 33kV electricity distribution lines and Heathcote to Lyttelton 11kV electricity distribution line identified on the planning maps. 	<p>The objectives and policies seek to ensure that the development of sensitive activities does not adversely affect the operation, use, and development of strategic infrastructure in Christchurch.</p> <p>The Proposed Village will not adversely affect any strategic infrastructure within Christchurch and has not been subject to submissions by any strategic asset owners. As such, I consider that the Proposed Village will be consistent with Objective 14.2.3 and its associated policies.</p>
<p>Objective 14.2.4 – High quality residential environments</p> <p>a. High quality, sustainable, residential neighbourhoods which are well designed, have a high level of amenity, enhance local character, and reflect the Ngāi Tahu heritage of Ōtautahi.</p> <p>Policy 14.2.4.1 – Neighbourhood character, amenity, and safety</p> <p>a. Facilitate the contribution of individual developments to high quality residential environments in all residential areas (as characterised in Table 14.2.1.1a), through design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. reflecting the context, character, and scale of building anticipated in the neighbourhood; ii. contributing to a high-quality street scene; iii. providing a high level of on-site amenity; iv. minimising noise effects from traffic, railway activity, and other sources where necessary to protect residential amenity; v. providing safe, efficient, and easily accessible movement for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles; and vi. incorporating principles of crime prevention through environmental design. <p>Policy 14.2.4.2 – High Quality, Medium Density Residential Development</p>	<p>The objectives and policies seek that residential developments produce high quality, sustainable, residential neighbourhoods which are well designed and have a high level of amenity, while maintaining the amenity, context, character, and scale of the surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>The Proposed Village will enable an increase in the density, diversity, and quality of the area in the Residential Central City Zone – which is expected to experience change in its density and types of development under the District Plan.</p> <p>Based upon the evidence of Ms Rebecca Skidmore and Mr Andrew Burns, it is considered that the Proposed Village will provide a high quality street scene along the adjacent roads, a high level of on-site amenity, and a range of facilities for residents. It is noted that Ryman, via the evidence of Mr Dixon, is proposing to alter the tree planting strategy around the boundary of the Site in response to the comments of Ms Dray and Ms Schroder (notwithstanding the evidence of Ms Skidmore and Mr Burns regarding the need for such planting changes).</p> <p>Further, CPTED principles have been considered in the overall master planning of the Proposed Village by Warren and Mahoney, which is reflected in the orientation of buildings towards the street and open spaces.</p>

<p>a. Encourage innovative approaches to comprehensively designed, high quality, medium density residential development, which is attractive to residents, responsive to housing demands, and provides a positive contribution to its environment (while acknowledging the need for increased densities and changes in residential character), through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. consultative planning approaches to identifying particular areas for residential intensification and to defining high quality, built and urban design outcomes for those areas; ii. encouraging and incentivising amalgamation and redevelopment across large-scale residential intensification areas; iii. providing design guidelines to assist developers to achieve high quality, medium density development; iv. considering input from urban design experts into resource consent applications; v. promoting incorporation of low impact urban design elements, energy and water efficiency, and life-stage inclusive and adaptive design; and vi. recognising that built form standards may not always support the best design and efficient use of a site for medium density development, particularly for larger sites. <p>14.2.4.7 Policy - Residential character areas in Christchurch City, Akaroa and Lyttelton</p> <p>a. Maintain and enhance the identified special character values of residential areas arising from the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the continuity or coherence of the character; ii. the pattern of subdivision, open space, buildings and streetscape; iii. the landforms or features that contribute to the qualities of the landscape and built form; iv. the scale, form and architectural values of buildings and their landscape setting; v. the qualities of the streetscape; and <p>b. Within the Lyttelton and Akaroa Character Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. maintains and enhances the relationship to historic heritage; ii. retains buildings and settings of high character value; iii. retains important views from public places; iv. reflects the existing small scale of development and integration with the landscape. <p>Policy 14.2.4.8 - Best practice for health, building sustainability, energy, and water efficiency</p>	<p>In light of the above, and recognising that the change proposed as part of the Proposed Village is anticipated, I consider that the Proposed Village will be consistent with Objective 14.2.4 and its associated policies.</p>
--	---

<p>a. Promote new residential buildings that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. provide for occupants' health, changing physical needs, and life stages; and ii. are energy and water efficient; iii. through non-regulatory methods including incentives. 	
<p>Objective 14.2.8 – Central City Residential Role, Built Form, and Amenity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A predominantly residential environment offering a range of residential opportunities, including medium to high density living, within the Central City to support the restoration and enhancement of a vibrant city centre; b. A form of built development in the Residential Central City Zone that enables change to the existing environment, while contributing positively to the amenity and cultural values of the area, and to the health and safety, and quality and enjoyment, for those living within the area. <p>Policy 14.2.8.1 - Building heights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide for different maximum building heights in areas of the Residential Central City Zone with some areas requiring a reduced height compatible with the existing predominant character. <p>Policy 14.2.8.2 - Amenity standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Prescribing minimum standards for residential development which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. are consistent with higher density living; ii. protect amenity values for residents; iii. integrate development with the adjacent and wider neighbourhood; iv. provide for a range of current and future residential needs; and v. recognise cultural values. 	<p>The Proposed Village is located within the Residential Central City Zone and provides high-quality medium to high density residential development that is sought for the Central City.</p> <p>The Proposed Village has been comprehensively designed and will provide a high level of amenity for residents by offering a high-quality living environment for the elderly. The site configuration, built form, and architectural approach also responds to the characteristics of the Residential Central City Zone.</p> <p>It is my opinion that the shading and privacy / overlooking effects of the Proposed Village, based on the thorough assessments of the relevant experts, will be acceptable and generally consistent with the expectations for the Residential Central City Zone in terms of providing for density while protecting amenity values – as per Policy 14.2.8.2.</p> <p>In light of the above, I consider that the Proposed Village will be consistent with Objective 14.2.8.</p>

APPENDIX D



HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND
POUHERE TAONGA

16 December 2020

File ref: 12013-03

Resource Consents Unit
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 73014
Christchurch 8154

By email: Adrienne.Farr@ccc.govt.nz and resourceconsentapplications@ccc.govt.nz

To Whom It May Concern,

**RE: SUBMISSION OF HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND POUHERE TAONGA TO RESOURCE CONSENT
APPLICATION RMA/2020/673**

Following our submission on the above resource consent, we note that there has been further correspondence and information supplied by the applicants. We consider that the concerns raised in our submission are met by the following draft conditions being proposed by the applicant – Conditions 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41 and 42 – see attached document (Appendix 4).

Between them these conditions will cover all the relief sought by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) in our submission dated 13 October 2020. Therefore we no longer wish to be heard in person on this matter, but ask that you draw this letter and the attached conditions to the attention of the appropriate personnel.

Yours faithfully,

Arlene Baird
Consultant Planner
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
PO Box 4403
Christchurch 8140

Email: abaird@heritage.org.nz

Encl. RMA2020673 – Appendix D – Draft Conditions – 16 December 2020

DRAFT CONSENT CONDITIONS
RYMAN HEALTHCARE LIMITED
78, 100 - 104 PARK TERRACE AND 20 DORSET STREET, CHRISTCHURCH

General

1. The construction, operation and maintenance of a comprehensive care retirement village at 100 – 104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street (Lot 1 DP 46511, Lot 1 DP 46369, Lot 2 DP 13073, Pt Res 23 Town of Christchurch and Pt Town Res 25 City of Christchurch), and 78 Park Terrace (Lot 1 DP 77997), shall be undertaken in accordance with the information and plans submitted with the resource consent application dated 27 March 2020, including responses to requests for further information from the Christchurch City Council in accordance with section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The Approved Consent Documents have been entered into Council records as RMA/2020/673 and RMA/2020/679.
2. All of the conditions of this resource consent apply to the construction, operation and maintenance of a comprehensive care retirement village at 100 – 104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street, and 78 Park Terrace, unless the conditions specifically refer to them only applying to an individual site.
3. The consent holder shall keep a copy of this consent, and all required management plans, on-site at all times and shall ensure that all contractors engaged to undertake works authorised by this resource consent are made aware of the conditions of this resource consent relevant to their work area and the measures required for compliance with the conditions.
4. Pursuant to section 125 of the Resource Management Act 1991, this resource consent lapses five years after the date it commences unless:
 - a. The consent is given effect to; or
 - b. The council extends the period after which the consent lapses.

Earthworks and Construction Management

5. All earthworks on the site shall be carried out in accordance with a Construction Management Plan ('CMP'), which shall include an Erosion, Sediment and Dust Control Plan ('ESDCP'). The CMP ESDCP shall be based upon the draft plan submitted as part of the resource consent application, and shall be submitted to the Christchurch City Council for certification at least 10 working days prior to any earthworks commencing on the site. The CMP ESDCP shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person, and include a design certificate that the proposed erosion and sediment controls are appropriately designed.

The best practice principles, techniques, inspections and monitoring for erosion and sediment control in the CMP ESDCP shall be in accordance with Environment Canterbury's Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury (<http://esccanterbury.co.nz/>). The CMP ESDCP shall include (but is not limited to):

- a. A site description (i.e. topography, vegetation, soils etc);

- b. Details of proposed activities;
- c. A locality map;
- d. The identification of environmental risks including erosion, sediment and dust control, spills, wastewater overflows, dewatering, and excavation and disposal of material from contaminated sites;
- e. Drawings showing the site, type and location of sediment control measures, on-site catchment boundaries and off-site sources of runoff;
- f. A programme of works including a proposed timeframe and completion date;
- g. Emergency response and contingency management;
- h. Procedures for compliance with resource consents and permitted activities;
- i. Procedures for environmental monitoring and auditing, including frequency;
- j. Record of corrective actions or solutions implemented;
- k. Procedures for updating the CMP ESDCP;
- l. Procedures for training and supervising staff in relation to environmental issues; and
- m. Contact details of key personnel responsible for on-site environmental management and compliance.

Note:

The Christchurch City Council Infrastructure Design Standard (Clause 3.8.2) contains further detail on Environmental Management Plans.

- 6. The CMP ESDCP shall be implemented on site throughout the construction of the comprehensive care retirement village. No earthworks shall commence on site until:
 - a. The measures identified in the CMP ESDCP have been installed; and
 - b. An Engineering Completion Certificate (IDS – Part 3, Appendix VII), signed by an appropriately qualified and experienced engineer, is completed and presented to Christchurch City Council. This certificate is to certify that the erosion and sediment control measures have been properly installed in accordance with the CMP ESDCP.
- 7. The consent holder shall ensure any change in ground levels on the site due to earthworks shall not cause a ponding or drainage nuisance to neighbouring properties.
- 8. The consent holder shall ensure any change in ground levels on the site due to earthworks shall not affect the stability of the ground or fences on neighbouring properties.
- 9. The consent holder shall ensure that all open areas on the site shall be adequately stabilised as soon as practicable to limit sediment mobilisation.

Note:

In accordance with the condition above earthworks on the site shall be progressively stabilised against erosion during all stages of the earthwork activity. Interim stabilisation measures may include the use of waterproof covers, geotextiles or aggregate cover that has obtained a density of more than 80% of a normal pasture sward.

- 10. The consent holder shall ensure that any local roads, shared accesses, footpaths, landscaped areas or service structures that are damaged as part of the construction works authorised under this resource consent, are reinstated to their pre-construction standard and as specified in the Construction Standard Specifications (and at the expense of the consent holder).

The consent holder shall, in consultation with the Christchurch City Council, undertake a baseline survey of the condition of all local roads, shared accesses, footpaths, landscaped areas or service structures to be used as part of the construction works, prior to the commencement of construction works authorised as part of this resource consent, in order to provide a benchmark for the potential remedial works that may be required.

11. The consent holder shall ensure that footpaths and local roads to, and from, the site remain clean of debris and tracked material at all times. Footpaths and roads shall be regularly checked by the consent holder, and swept if any debris and tracked material is deposited as a result of the construction works.

Contaminated Material

12. A Site Management Plan, prepared in accordance with the Framework Site Management Plan submitted with the resource consent application, shall be submitted to Christchurch City Council for certification at least 10 working days prior to earthworks commencing on the site.

The Site Management Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

- a. Pre-works testing;
 - b. General earthworks procedures for contaminated soils and material to manage potential exposure to workers and the public;
 - c. Dust controls for the management of contaminated soils and material;
 - d. Asbestos-specific health and safety controls for the site;
 - e. Unexpected contamination and contingency procedures; and
 - f. Monitoring procedures.
13. Any contaminated soils and materials removed from the site must either be (i) disposed of at a facility whose waste acceptance criteria permit the disposal, or (ii) encapsulated on site (e.g. beneath buildings, roads or landscaped areas).
14. Within three months of the completion of earthworks on the site, a Site Validation or Works Completion Report (as appropriate) shall be prepared and submitted to the Christchurch City Council. The report shall include as a minimum:
 - a. Volumes of materials moved on site;
 - b. Details of any variations to the site works set out in the Site Management Plan;
 - c. Details of any discharges to the environment during the earthworks;
 - d. Details of any contingency measures employed during the earthworks;
 - e. Photographic evidence of the site works;
 - f. Evidence the objectives of the final site capping and / or remediation have been met with regard to high density residential land use; and
 - g. Evidence of the disposal of any soils off site to an authorised facility.

The report shall be written in accordance with the Ministry for the Environment Guidelines for Reporting on Contaminated Sites in New Zealand (Revised 2011). In the event that contaminated soils and materials are encapsulated on site in accordance with condition 13, the Site Validation or Works Completion Report shall also include a Long Term Management Plan that documents the ongoing management controls to be implemented by the consent holder.

Construction Traffic

15. All construction work shall be carried out in accordance with a Construction Traffic Management Plan ('CTMP') to minimise the local traffic effects of construction works. The CTMP shall be based upon the draft plan submitted as part of the resource consent application, and shall be submitted to the Christchurch City Council for certification at least 10 working days prior to any construction works commencing on site. The CTMP shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person.

The CTMP shall include, but not be limited to:

- a. Construction dates and hours of operations;
 - b. Truck route diagrams for the local road network;
 - c. Contractor parking arrangements;
 - d. Temporary traffic management signage; and
 - e. Details of site access / egress over the construction period.
16. All loading and unloading of trucks with excavation or fill material shall be carried out within the site.

Construction Noise and Vibration

17. All construction work shall be carried out in accordance with a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan ('CNVMP') to minimise the noise and vibration effects of construction works. The CNVMP shall be based upon the draft plan submitted as part of the resource consent application, and shall be submitted to the Christchurch City Council for certification at least 10 working days prior to any construction works commencing on site. The CNVMP shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person.

The CNVMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

- a. Construction noise and vibration levels from key equipment to be utilised on site;
- b. Identification of the premises where there exists the potential for noise / vibration effects;
- c. Description and duration of the works, anticipated equipment and the processes to be undertaken;
- d. Hours of operation, including specific times and days when construction activities causing noise / vibration would occur;
- e. Mitigation options where noise / vibration levels are predicted or demonstrated to approach or exceed the relevant limits in the Christchurch District Plan. Specific noise / vibration mitigation measures must be implemented which may include but not limited to: (i) acoustic screening, (ii) time management procedures and (iii) alternative excavation / construction method technologies;
- f. The process for erecting temporary construction noise barriers where appropriate;
- g. Schedule and methods for monitoring and reporting on construction noise / vibration;
- h. Details of noise / vibration monitoring to be undertaken or in the event of any complaints received;
- i. Implementation of a complaint management system with contact numbers for key construction staff responsible for the implementation of the CNVMP and complaint

investigation and including procedures for maintaining contact with stakeholders, notifying of proposed construction activities and handling of noise / vibration complaints;

- j. The process for notifying the owners and occupiers of adjacent buildings prior to construction activities commencing on the site; and
- k. Training procedures for construction personnel.

Pre and Post Construction Building Condition Surveys

- 18. Earthworks on site shall not commence on site until proof of an approved building consent covering all retaining walls shown on the plans approved as part of this resource consent is provided to the Christchurch City Council.
- 19. Where a pre-construction building condition survey is required by these consent conditions, the consent holder shall request in writing the approval of the owners of identified properties to undertake an initial condition and photographic survey. The consent holder shall send copies of each of the requests to the Christchurch City Council, Team Leader Compliance via email to rcmon@ccc.govt.nz
- 20. The consent holder shall engage a suitably qualified and experienced person to undertake a survey of the properties within 20 metres of where excavation will occur on the site, where the property owner has given their written approval.
- 21. If the property owner does not respond within four weeks of the request in condition 20 being made, the consent holder need not undertake a survey of that property.
- 22. The survey shall assess the current condition of the exterior and interior of the buildings on the properties identified in condition 20 (any additional properties to be surveyed at the consent holder's discretion). The methodology to be utilised by the consent holder shall be documented and provided to the Christchurch City Council, Team Leader Compliance prior to the surveys being undertaken.
- 23. A copy of each survey shall be made available to those property owners who participate in the survey and request a copy of the results.
- 24. Within twelve weeks of the completion of the construction works a follow up survey of each property surveyed shall be carried out (at the consent holder's cost) where the property owner has given their written approval. The purpose of these surveys is to assess any damage caused by the excavation and construction activities at the site. Provided the consent of any landowner is obtained, the consent holder shall be responsible for any repairs, reinstatement or other works to surveyed buildings that can be reasonably attributed to construction activity.

Significant Tree – 78 Park Terrace

- 25. The consent holder is to appoint a suitably qualified and experienced arborist to monitor and supervise the works within the dripline of the Common Lime Tree (ID Number 3300 / Christchurch District Plan Number T271) for the duration of the works at 78 Park Terrace.

26. Prior to earthworks commencing at 78 Park Terrace, a meeting shall be held on site so that the protection measures for the Common Lime Tree can be discussed between the council arborist, the appointed arborist and relevant contractors who will be working on the site in proximity to the tree. At the meeting, the following will be agreed:
- a. Areas for storing and / or stockpiling materials, spoil and equipment;
 - b. Procedures for protection of roots within the dripline of the Common Lime Tree (e.g. exposure of roots and protection measures, severing methodology and backfilling of exposed areas); and
 - c. Correct procedures when working around the Common Lime Tree.
27. Temporary protective fencing is to be erected to isolate the Common Lime Tree before any construction works occur around, or adjacent to, the tree. The fencing shall be retained in place for the duration of the construction works, and shall not be removed or moved without the prior approval of the council arborist. If the fencing is damaged, the site manager will be responsible for repairing it at the earliest opportunity.
28. No heavy machinery is to be driven within the dripline of the Common Lime Tree, unless on existing hard surfaces, or on load bearing mats or sheets designed to spread loading forces.
29. No materials or machinery / vehicles are to be stored / parked within the dripline of the Common Lime Tree during the construction work, including excavated soil, chemicals or building materials.
30. Notice boards, cables and other services shall not be attached to any part of the Common Lime Tree.
31. Postholes for the Peterborough Street road boundary fence posts are to be lined with plastic or similar impervious material to create a barrier between tree roots and raw concrete. Exploratory digging should be used to locate any major roots in the proposed posthole locations.
32. Any pruning of the Common Lime Tree to enable clearance from heavy machinery used for the basement retention system, or due to canopy damage from the operation of the machinery, is to be carried out by the appointed arborist to the Australian Standard- AS 4373-2007 "*Pruning of Amenity Trees*", or British Standard BS 3998: 2010 "*Recommendations - Tree Work*". The maximum diameter of any live limb removed is up to 100 mm at the point of removal.

Heritage

33. At least 10 working days prior to the commencement of works at 100 – 104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street, the consent holder shall submit a Temporary Protection Plan ("TPP") for the repair of the former Bishops Chapel (Heritage ID: 1035) for certification by the Christchurch City Council. The TPP shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person and shall be based upon the draft plan submitted as part of the resource consent application.

The TPP shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

- a. A specific methodology for the removal and storage of exterior and interior heritage elements;
- b. Procedures for dust suppression from construction and works to the heritage building;
- c. Measures for fire protection;

- d. Measures for security; and
 - e. A methodology for preparation of the exterior surface of the chapel if this is required (where any heritage fabric is remaining in situ).
34. The measures in the TPP shall ensure that the former Bishops Chapel is repaired to the extent that it can be utilised as a non-denominational prayer centre and meeting room as part of the comprehensive care retirement village on the site.
35. Prior to commencement of works, the consent holder's heritage professional shall hold a site briefing of all lead contractors and supervising staff to communicate the significance of the building, the consent conditions and the requirements of the TPP. The consent holder shall notify the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council of the date and time of the meeting at least three working days before the meeting.
36. The consent holder shall provide written confirmation is to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council stating that the initial setup of the TPP has been implemented and inspected on site (including methodologies for removal and storage of heritage fabric) by a suitably qualified and experienced person before any other works commence. Following the initial implementation of the TPP, the consent holder's heritage professional shall regularly monitor the TPP to ensure that appropriate measures are being taken by the contractors at each stage of construction and advise contractors if any additional protection is required.
37. All works to the former Bishops Chapel, and within the heritage setting of the former Bishops Chapel (Heritage ID: 470), shall be undertaken by suitably qualified tradespeople, and overseen by a suitably qualified CPEng structural engineer and heritage professional appointed by the consent holder.
38. No building works within the heritage setting of the former Bishops Chapel must proceed beyond the foundation stage until a registered surveyor or licensed cadastral surveyor, engaged by the consent holder, has provided written certification to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council that the works completed have been completed in accordance with the approved plans.
39. A registered surveyor or licensed cadastral surveyor, engaged by the consent holder, must provide written certification to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council that the heights of the buildings with the heritage setting of the former Bishops Chapel, as completed have been completed in accordance with the approved plans.
40. If the proposed access ramp is to be attached to the heritage fabric of the former Bishops Chapel, at least 10 working days prior to the commencement of works to the chapel, the consent holder's heritage professional and engineer shall submit for certification to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council, details of the methodology for fixing the ramp to the chapel.
41. A digital photographic record of the works to the heritage building and heritage setting is to be undertaken by the consent holder's heritage professional, before, during, and after the completion of the works. The photographic record of the works in the heritage setting shall include affected views to and from the heritage item. The record must be lodged with the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council for their records within three months of the completion of the work.

42. New or introduced materials, works or reconstructed elements shall be recorded and date marked to indicate the time of their installation. The form and location of the visible dating of the new entry / pergola structure is to be agreed with the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council prior to its installation.

Landscaping

43. The proposed landscaping shall be established in accordance with the Landscape Plan labelled X as part of the Approved Consent Document.
44. Prior to the relevant buildings in any stage passing their final building inspection, the consent holder shall provide the Christchurch City Council with a detailed Planting Plan and a Planting, Implementation and Maintenance Strategy for the site at least 10 working days prior to any earthworks commencing on site. The Planting Plan and a Planting, Implementation and Maintenance Strategy shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.
- a. The final landscape plan and specifications;
 - b. Planting schedules, detailing the specific planting species, the number of plants / trees to be provided, locations and height/Pb sizes;
 - c. Annotated sections with key dimensions to illustrate that adequate widths and depths are provided for tree pits / planter boxes; and
 - d. A management / maintenance programme.
45. The proposed landscaping shall be established on site for each stage of building works within the first planting season (extending from 1 April to 30 September) following the final, passed building inspection for each relevant stage of building works.
46. Should any of the trees to be planted along the street frontage boundaries of the site not survive, the consent holder shall procure and plant replacement specimens at a minimum height of 4.5 m.

Note:

This condition shall continue to apply for the duration that the comprehensive care retirement village exists on the site. It is intended to ensure that any trees that perish along the street frontage of the site are replaced with specimens that are appropriately sized in order to retain the amenity of the site and the surrounding streetscape.

Traffic

47. Prior to occupation of the village, the consent holder shall provide a pedestrian crossing across Salisbury Street as shown in [add final drawing number].
48. Plans for the construction of the pedestrian crossing across Salisbury Street shall be lodged with the Christchurch City Council at least 20 working days prior to the commencement of construction of the crossing. These plans are to be subject to acceptance by the Traffic Engineer, Christchurch City Council (or their nominee) prior to construction. All works are to be in accordance with Christchurch City Council's Construction Standard Specifications.

Note:

The consent holder may be required to obtain approval from the Waikura / Linwood – Central – Heathcote Community Board for the establishment of the pedestrian crossing across Salisbury Street.

Stormwater

49. Prior to undertaking any site works, the applicant shall obtain written confirmation from the Christchurch City Council that the construction and operational phase stormwater discharges have been accepted under the Christchurch City Council's stormwater network discharge consent or confirm that separate resource consents from Environment Canterbury have been obtained.

Water Supply

50. Prior to the occupation of residential units on the site sufficient water supply and access to water supplies for fire-fighting shall be made available to all residential units via Council's urban fully reticulated system and in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice (SNZ PAS:4509:2008).

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX E – RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO PROPOSED CONSENT CONDITIONS

General

1. The construction, operation and maintenance of a comprehensive care retirement village at 100 – 104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street (Lot 1 DP 46511, Lot 1 DP 46369, Lot 2 DP 13073, Pt Res 23 Town of Christchurch and Pt Town Res 25 City of Christchurch), and 78 Park Terrace (Lot 1 DP 77997), shall be undertaken in accordance with the information and plans submitted with the resource consent application dated 27 March 2020, including responses to requests for further information from the Christchurch City Council in accordance with section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The Approved Consent Documents have been entered into Council records as RMA/2020/673 and RMA/2020/679 pages X to X.

2. All of the conditions of this resource consent apply to the construction, operation and maintenance of a comprehensive care retirement village at 100 – 104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street, and 78 Park Terrace, unless the conditions specifically refer to them only applying to an individual site.

Notwithstanding the above, any management plans required under the conditions of this resource consent may apply to works at 100 – 104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street, and 78 Park Terrace, or may solely apply to an individual site depending on the programme of works proposed by the consent holder.

3. The consent holder shall keep a copy of this consent, and all required management plans, on-site at all times and shall ensure that all contractors engaged to undertake works authorised by this resource consent are made aware of the conditions of this resource consent relevant to their work area and the measures required for compliance with the conditions.
4. Pursuant to section 125 of the Resource Management Act 1991, this resource consent lapses five years after the date it commences unless:
 - a. The consent is given effect to; or
 - b. The council extends the period after which the consent lapses.

Earthworks and Construction Management

5. All ~~filling and excavation work construction activities on site~~ shall be carried out in accordance with ~~a the Ryman Healthcare Ltd 78 and 100-104 Park Terrace, 20 Dorset Street, Christchurch~~ Construction Management Plan (CMP). The CMP shall be based upon the draft Ryman Healthcare Limited Construction Management Plan submitted as part of the resource consent application and ~~The CMP~~ shall ensure that any potential effects arising from construction activities on the site are effectively managed. No earthworks shall occur ~~unless and~~ until the finalised CMP, with contact details of construction and supervision contacts included, has been submitted to the Council (via email to rcmon@ccc.govt.nz), reviewed and ~~certified~~accepted by Christchurch City Council's Subdivision Engineer.

Advice Note: Any other management plans required under the consent, e.g. Construction Traffic Management, Landscape Management, Contaminated Site Management, can be combined with the CMP to avoid conflict and duplication.

The CMP shall include a site specific Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) covering all earthwork associated with the [comprehensive care retirement village-consented-development](https://www.ccc.vt.nz/assets/Documents/Consents-and-Licences/construction-requirements/IDS/IDS-Part-03-Quality-Assurance-V3-September-2016.PDF). The CMP shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional and a design certificate (on the Infrastructure Design Standard Part 3: Quality Assurance Appendix IV template <https://www.ccc.vt.nz/assets/Documents/Consents-and-Licences/construction-requirements/IDS/IDS-Part-03-Quality-Assurance-V3-September-2016.PDF>) supplied by that professional with the CMP for acceptance at least 10 days prior to the works commencing. The best practice principles, techniques, inspections and monitoring for erosion and sediment control in the CMP ESDCP shall be in accordance with Environment Canterbury's Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury (<http://esc.canterbury.co.nz/>).

The CMP ESDCP shall include (but is not limited to):

- a. A site description (i.e. topography, vegetation, soils etc);
- b. Details of proposed activities;
- c. A locality map;
- d. The identification of environmental risks including erosion, sediment and dust control, spills, wastewater overflows, dewatering, and excavation and disposal of material from contaminated sites;
- e. Drawings showing the site, type and location of sediment control measures, on-site catchment boundaries and off-site sources of runoff;
- f. A programme of works including a proposed timeframe and completion date;
- g. Storage of fuel and/or lubricants and any handling procedures;
- h. Emergency response and contingency management;
- i. Procedures for compliance with resource consents and permitted activities;
- j. Procedures for environmental monitoring and auditing, including frequency;
- k. Record of corrective actions or solutions implemented;
- l. Procedures for updating the CMP ESDCP;
- m. Procedures for training and supervising staff in relation to environmental issues; and
- n. Roles and responsibilities, including contact details of key personnel responsible for on-site environmental management and compliance and of the site manager.

Note:

The Christchurch City Council Infrastructure Design Standard (Clause 3.8.2) contains further detail on Environmental Management Plans.

6. The CMP ESDCP shall be implemented on site throughout the construction of the comprehensive care retirement village. No earthworks shall commence on site until:

- a. The contractor has received a copy of all resource consents and relevant permitted activity rules controlling this work;
- b. The measures identified in the CMP ESDCP have been installed; and
- c. An Engineering Completion Certificate (IDS – Part 3, Appendix VII), signed by an appropriately qualified and experienced engineer, is completed and presented to Christchurch City Council. This certificate is to certify that the erosion and sediment control measures have been properly installed in accordance with the CMP ESDCP.

7. The consent holder shall ensure any change in ground levels on the site [due to activities authorised by this consent](#) shall not cause a ponding or drainage nuisance to neighbouring properties.
8. The consent holder shall ensure any change in ground levels on the site [due to activities authorised by this consent](#) shall not affect the stability of the ground or fences on neighbouring properties.
9. The consent holder shall ensure that all open areas on the site shall be adequately stabilised as soon as practicable to limit sediment mobilisation.

Note:

In accordance with the condition above earthworks on the site shall be progressively stabilised against erosion during all stages of the earthwork activity. Interim stabilisation measures may include the use of waterproof covers, geotextiles or aggregate cover that has obtained a density of more than 80% of a normal pasturesward.

10. The consent holder shall ensure that any local roads, shared accesses, footpaths, landscaped areas or service structures that are damaged as part of the construction works authorised under this resource consent, are reinstated to their pre-construction standard and as specified in the Construction Standard Specifications (and at the expense of the consent holder).

The consent holder shall, in consultation with the Christchurch City Council, undertake a baseline survey of the condition of all local roads, shared accesses, footpaths, landscaped areas or service structures to be used as part of the construction works, prior to the commencement of construction works authorised as part of this resource consent, in order to provide a benchmark for the potential remedial works that may be required.

11. The consent holder shall ensure that footpaths, [shared accesses](#) and local roads to, and from, the site remain clean of debris and tracked material at all times. Footpaths and roads shall be regularly checked by the consent holder, and swept if any debris and tracked material is deposited as a result of the construction works.

Contaminated Material

12. A Site Management Plan, prepared in accordance with the Framework Site Management Plan submitted with the resource consent application, shall be submitted to Christchurch City Council for certification at least 10 working days prior to earthworks commencing on the site.

The Site Management Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

- a. Pre-works testing;
- b. General earthworks procedures for contaminated soils and material to manage potential exposure to workers and the public;
- c. Dust controls for the management of contaminated soils and material;
- d. Asbestos-specific health and safety controls for the site;
- e. Unexpected contamination and contingency procedures; and
- f. Monitoring procedures.

13. Council is to be notified at least 5 working days in advance of the earthworks commencing. This may be by way of email to rcmon@ccc.govt.nz.
14. Any contaminated soils and materials removed from the site must either be (i) disposed of at a facility whose waste acceptance criteria permit the disposal, or (ii) encapsulated on site (e.g. beneath buildings, roads or landscaped areas).
15. Within three months of the completion of earthworks on the site, a Site Validation or Works Completion Report (as appropriate) shall be prepared and submitted to the Christchurch City Council. The report shall include as a minimum:
 - a. Volumes of materials moved on site;
 - b. Details of any variations to the site works set out in the Site Management Plan;
 - c. Details of any discharges to the environment during the earthworks;
 - d. Details of any contingency measures employed during the earthworks;
 - e. Photographic evidence of the site works;
 - f. Evidence the objectives of the final site capping and / or remediation have been met with regard to high density residential land use; and
 - g. Evidence of the disposal of any soils off site to an authorised facility.

The report shall be written in accordance with the Ministry for the Environment Guidelines for Reporting on Contaminated Sites in New Zealand (Revised 2011). In the event that contaminated soils and materials are encapsulated on site in accordance with condition 13, the Site Validation or Works Completion Report shall also include a Long Term Management Plan that documents the ongoing management controls to be implemented by the consent holder.

Construction Traffic

16. All construction work shall be carried out in accordance with an approved Construction Traffic Management Plan ('CTMP') to minimise the local traffic effects of construction works. No works are to commence until such time as the CTMP has been [certified by the Council](#)~~installed~~. The CTMP shall be prepared by an STMS accredited person and submitted through the web portal www.myworksites.co.nz and approved by the Christchurch Transport Operation Centre – please refer to www.tmpforchch.co.nz.

The CTMP shall be based upon the draft plan submitted as part of the resource consent application, and shall be submitted to the Christchurch City Council for certification at least 10 working days prior to any construction works commencing on site. The CTMP shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person.

The CTMP shall include, but not be limited to:

- a. Construction dates and hours of operations;
 - b. Truck route diagrams for the local road network;
 - c. Contractor parking arrangements;
 - d. Temporary traffic management signage; and
 - e. Details of site access / egress over the construction period.
17. All loading and unloading of trucks with excavation or fill material shall be carried out within the site.

Construction Noise and Vibration

18. All construction work shall be carried out in accordance with a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan ('CNVMP') to minimise the noise and vibration effects of construction works. The CNVMP shall be based upon the draft plan submitted as part of the resource consent application, and shall be submitted to the Christchurch City Council for certification at least 10 working days prior to any construction works commencing on site. The CNVMP shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person.

The CNVMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

- a. Construction noise and vibration levels from key equipment to be utilised on site;
- b. Identification of the premises where there exists the potential for noise / vibration effects;
- c. Description and duration of the works, anticipated equipment and the processes to be undertaken;
- d. Hours of operation, including specific times and days when construction activities causing noise / vibration would occur;
- e. Mitigation options where noise / vibration levels are predicted or demonstrated to approach or exceed the relevant limits in the Christchurch District Plan. Specific noise/vibration mitigation measures must be implemented which may include but not limited to: (i) acoustic screening, (ii) time management procedures and (iii) alternative excavation / construction method technologies;
- f. The process for erecting temporary construction noise barriers where appropriate;
- g. Schedule and methods for monitoring and reporting on construction noise / vibration;
- h. Details of noise / vibration monitoring to be undertaken or in the event of any complaints received;
- i. Implementation of a complaint management system with contact numbers for key construction staff responsible for the implementation of the CNVMP and complaint investigation and including procedures for maintaining contact with stakeholders, notifying of proposed construction activities and handling of noise / vibration complaints;
- k. The process for notifying the owners and occupiers of adjacent buildings prior to construction activities commencing on the site; and
- l. Training procedures for construction personnel.

Pre- and Post-Construction Building Condition Surveys

20. Earthworks on site shall not commence, [except those associated with the remediation of shallow contaminated material](#) ~~on-site~~ until proof of an approved building consent covering all retaining walls shown on the plans approved as part of this resource consent is provided to the Christchurch City Council, [Team Leader Compliance](#).
21. Where a pre-construction building condition survey is required by these consent conditions, the consent holder shall request in writing the approval of the owners of identified properties to undertake an initial condition and photographic survey. The consent holder shall send copies of each of the requests to the Christchurch City Council, Team Leader Compliance via email to rcmon@ccc.govt.nz

22. The consent holder shall engage a suitably qualified and experienced person to undertake a survey of the properties within 20 metres of where excavation will occur on the site, where the property owner has given their written approval.
23. If the property owner does not respond within four weeks of the request in condition 20 being made, the consent holder need not undertake a survey of that property.
24. The survey shall assess the current condition of the exterior and interior of the buildings on the properties identified in condition 20 (any additional properties to be surveyed at the consent holder's discretion). The methodology to be utilised by the consent holder shall be documented and provided to the Christchurch City Council, Team Leader Compliance prior to the surveys being undertaken.
25. A copy of each survey shall be made available to those property owners who participate in the survey and request a copy of the results.
26. Within twelve weeks of the completion of the construction works a follow up survey of each property surveyed shall be carried out (at the consent holder's cost) where the property owner has given their written approval. The purpose of these surveys is to assess any damage caused by the excavation and construction activities at the site. Provided the consent of any landowner is obtained, the consent holder shall be responsible for any repairs, reinstatement or other works to surveyed buildings that can be reasonably attributed to construction activity.

Significant Tree – 78 Park Terrace

27. The consent holder is to appoint a suitably qualified and experienced arborist to monitor and supervise the works within the dripline of the Common Lime Tree (ID Number 3300 / Christchurch District Plan Number T271) for the duration of the works at 78 Park Terrace.
28. Prior to earthworks commencing at 78 Park Terrace, a meeting shall be held on site so that the protection measures for the Common Lime Tree can be discussed between the council arborist, the appointed arborist and relevant contractors who will be working on the site in proximity to the tree. At the meeting, the following will be agreed:
 - a. Areas for storing and / or stockpiling materials, spoil and equipment;
 - b. Procedures for protection of roots within the dripline of the Common Lime Tree (e.g. exposure of roots and protection measures, severing methodology and backfilling of exposed areas); and
 - c. Correct procedures when working around the Common Lime Tree.
29. Temporary protective fencing is to be erected to isolate the Common Lime Tree before any construction works occur around, or adjacent to, the tree. The fencing shall be retained in place for the duration of the construction works, and shall not be removed or moved without the prior approval of the council arborist. If the fencing is damaged, the site manager will be responsible for repairing it at the earliest opportunity.
30. The protective fencing is to be positioned to maximise the tree protection area, whilst allowing a safe work area for the works to occur. The appointed arborist is to determine the exact position of the fencing in consultation with the project manager, but it should be set at the maximum possible practicable distance while still allowing the work to proceed.

31. All soil excavation within the dripline area is to occur under the direction and supervision of the appointed Arborist.
32. Excavation should take place carefully, and any roots will be identified and protected from damage, as the work occurs. This can involve a combination of manual excavation and probing. Any use of machinery will be at the discretion of the appointed Arborist.
33. When soil is cleared around any tree roots, they are not to be left exposed for an extended time (no more than 1 hour), and they shall be protected from desiccation and damage by the use of damp Hessian or bidim, or good quality topsoil, as specified by the appointed Arborist. The Appointed Arborist shall be responsible for this.
34. If any roots encountered at the levels to be excavated have to be severed, this should be carried out to the satisfaction of the appointed Arborist. All root pruning is to be carried out by the appointed Arborist.
35. Care should be taken to avoid damage to roots over 25mm diameter. Roots over 25mm in diameter at point of severance shall only be severed with the approval of the Christchurch City Council Arborist.
36. Following any excavations, backfilling shall take place at the earliest opportunity, and prior to backfilling, any protective material over the roots should be removed. The backfill material should be of sufficient quality to allow for the continued growth/health of the root system.
37. To avoid damage to roots, reinstatement of soil shall not occur except carefully by hand whenever feasible.
38. To avoid contact of raw concrete with root mass during the infill of the clutch piling, it is recommended that the top 2 metres of the piles be lined with a heavy grade PVC or similar impervious material.
39. No heavy machinery is to be driven within the dripline of the Common Lime Tree, unless on existing hard surfaces, or on load bearing mats or sheets designed to spread loading forces.
40. No materials or machinery / vehicles are to be stored / parked within the dripline of the Common Lime Tree during the construction work, including excavated soil, chemicals or building materials.
41. Notice boards, cables and other services shall not be attached to any part of the Common Lime Tree.
42. Postholes for the Peterborough Street road boundary fence posts are to be lined with plastic or similar impervious material to create a barrier between tree roots and raw concrete. Exploratory digging should be used to locate any major roots in the proposed posthole locations.
43. Any pruning of the Common Lime Tree to enable clearance from heavy machinery used for the basement retention system, or due to canopy damage from the operation of the machinery, is to be carried out by the appointed arborist to the Australian Standard- AS 4373-2007 "*Pruning of Amenity Trees*", or British Standard BS 3998: 2010 "*Recommendations - Tree Work*". The maximum diameter of any live limb removed is up to 100 mm at the point of removal.

44. The maximum diameter of any live limb removed is to be up to 100 mm at the point of removal.

~~45. Should the Lime Tree die within 10 years of the development commencing on the site it shall be replaced with the same or similar species which is a minimum of 3.5m high at the time of planting and 5 further replacement trees on the site or in the local area on council land (road or reserve), with the location and species to be confirmed by the Council arborist at the time.~~

Heritage

~~46.~~45. The applicant will advise the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council (or nominee) of the commencement of works [at 100 – 104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street](#) at least 10 working days prior to works starting on site, to ensure that those conditions of consent that require prior agreement are verified in writing.

~~47.~~46. At least 10 working days prior to the commencement of works at 100 – 104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street, the consent holder shall submit a Temporary Protection Plan ('TPP') for the repair of the former Bishops Chapel (Heritage ID: 1035) for certification by the Christchurch City Council. The TPP shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person and shall be based upon the draft plan submitted as part of the resource consent application.

The TPP shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

- a. A specific methodology for the removal and storage of exterior and interior heritage elements;
- b. Procedures for dust suppression from construction and works to the heritage building;
- c. Measures for fire protection;
- d. Measures for security; and
- e. A methodology for preparation of the exterior surface of the chapel if this is required (where any heritage fabric is remaining in situ). ~~The engineering report references sandblasting and high pressure water blasting of surfaces. Sandblasting is not considered an appropriate conservation technique and is not to be used as it can damage the heritage fabric.~~ Significant care must be taken with [any water sand blasting that is required to the brick substrate](#) to avoid damage to heritage fabric, ~~for example, beginning with low pressure (garden hose pressure) and increasing the pressure slowly if required with constant monitoring. Water blasting is not considered appropriate on the exterior surface of the chapel.~~

~~48.~~47. The measures in the TPP shall ensure that the former Bishops Chapel is repaired to the extent that it can be utilised as a non-denominational prayer centre and meeting room as part of the comprehensive care retirement village on the site.

~~49.~~48. Prior to commencement of works, the consent holder's heritage professional shall hold a site briefing of all lead contractors and supervising staff to communicate the significance of the building, the consent conditions and the requirements of the TPP. The consent holder shall notify the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council of the date and time of the meeting at least three working days before the meeting.

~~50.~~49. The consent holder shall provide written confirmation to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council stating that the initial setup of the TPP has been implemented and inspected on site (including methodologies for removal and storage of heritage fabric) by a suitably qualified and experienced

person before any other works commence. Following the initial implementation of the TPP, the consent holder's heritage professional shall regularly monitor the TPP to ensure that appropriate measures are being taken by the contractors at each stage of construction and advise contractors if any additional protection is required.

~~54-50.~~ A copy of the conditions of this consent, the amended Temporary Protection Plan (TPP), and a full copy of the approved consent application and plans, are to be kept on site at all times, form part of the induction process, and are to be made available to and adhered to by all contractors and subcontractors undertaking work in connection with this consent.

~~52-51.~~ All works to the former Bishops Chapel, and within the heritage setting of the former Bishops Chapel (Heritage ID: 470), shall be undertaken by suitably qualified tradespeople, and overseen by a suitably qualified CPEng structural engineer and heritage professional appointed by the consent holder.

~~53-52.~~ No building works within the heritage setting of the former Bishops Chapel must proceed beyond the foundation stage until a registered surveyor or licensed cadastral surveyor, engaged by the consent holder, has provided written certification to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council that the works completed have been completed in accordance with the approved plans.

~~54-53.~~ A registered surveyor or licensed cadastral surveyor, engaged by the consent holder, must provide written certification to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council that the heights of the buildings with the heritage setting of the former Bishops Chapel, as completed have been completed in accordance with the approved plans.

~~55-54.~~ If the proposed access ramp is to be attached to the heritage fabric of the former Bishops Chapel, at least 10 working days prior to the commencement of works to the chapel, the consent holder's heritage professional and engineer shall submit for certification to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council, details of the methodology for fixing the ramp to the chapel.

~~56-55.~~ A digital photographic record of the works to the heritage building and heritage setting is to be undertaken by the consent holder's heritage professional, before, during, and after the completion of the works. The photographic record of the works in the heritage setting shall include affected views to and from the heritage item. The record must be lodged with the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council for their records within three months of the completion of the work.

~~57-56.~~ New or introduced materials, works or reconstructed elements shall be recorded, and date marked to indicate the time of their installation. The form and location of the visible dating of the new entry / pergola structure is to be agreed with the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council prior to its installation.

~~58-57.~~ Heat pump units, if proposed to be attached to exterior heritage fabric, must comply with the permitted activity standard in rule 9.3.4.1.1 P13 of the Christchurch District Plan requiring the design and/or supervision of a Heritage Professional. If this standard is not met, their proposed appearance, location and fixing details are to be submitted by email for certification to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council (or nominee) prior to their installation.

Landscaping

~~59-58.~~ The proposed landscaping shall be established in accordance with the Landscape Plan labelled ~~X~~ as part of the Approved Consent Document (page ~~XX~~), except as specified in the conditions below.

~~60-59.~~ Prior to the relevant buildings in any stage passing their final building inspection, the consent holder shall provide the Christchurch City Council with a detailed Planting Plan and a Planting, Implementation and Maintenance Strategy for the site at least 10 working days prior to any earthworks commencing on site. The Planting Plan and a Planting, Implementation and Maintenance Strategy shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.

- a. The final landscape plan and specifications;
- b. Planting schedules, detailing the specific planting species, the number of plants / trees to be provided, locations and height/Pb sizes;
- c. Annotated sections with key dimensions to illustrate that adequate widths and depths are provided for tree pits / planter boxes; and
- d. A management / maintenance programme.

~~64-60.~~ The proposed landscaping shall be established on site for each stage of building works within the first planting season (extending from 1 April to 30 September) following the final, passed building inspection for each relevant stage of building works.

~~62-61.~~ Should any of the trees to be planted along the street frontage boundaries of the site not survive, the consent holder shall procure and plant replacement specimens at a minimum height of 4.5 m.

Note: This condition shall continue to apply for the duration that the comprehensive care retirement village exists on the site. It is intended to ensure that any trees that perish along the street frontage of the site are replaced with specimens that are appropriately sized in order to retain the amenity of the site and the surrounding streetscape.

~~63. A revised landscaping plan be prepared by the Consent Holder's Landscape Architect for certification by the CCC Head of Resource Consents or nominee. The purpose of this condition is to ensure that the tree species and methodology that can be established in the available space and are allowed to reach their natural form and height. The following is required to meet this condition:-~~

~~Bishopspark Site~~

- ~~← Two large tree species capable of reaching 15m at maturity along the Park Terrace frontage shall be allowed to grow to their natural height and form. This is in addition to the trees to be provided either side of the driveway.~~
- ~~← The provision of a tree on either side of the Park Terrace access capable of reaching a minimum of 15m in height and are to be grown in conventional tree pits.~~
- ~~← The Dorset Street frontage shall be planted with a tree species with a mature height of 6m which can be established in the available space and able to reach their natural form and height.~~
- ~~← The boundary shared with 2 to 18 Dorset Street shall be planted with tree species that are capable of reaching a mature height of 8m and shall be allowed to grow to their natural height and form.~~
- ~~← The boundary shared with 13 to 17 Salisbury Street shall be planted with tree species that are capable of reaching a mature height of 8m and shall be allowed to grow to their natural height and form.~~

~~Peterborough Site~~

- ~~€ The Oak and Beech Trees along the Park Terrace frontage shall be allowed to grow to their natural height and form.~~
- ~~€ Trees shall be provided along the northern side of the access adjacent to Building B07 and not along the southern side adjacent to the property at 76 Park Terrace.~~
- ~~€ The Salisbury Street frontage shall be planted with tree species that are capable of reaching a mature height of 12m which can be established in the available space and shall be allowed to grow to their natural form and height.~~

Traffic

~~64.62.~~ Westwood Terrace shall not to be used as an access for earthworks or during construction for the development.

~~65.63.~~ Service vehicles accessing the site via Dorset St shall reverse on to the site so they can exit the site in forward gear. This requirement shall be detailed in all contract arrangements with service providers to the site and shall be reflected in signage at this access.

Stormwater

~~66.64.~~ Prior to undertaking any site works, the applicant shall obtain written confirmation from the Christchurch City Council that the construction and operational phase stormwater discharges have been accepted under the Christchurch City Council's stormwater network discharge consent or confirm that separate resource consents from Environment Canterbury have been obtained.

Water Supply

~~67.65.~~ Prior to the occupation of residential units on the site sufficient water supply and access to water supplies for fire-fighting shall be made available to all residential units via Council's urban fully reticulated system and in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice (SNZ PAS:4509:2008).

Noise

~~68.66.~~ The consent holder shall provide the Christchurch City Council with a design report (prior to construction) and a design certificate (prior to occupation) prepared by a suitably qualified acoustics specialist stating the design proposed for each building is capable of meeting the applicable noise standard in Rule 6.7.7.2.1 of the District Plan.

Advice notes:

i) *Monitoring*

The Council will require payment of its administrative charges in relation to monitoring of conditions, as authorised by the provisions of section 36 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The current monitoring charges are:

- (a) A monitoring programme administration fee of \$102.00 to cover the cost of setting up the monitoring programme; and
- (b) A monitoring fee of \$175.50 for the first monitoring inspection to ensure compliance with the conditions of this consent; and

- (c) Time charged at an hourly rate if more than one inspection, or additional monitoring activities (including those relating to non-compliance with conditions), are required.

The monitoring programme administration fee and inspection fees will be charged to the applicant with the consent processing costs. Any additional monitoring time will be invoiced to the consent holder when the monitoring is carried out, at the hourly rate specified in the applicable Annual Plan Schedule of Fees and Charges.

- ii) This resource consent has been processed under the Resource Management Act 1991 and relates to planning matters only. You will also need to comply with the requirements of the Building Act 2004. Please contact a Building Consent Officer (ph: 941 8999) for advice on the building consent process.
- iii) This site may be an archaeological site as defined and protected under the provisions of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Archaeological sites are defined in the HNZPTA as any place in New Zealand where there is physical evidence of pre-1900 occupation, regardless whether the site is known or not, recorded in the NZAA Site Recording Scheme or not, or listed with Heritage New Zealand or the local council. Authority from Heritage New Zealand is required for any work that affects or may affect an archaeological site. **Please contact the Heritage New Zealand regional archaeologist on 03 363 1880 or archaeologistcw@heritage.org.nz before commencing work on the land.**

Heritage

- iv) Information being submitted in relation to conditions of this consent is to be sent by email to: rcmon@ccc.govt.nz. The current nominated Council Heritage Advisor for this consent is Suzanne Richmond, 941 5383 or suzanne.richmond@ccc.govt.nz. The alternative contact is Gareth Wright, 941 8026 or gareth.wright@ccc.govt.nz.
- v) The applicant should not commence or should cease work on a given area if the works proposed in that area change from those in the approved consent documentation. Any variation must be discussed with the Christchurch City Council's Heritage Team Leader (or nominee), who in consultation with the Council's Resource Consents Unit will determine an appropriate consenting response. Five working days should be allowed for this process. Failure to discuss changes with the Council's Heritage Team may constitute a breach of the conditions of this consent. Amended plans and information showing these changes, may be required to be submitted to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council (or nominee) for certification prior to work on that area commencing or resuming.
- vi) The intention of the photographic record condition is to maintain a record of the works with a focus on the areas of the heritage item and heritage setting undergoing change rather than individual elements. The same camera positions should be used for all photo sets before, during and after the works to enable comparison. Photographs should be of printable quality, at least 1440 pixels by 960 pixels for a 4"x 6" print at a minimum resolution of 240 PPI. They should be labelled with the position on site or in relation to the site, date and photographer's name, and submitted with a plan showing photograph locations. Photos should be submitted electronically, either by email (noting that Council's email data transfer limit is 20MB per email), or via a file transfer website such as wettransfer.com or dropbox.com to rcmon@ccc.govt.nz.
- vii) Date stamping or marking is important to clearly distinguish replicated or introduced old features and new areas of fabric from heritage fabric so changes to the heritage item can be readily understood in the future. The dating of new or introduced fabric may be undertaken by a number of permanent means. It is recommended that a builder's pencil or small steel plate with the date is used on masonry or timber. A

permanent marker pen may be used on steel elements, but not masonry or timber as the marking may deteriorate. Marking should generally be in unobtrusive locations where elements are proposed for reinstatement. Dates may be prominent in some cases when used for commemorative purposes such as over the entrance to acknowledge major works to a building or a new wing. **In the case of the entry/pergola to the chapel, the new structure should be dated in a visible location to acknowledge the date of the works to the chapel alongside the chapel's construction date, for example: "1927 20[XX]"**.

- viii) All works should be carried out with regard to the conservation principles contained within the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010).
- ix) All works to be undertaken on the repair and replacement of heritage fabric should be undertaken by tradespeople experienced in working with such fabric.