

Before the Hearings Commissioners at Christchurch City Council

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 **Rebecca Anne Skidmore** 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 REBECCA ANNE SKIDMORE ON BEHALF OF RYMAN HEALTHCARE LIMITED

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Rebecca Anne Skidmore.
- 2 I am an Urban Designer and Landscape Architect. I am a director of the consultancy R. A. Skidmore Urban Design Limited and have held this position for approximately seventeen years.
- 3 I hold a Bachelor of Science degree from Canterbury University (1987), a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture (Hons) degree from Lincoln University (1990), and a Master of Built Environment (Urban Design) degree from Queensland University of Technology in Brisbane (1995).
- 4 I have approximately 25 years' professional experience, practising in both local government and the private sector. In these positions I have assisted with district plan preparation and I have assessed and reviewed a wide range of resource consent applications throughout the country. These assessments relate to a range of rural, residential and commercial proposals.
- 5 I regularly assist councils with character assessments and the development of frameworks for the protection and management of identified special character areas. I also regularly assist local authorities with policy and district plan development in relation to growth management, urban design, landscape, character and amenity matters.
- 6 I am an accredited independent hearing commissioner. I also regularly provide expert evidence in the Environment Court and I have appeared as the Court's witness in the past.
- 7 I am familiar with Ryman Healthcare Limited's (*Ryman*) 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 (*Sites*). 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 the "Bishopspark Site". For completeness, when I use the term "Sites" I am referring to both the Peterborough Site and the Bishopspark Site.
- 8 I prepared the Urban Design, Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment Report dated March 2020 (*Urban Design, Landscape and Visual Report*). I also prepared the urban design, landscape and visual effects inputs for the section 92 responses dated 18 May, 13 July and 17 November 2020 (*Further Information*

Responses). I attended the Urban Design Panel (*UDP*) meeting on 2 October 2019.

- 9 I have visited the Site and its surroundings on a number of occasions, the most recent being 23 October 2020.

CODE OF CONDUCT

- 10 Although this hearing is 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

- 11 My evidence sets out the following:
- 11.1 A summary of the Site characteristics and the planning context that have informed my assessment;
 - 11.2 A brief description of the Proposed Village;
 - 11.3 My opinion in relation to urban design considerations and the associated amenity effects. These effects include: effects on the urban structure and character of the wider environment; effects on the immediate street interface; amenity effects resulting from shading and overlooking; on-site amenity; and crime prevention through environmental design (*CPTED*);
 - 11.4 My opinion in relation to landscape effects;
 - 11.5 My opinion in relation to visual effects and particularly the visual effects on the four groups identified as comprising the primary viewing audience, being: users of the surrounding street network; residents and users of immediately adjoining residential and commercial properties; residents and users of properties in the wider neighbourhood; and users of Hagley Park.
 - 11.6 My response to the urban design, landscape and visual issues raised in submissions;

11.7 My response to the urban design, landscape and visual issues raised in the Council Officer's Report dated, and particularly the Urban Design Report of Josie Schroder (Appendix B of the Council Officer's Report) and the Landscape Report of Jennifer Dray (Appendix H of the Council Officer's Report);

11.8 My comments on the draft conditions; and

11.9 My conclusions.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Site and Planning Context

- 12 The Proposed Village will extend across two sites – the Bishopspark Site and the Peterborough Site.
- 13 The Bishopspark Site previously contained the Bishopspark retirement village and the Anglican Bishop's residence. The former Bishop's Chapel remains on the Site. The Peterborough Site formerly accommodated a series of residential towers (up to 10 storeys), which were demolished following the earthquakes.
- 14 The Sites are located at the periphery of the Christchurch City Centre in a well-established neighbourhood. The Sites have prominent frontages to Park Terrace. The built character of the neighbourhood is quite varied. The area has been through considerable built change, as a result of extensive damage resulting from the earthquakes.
- 15 Both Sites are zoned Residential Central City in the Christchurch District Plan (*DP*). This zone provides for higher density residential development, and change to the existing environment is anticipated. The retirement village activity is a permitted activity on the Sites. The proposed buildings, including infringements of the built form standards, require restricted discretionary consent. My assessment has been guided by the existing context, the relevant DP objectives and policies, matters for discretion and built form standards.

Proposed Village

- 16 The design of the Proposed Village has been led by Warren and Mahoney. The design has been through an interactive process, with input from various project team specialists, including myself, the Urban Design Panel (*UDP*) and Council's review staff.
- 17 The Bishopspark Site accommodates Buildings B01 to B04, with the former Chapel providing the focal point for a central plaza that will be the open space hub of the Village. Basement carparking is provided, avoiding a dominance of accessways and surface parking

at ground level and enabling a number of landscaped amenity spaces to be provided between the buildings.

- 18 The Peterborough Site accommodates Building B07 and B08. Building B07 is configured with two wings, which are connected by a single-level entrance lobby and separated by a communal plaza/garden. Basement carparking is also provided.

Assessment Methodology

- 19 My assessment is based on architectural drawings, landscape plans and visual simulations; and has been informed by site visits; relevant planning provisions; and feedback from the Council's UDP and technical reviewers.
- 20 My urban design assessment was guided by the DP framework, which articulates how the factors identified in the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (2005) are to be achieved in this inner Christchurch location. The DP anticipates change in this inner city neighbourhood, and the built form standards provide a relevant guide as to the degree of change, and therefore the scale of development, that can generally be readily and appropriately accommodated by the environment. My urban design assessment was also informed by the Ministry of Justice "National Guidelines for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design In New Zealand" and the Christchurch City Council's 'Safer Canterbury: Creating Safer Communities" (2004).
- 21 The methodology I used for the assessment of landscape and visual effects is consistent with the NZ Institute of Landscape Architect's 'Landscape Assessment and Sustainable Management Best Practice Guide (10.1)'.

Urban Design Considerations and Associated Amenity Effects

Effects on the Wider Environment - Urban Structure and Character

- 22 While being mindful of the functional and operational requirements of the Proposed Village, considerable effort has been applied to create a layout and collection of building forms and spaces that respond to the particular characteristics of the location. In my opinion, this outcome has been successfully achieved.
- 23 On the Bishopspark Site, the building layout and massing creates a strong and direct axis from Park Terrace to the heart of the Village. The buildings are configured around a series of communal open spaces, and respond to the differing characteristics of the various boundary interfaces. The building forms have also been visually broken into a cohesive series of distinct forms through physical separation, a distinctive roofline and façade articulation. The majority of carparking is located in a basement ensuring the

ground level is uncluttered by parking and multiple vehicular accessways.

- 24 On the Peterborough Site, the building layout and massing responds to the prominent corner location and relationship to Hagley Park. The architectural concept for this Site was amended in response to feedback from the UDP, and I consider these changes have resulted in a more nuanced design response that better responds to the wider neighbourhood character.
- 25 Overall, I consider the Proposed Village will make a positive contribution to the evolving urban character of this area as it recovers from extensive earthquake damage.
- 26 A number of submissions consider the Proposed Village is of a scale, intensity and design that is not compatible with the established neighbourhood character. As noted, the DP framework anticipates an evolution and change within the Residential Central City zone, and the Proposed Village reflects this expectation. In addition, the neighbourhood character is already varied, and contains a number of apartment and terrace buildings. Considerable effort has also been applied to create a layout and collection of building forms and spaces that respond to the particular characteristics of the location. I consider this outcome has been successfully achieved.

Street Interfaces

- 27 The Bishopspark Site interfaces with Park Terrace (primarily Building B02) and Dorset Street (primarily Building B03):
- 27.1 I consider the vertical scale of Building B02 will provide a suitable level of enclosure to the street, with the building setback, unit orientation and façade articulation, together with the boundary treatment creating a positive edge treatment.
- 27.2 In my opinion, the scale of Building B03 sits comfortably in its Dorset Street context. The location of the building in relation to the street, its proportion and the large areas of glazing and balconies overlooking the street will create a positive street interface.
- 28 The Peterborough Site interfaces with Park Terrace, Salisbury Street (Building B07) and Peterborough Street (Building B08):
- 28.1 The Proposed Village layout acknowledges the primacy of the Park Terrace frontage by creating a strong built edge and address to Park Terrace. I consider the boundary treatment creates an appropriate balance between defining the outdoor terraces and maintaining engagement with the streets.

- 28.2 Reflecting the street hierarchy, the Salisbury Street building frontage will be viewed as secondary to the Park Terrace frontage. From Salisbury Street, a clear visual break between the two Building B07 wings is created with views to the low-level entry pavilion beyond. Generous areas of glazing and juliet balconies, facing this street, together with specimen tree planting along the boundary will provide a positive street interface.
- 28.3 Building B08 presents a narrow end to Peterborough Street, with a stepped façade, generous glazing and balconies, and retention of the Common Lime Tree creating an appropriate interface.
- 29 In my opinion, the location and scale of specimen tree planting (including amendments to the landscape masterplan now proposed) is suitable to contribute a vegetated quality to the streetscape and complement the Proposed Village buildings.

Amenity of Surrounding Properties

- 30 Ryman's comprehensive and iterative design process included extensive consideration of the characteristics of surrounding properties to maintain a suitable level of amenity. The majority of the properties surrounding the Sites are residential, although some commercial properties are located to the east of the Bishopspark Site. The Dorset Street Flats have heritage values. However I do not consider these values change the approach to assessing amenity effects such as overlooking shading effects.
- 31 The potential for overlooking/privacy amenity effects on surrounding properties has been addressed through the orientation of buildings and units, separation from the neighbouring buildings, setbacks of facades, and the location, size and treatment of windows and balconies. I consider the Proposed Village will not result in inappropriate overlooking or loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.
- 32 The Proposed Village will result in varying degrees of shading of neighbouring properties. However, shading is expected in a central city environment. The potential for shading amenity effects on surrounding properties have been addressed through compliance with the recession plane standards to the extent possible and the location and massing of buildings. I consider the Proposed Village will not result in inappropriate shading effects for neighbouring properties.

On-Site Amenity

- 33 The Proposed Village is designed to cater for a range of requirements and preferences for future residents. A range of amenities and communal open spaces are provided. The Sites have been designed to provide clear, safe and easy circulation

around the Proposed Village ensuring all communal amenities are accessible.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

- 34 I consider the CPTED principles have been successfully addressed in the Proposed Village design through layout and provision of connections, integration and engagement with surrounding context and lighting of communal outdoor spaces. I also note that the sense of shared ownership and overarching management and maintenance will make a particular contribution to the safety of the Village.

Landscape Effects

- 35 I consider the proposed Site layout, building configuration and architectural design responds to the characteristics of the location, the interfaces with immediately surrounding streets, and the Sites themselves. In particular, Building B02 and B07 will make a positive contribution to the evolving character of the Park Terrace street corridor. The provision of basement carparking is also beneficial as it reduces the dominance of vehicle accessways and parking.
- 36 I consider the design of open spaces and associated planting will complement the built elements of the Proposed Village and will assist to embed the Village in its wider context. In my opinion, the scale of planting proposed is suitable for this inner city residential location. In my opinion, the scale and form of planting proposed is suitable for an inner-city residential environment rather than trying to replicate the character of Hagley Park.
- 37 Overall, I consider the Proposed Village design achieves a suitable balance between ensuring cohesion between the Sites and creating visual interest and a grain that respects the differing characteristics of the surrounding context. In my opinion, the Proposed Village will make a positive contribution to the landscape character of this neighbourhood that is gradually re-establishing after the earthquakes.

Visual Effects

- 38 My evidence addresses visual effects on the primary viewing audiences being: users of the surrounding street network, residents and users of immediately adjoining properties, residents and users of properties in the wider neighbourhood and users of Hagley Park.
- 39 Users of the surrounding street network are less sensitive to change due to the transient nature of their viewing experience. For users of Park Terrace, Building B02 and Building B07 in particular, will result in considerable visual change. However, I consider these buildings are appropriate in the context of the wide street corridor and Park Terrace/Salisbury Street corner site, and

have been designed to avoid any inappropriate visual dominance effects. For users of Dorset Street, Building B03 will not appear incongruous with the location and scale of buildings in the surrounding context. For users of Salisbury Street, there is a generous separation between the western and eastern wings of Building B07 and a clear step down in scale from the western to the eastern wing. For users of Peterborough Street, Building B08 will be subservient to other buildings in the street corridor and the Common Lime Tree will continue to contribute to the vegetated quality of the streetscape. For all of these viewing audiences, I consider the visual effects of the Proposed Village will be positive.

- 40 As noted earlier, the comprehensive and iterative design process included extensive consideration of the characteristics of surrounding properties to maintain a suitable level of amenity, including the orientation of dwellings in relation to the Site. I consider the potential for adverse visual amenity effects on residents and users of immediately adjoining properties has been addressed through the separation from the neighbouring buildings, modulation, angling and articulation of the building facades, the location, size and treatment of windows and balconies, and variations in materials and colours to create visual interest. The proposed planting is not intended to generally mitigate any visual effects on neighbours, but in some cases will provide a soft visual foil between proposed buildings and neighbouring properties. The Proposed Village will result in considerable visual change when viewed from a number of surrounding properties. However, such change is consistent with the DP expectation of higher density residential development. I consider the Proposed Village will result in negligible – low adverse visual effects on the users of immediately adjoining properties.
- 41 For the users of properties in the wider neighbourhood, including those on Dorset Street, the Proposed Village will integrate well with the surrounding context and will not appear incongruous. For users of properties facing the Peterborough Site, particularly those on the northern side of Salisbury Street, the magnitude of visual change will be high. However, separation is provided by the wide intersection/street, the pocket park and planting along the street edge. Building B07 also creates a well-ordered configuration. I consider the Proposed Village will result in positive – low adverse visual effects on these properties.
- 42 The Proposed Village will be visible to users of the pathway running along the Avon River within Hagley Park. I consider Buildings B02 and B07 are well articulated and terminated by a distinctive roofline. The proposed landscaping will complement (rather than replicate) the planting within Hagley Park to reinforce the vegetated quality of the neighbourhood. From further within Hagley Park, the mature trees and distance will obscure views.

Overall, I consider the Proposed Village will result in positive visual effects on users of Hagley Park.

- 43 I do not agree with the opinions expressed by the Council's urban design and landscape and visual effects reviewers that the proposed specimen tree planting is necessary to mitigate an identified adverse visual effect arising from the Proposed Village buildings. Rather, the planting is proposed as an integral part of the Village design to contribute to both the on-site amenity and the amenity of the surrounding environment.

Conclusions

- 44 In conclusion, I consider the Proposed Village has been designed to reflect the DP expectations of change in this environment, to: respond appropriately to the wider neighbourhood context and character, engage with the adjacent streets, integrate the historic Chapel as a key ordering element for the Bishopspark site structure, address potential residential amenity effects on neighbours and to create visual quality and interest.

SITE AND PLANNING CONTEXT

Site

- 45 The Proposed Village will extend across two sites – the Bishopspark Site and the Peterborough Site.

Bishopspark Site

- 46 The Bishopspark Site has an area of 12,267 m². The property has an irregular proportion. The main street frontage, with a length of 50.8 m, is to Park Terrace. The frontage to Dorset Street is 24.7 m long. The Bishopspark Site is generally flat.
- 47 The Bishopspark Site has a rich history. It was the site of the Anglican Bishop's residence, which was first established in 1858. Designed by the eminent architect Cecil Wood, the second Bishop's residence was a 22 roomed mansion built in 1926. In the 1980s, a retirement village was designed around the Bishop's residence. The Bishop's residence was damaged in the earthquakes and subsequently demolished. The former retirement village has ceased operation and most of the buildings have been removed. The exception is a small Chapel that, while in a poor state of repair, is of particular note and is listed in the DP and the New Zealand Heritage List as a scheduled heritage item. The Chapel provides a physical link to the Anglican Church's use of the Bishopspark Site.
- 48 The Bishopspark Site contains a mix of vegetation associated with gardens in the former retirement village.

Peterborough Site

- 49 The Peterborough Site has an area of 5,082 m². It is a corner site with frontage to both Park Terrace and Salisbury Street. While it has a generally rectangular portion, a narrower area also extends to Peterborough Street. The Site is generally flat.
- 50 The Peterborough Site formerly accommodated a series of residential towers (up to 10 storeys). These were demolished following the earthquakes. The Site is now vacant and is used for informal carparking.
- 51 A large, mature Common Lime tree, which is scheduled in the DP, is located adjacent to the Peterborough Street frontage.

Site context

Drawing reference: Attachment 1, S01 A0-020 and S02 A0-020 (of RC drawing set)

- 52 The Sites are located at the periphery of the Christchurch City Centre in a well-established neighbourhood. The Sites have prominent frontages to Park Terrace, which is one of the premiere streets of the City. It is a broad street that carries large volumes of vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. The street creates the eastern edge to Hagley Park and the Avon River which flows along the eastern side of the Park. These two landscape features are closely associated with and contribute to the identity of Christchurch.
- 53 The built character of the neighbourhood is quite varied. In part this variation reflects the activity mix accommodated in the area. Along the Park Terrace corridor 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. Some properties remain vacant and undeveloped. As a result of the long history of the area and the considerable redevelopment that has occurred, particularly in recent time, the built character of the area reflects a rich diversity of architectural eras and styles.
- 54 Park Terrace contains a range of building scales from stand-alone dwellings to attached apartments in a variety of configurations. The street corridor has a strong vegetated character. In particular, the mature trees within Hagley Park create a vegetated counterbalance to the urban environment. Mature vegetation within properties along Park Terrace also contributes to the mixed vegetated character of the street corridor.

- 55 At the corner of Park Terrace and Salisbury Street, in front of the Peterborough Site, the road reserve broadens out and creates a small grassed 'pocket park' that contains a cluster of small trees.
- 56 The side streets that run off Park Terrace are narrower in dimension, and have a harder, more urban character. Peterborough Street contains a single traffic lane in each direction with on-street parking and footpaths on either side of the street. The street contains a mix of residential apartments and commercial activities. The George Hotel is located on the southern side of the Park Terrace intersection with access to the carpark from Peterborough Street. The former Teachers College is a distinctive historic stone building located on the corner of Peterborough and Montreal Street which has strong street presence.
- 57 Salisbury Street is a one-way street that carries two lanes of traffic in an eastward direction, with on-street parking on both sides of the street. Footpaths are also located on either side of the street. The street contains a mix of older, stand-alone dwellings, terrace houses and apartments. To the east the street opens out to the broad Montreal / Victoria Street intersection with its commercial focus and bulkier building forms.
- 58 Westwood Terrace is a small accessway from Salisbury Street that provides access to the Bishopspark Site as well as a number of commercial properties that front Victoria Street.
- 59 Dorset Street is a local street that carries a single lane of traffic in each direction and accommodates on-street parking on both sides of the street. Footpaths are located on both sides of the street with associated grassed berms. The street contains a mix of stand-alone dwellings, terrace houses and small apartment buildings. Towards Victoria Street the activity mix transitions to small-scale commercial activities.
- Dublin Street, which intersects with Dorset Street in the vicinity of the Site frontage, is also a minor residential street. It has a mixed residential character, containing a diverse range of dwellings of differing periods and styles.
- 60 The eastern boundary of the Bishopspark Site adjoins properties that front the Victoria Street commercial corridor. This street contains a diverse range of commercial buildings that accommodate a mix of business, retail and hospitality uses. Many sites have been redeveloped since the earthquakes and are of considerable scale. The busy commercial corridor has a character that is quite distinct from the more residentially focussed streets that feed into it.

61 While the Sites are located within an established neighbourhood, the area is going through considerable built change as a result of extensive damage resulting from the earthquakes in 2011. Many former buildings, including the high residential apartment buildings on the Peterborough Site and the Bishops residence on the Bishopspark Site, have been demolished. Some sites have been recently redeveloped (e.g. the dwelling at 84 Park Terrace) and construction is underway on others (e.g. the apartment building at 108 Park Terrace and the commercial building containing a hotel at 155 Victoria Street). Quite unusually for an inner-city suburb, a number of sites are currently vacant. Some have resource consents for re-development (e.g. the Stables at 4A Dorset Street).

Planning context

62 A full description of relevant planning considerations is set out in the Assessment of Environmental Effects (*AEE*) and the planning context is also addressed in the evidence of Dr Mitchell. The following is a summary of key provisions that have guided my assessment.

63 Both Sites are located within the Residential Central City zone.

64 The properties adjoining the Bishopspark Site to the north and south are also zoned Residential Central City, with the properties to the east mostly within the Commercial Central City Business zone. The property at 155 Victoria Street has a split zoning with a small portion adjacent to the Site also zoned Residential Central City.

65 The properties surrounding the Peterborough Site are zoned Residential Central City. To the west, Hagley Park is zoned Open Space Community Parks and the Avon River is identified as part of the Avon River Precinct (Te Papa Otākaro).

66 The DP describes the Residential Central City zone as being (Table 14.2.1.1a):

...developed to contribute to Christchurch's liveable city values. Providing for a range of housing types, including attractive, high density living opportunities, the zone utilises the potential for living, working and playing in close proximity to the commercial centre of the city. The character, scale and intensity of non-residential activities is controlled in order to mitigate effects on the character and amenity of the inner city residential areas.

- 67 The relevant objectives and policies for the Residential Central City Zone seek the following outcomes:
- 67.1 An increased supply of housing that is diverse and meets the needs for the community (Objective 14.2.1);
 - 67.2 Higher density residential development in the central city, with an average net density of at least 50 households per hectare for intensification development (Policy 14.2.1.1(a)(ii));
 - 67.3 The restoration and enhancement of residential activity in the central city by providing for a variety of housing types, and assisting in the creation of new inner city neighbourhoods (Policy 14.2.1.3);
 - 67.4 The provision of housing options for the elderly, and that such housing can require higher densities than typical residential developments (Policy 14.2.1.8);
 - 67.5 High quality residential developments that (i) reflect the character and scale of buildings anticipated in the neighbourhood, (ii) contribute to a high quality street scene, (iii) provide a high level of on-site amenity, and (v) provide safe and efficient movement for pedestrians and vehicles and (vi) incorporate principles of CPTED (Policy 14.2.4.1);
 - 67.6 A form of 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 (Objective 14.2.8(b)); and
 - 67.7 The use of minimum standards for residential development in the central city to (i) protect amenity values for residents, (ii) integrate development with the neighbourhood, and (iii) provide for a range of residential needs (Policy 14.2.8.2).
- 68 The Sites are also subject to a number of relevant overlay notations that are relevant to the urban design, landscape and visual effects assessment:
- 68.1 Central City Building Setbacks (along the boundary with Park Terrace);
 - 68.2 Central City Building Height 14 m Overlay (Bishopspark Site only);
 - 68.3 Heritage Item 1305 and Heritage Setting 470 (Bishopspark Site only) – the former Bishops Chapel and setting;

68.4 Significant Individual Tree on the Peterborough Site (T271) – a Common Lime tree.

69 Activity associated with a retirement village is a permitted activity within the Residential Central City zone. The construction of new buildings for the Proposed Village requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. Rule 14.15.9 sets out the matters of discretion. It begins by stating that 'while bringing change to existing environments' the proposal should be considered as to whether it is 'appropriate to its context', taking into account a range of factors. My assessment was guided by matters for discretion in Rule 14.15.9. These can be summarised as follows:

69.1 Engagement with, and contribution to, adjacent streets and public open spaces (e.g. via fencing, sightlines, setbacks, pedestrian entrances and the use of corner of sites);

69.2 Integration of access and parking areas in a way that is safe for pedestrians and cyclists, and that does not visually dominate the development;

69.3 Retention or response to existing character buildings or established landscape features (e.g. mature trees);

69.4 The response to subdivision patterns, visible scale of buildings and open spaces, and building materials;

69.5 Incorporation of CPTED principles;

69.6 Residential amenity for neighbours (i.e. outlook, privacy, noise, odour, light spill and access to sunlight);

69.7 Creation of visual quality and interest through the separation of buildings and variety in building form / architectural detailing; and

69.8 The incorporation of environmental efficiency measures in the design of buildings.

70 My assessment has also been informed by the relevant built form standards for the Residential Central City zone. A new building that does not meet the relevant built form standards is also a restricted discretionary activity and is to be considered against the matters of discretion for the building form standard that is infringed. The infringements relevant to my assessment are:

70.1 Building height (Rules 14.6.2.1 and 14.15.27): At the Bishopspark Site, the maximum building height of 14 m will be exceeded by a maximum of 5.495 m (as illustrated on Drawing B02.A2-011). At the Peterborough Site, the maximum building height of 20 m will be exceeded by a

maximum of 5.002 m (as illustrated on Drawing B07.A2-014);

- 70.2 Daylight recession plane (Rules 14.6.2.2 and 14.15.28): At the Bishopspark Site, parts of Buildings B01, B02, B03 and B04 will penetrate the daylight recession plane standard (as illustrated on Drawing S01 A0-070). At the Peterborough Site, parts of Buildings B07 and B08 will penetrate the daylight recession plane standard (as illustrated on Drawing S02 A0-060);
 - 70.3 Road boundary building setback (Rules 14.6.2.3 and 14.15.29): At the Bishopspark Site, Building B02 encroaches on the 4.5 m setback from the Park Terrace boundary and Building B03 encroaches on the 2 m setback from the Dorset Street boundary; and
 - 70.4 Minimum building setbacks (Rules 14.6.2.4 and 14.15.30): At the Bishopspark Site, there are infringements of the 1.8 m internal setback along the rear internal boundary.
- 71 The overall activity status for the Proposed Village is restricted discretionary.

PROPOSED VILLAGE

Design philosophy

- 72 The design of the Proposed Village has been led by Warren and Mahoney. The Proposed Village design has been through numerous iterations with input from various project team specialists including myself. The design evolution has also been usefully informed by the feedback provided by the UDP and Christchurch City Council's (*Council*) review staff. From an urban design perspective, a number of key principles guided the design evolution. These include:
- 72.1 Ensure design cohesion that identifies the different Sites as a single Village, while respecting the different characteristics of the two Sites;
 - 72.2 Create a clear public address and activation of the adjacent streets;
 - 72.3 Provide clear and legible circulation and accommodating carparking and servicing discretely in a manner that does not visually dominate the public realm;
 - 72.4 Provide a clear pedestrian connection between the two Sites;

- 72.5 Create a strong social heart to the Village that is legible and easily accessed for residents and visitors;
 - 72.6 Configure buildings to respond to environmental conditions – sunlight, wind and views;
 - 72.7 Ensure the site layout and building designs reflect CPTED principles;
 - 72.8 Distribute building mass in a manner that respects the use and amenity of surrounding properties;
 - 72.9 Articulate large building forms to reduce visual mass by creating recesses and varied façade treatment;
 - 72.10 For higher buildings, recess top floors to articulate building form and mass;
 - 72.11 Maximise opportunities to accommodate specimen trees and underplanting to contribute a vegetated quality to the Village;
 - 72.12 Contribute positively to the neighbourhood character through building design, use of materials and colours and landscape treatment.
- 73 In addition, specifically for the Bishopspark Site:
- 73.1 Retain the former Chapel as a valued historical feature that contributes to the Site’s distinctive character and contributes to the Village’s social hub;
 - 73.2 Reference the history of the Site by reflecting the modulation of the former Bishop’s residence and the creation of a solid brick base and dark articulated roof in the design of new buildings.
- 74 And for the Peterborough Site:
- 74.1 Acknowledge the openness of the Park Terrace / Salisbury Street corner by concentrating building mass to the Park Terrace frontage;
 - 74.2 Maximise visual connection to Hagley Park and the Avon River.
- 75 In addition to these design principles, the layout and design of the Proposed Village has been informed by the DP planning context for the Sites, as I have described above.

Proposed Village

- 76 Following is a summary of key aspects of the Proposed Village for the Sites relevant to my assessment.

Bishopspark Site

- 77 The key features of the Bishopspark Site include:
- 77.1 The Site accommodates Buildings B01 – B04;
 - 77.2 The Site accommodates a mix of independent apartments, assisted living suites, and dementia, hospital and rest home care rooms;
 - 77.3 Building B01 is located at the centre of the Site with an area of approximately 3,952 m². It accommodates the Village centre, amenities, independent apartments and resident care area (which includes rest home, hospital, dementia care rooms, and assisted living suites). The distribution of these different uses is set out in detail in the AEE and evidence of Mr Richard McGowan. The building extends to four levels;
 - 77.4 Building B02 fronts Park Terrace and has an area of approximately 684 m². It accommodates one, two and three-bedroom apartments over five levels;
 - 77.5 Building B03 is located in the northern area of the Site. It has an area of approximately 859 m². It accommodates one and two-bedroom apartments over four levels. It also contains a theatre and activities room;
 - 77.6 Building B04 is located along the eastern boundary of the Site. The one and two-level building has an area of approximately 457 m². Level 1 includes common areas, library and storage areas. Level 2 accommodates a staff room;
 - 77.7 The former Bishop's Chapel will undergo earthquake strengthening works and will remain in its current location;
 - 77.8 The former Chapel provides a focal point for a central plaza which is the open space hub of the Village and centrally located in relation to the Village reception and various communal facilities;
 - 77.9 A number of landscaped amenity spaces are located between building wings and include a bowling green between Buildings B01 and B02, a pool and terrace area between the two northern wings of Building B01 and secure dementia garden between the southern wings of B01;

- 77.10 The main vehicular access to the central reception is from Park Terrace with access to the basement carpark provided under Building B02. Other than visitor carparking, all parking is located in a single basement carpark that extends under the various building footprints. Service access is located behind Building B03 off Dorset Street;
- 77.11 Pedestrian access to the main entrance is provided adjacent to the vehicular accessway. A second accessway is provided from Dorset Street to the central plaza space is provided through a landscaped laneway. Direct pedestrian access is provided from Park Terrace to the two Level 1 apartments that front Park Terrace. Access across Salisbury Street to the Peterborough Site is via Westwood Terrace;
- 77.12 Specimen trees are used through the Site to create a vegetated structure that complements the building forms. While much planting is located above the basement, in areas the slab sets down to accommodate tree pits. Specimen trees are also used to filter views to the Proposed Village from adjacent residential properties and contribute to the Park Terrace streetscape. Specimen trees will be complemented with mixed lower level planting. Continuity of plant species will provide a link to the Peterborough Site.
- 78 These features are clearly shown on the Landscape Concept Plan by Design Squared.

Peterborough Site

- 79 The key features of the Peterborough Site include:
- 79.1 The Site accommodates Buildings B07 and B08;
- 79.2 The Site provides independent apartments and a number of communal facilities;
- 79.3 Building B07 is located in the northern portion of the Site and has an area of approximately 2,047 m². The building is configured with two wings connected at the southern end of the ground level by a single-level entrance lobby / enclosed common area. Both the wings accommodate one, two and three-bedroom apartments. The eastern wing also accommodates a gym, pool and rubbish storage at Level 1 (ground). Level 3 of the western wing accommodates communal facilities including a dining area, kitchen, billiards room, library and meeting room. The eastern wing extends to five levels stepping down to four levels at the southern end. The western wing extends to seven levels, with the upper level set back from the main façade, and steps down to four levels in the southwestern portion of the building;

- 79.4 Building B08 is located in the southern area of the Site. It has an area of approximately 422 m² and accommodates one, two and three-bedroom apartments;
- 79.5 The two wings of Building B07 are separated by a communal plaza/garden that provides a north-south axis extending from Salisbury Street to the lobby/communal area pavilion;
- 79.6 Vehicular access to the Site is from Park Terrace to the south of Building B07 with a pick-up and drop-off area in front of the single-level connecting pavilion. Access to the basement, which accommodates all resident carparking, is provided from a continuation of this access via a ramp along the eastern boundary. Vehicles exit the Site onto Salisbury Street;
- 79.7 Pedestrian access is also provided from Park Terrace adjacent to the vehicular entrance and from Peterborough Street on the eastern side of Building B08. Resident access to the central courtyard is also provided from Salisbury Street. Individual entrances are provided from Park Terrace to the Level 1 apartments fronting Park Terrace. Pedestrian access to Building B08 is provided from the Peterborough Street on the eastern side of the building and from Building B07;
- 79.8 Specimen trees are used through the Site to create a vegetated structure that complements the building forms. Much of the planting is located above the basement. Specimen trees are also used to filter views to the Proposed Village from adjacent residential properties and contribute to the Park Terrace streetscape. The scheduled mature tree adjacent to the Peterborough Street frontage will be retained. Specimen trees will be complemented with mixed lower level planting. Continuity of plant species will provide a link to the Bishopspark Site.
- 80 These features are clearly shown on the Landscape Concept Plan by Design Squared.

ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

- 81 My assessment has been carried out from: analysing the architectural drawings, landscape concept plans and visual simulations; carrying out site visits; reviewing relevant planning provisions; and reviewing feedback from the Council's UDP and technical reviewers.

Urban design assessment

82 At a broad level, my urban design assessment was guided by the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (2005) (NZUDP)¹. The NZUDP seeks to make our cities healthy, safe and attractive places where business, social and cultural life can flourish. It identifies seven essential design qualities that together create quality urban design. These are:

Context: seeing buildings, places and spaces as part of whole towns and cities;

Character: reflecting and enhancing the distinctive character, heritage and identity of our urban environment;

Choice: ensuring diversity and choice for people;

Connections: enhancing how different networks link together for people;

Creativity: encouraging innovative and imaginative solutions;

Custodianship: ensuring design is environmentally sustainable, safe and healthy;

Collaboration: communicating and sharing knowledge across sectors, professions and with communities.

83 At a more detailed level, my assessment is informed by the DP framework. This framework articulates how the factors identified in the NZUDP are to be achieved in this particular location in inner Christchurch. The Site is located in the Residential Central City zone. I have set out the relevant DP provisions that informed my assessment above. In particular, my assessment is made in the context of the matters for discretion that apply to the Proposed Village.

84 My assessment is also guided by the built form standards in the DP as:

84.1 The DP directs that the effects of exceedances of the built form standards be expressly considered (Rule 14.6.1.3.RD5, Rule 14.15.27, Rule 14.15.28, Rule 14.15.29 and Rule 14.15.30 in this case); and

84.2 More generally, the built form standards are part of the assessment context in that they provide an indication of the scale of activities / buildings generally anticipated by the DP and the effects that are generally considered appropriate in the Residential Central City Zone (noting some properties

¹ RA Skidmore Urban Design Ltd. is a founding signatory to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (2005).

may have unique characteristics). For example, height in relation to boundary standards are set to maintain adequate privacy and sunlight access to adjoining properties and avoid over-dominance. Building setback standards seek to ensure the amenity of adjacent streets and neighbouring properties is maintained. Height standards are applied generally across the zone to provide an indication of the intended scale of development. I note that a higher limit is applied specifically to the Peterborough Site in light of its particular characteristics.

- 85 Overall, I consider there is a reasonable expectation for considerable change in the neighbourhood based on the site characteristics and the wider context and planning context. The built form standards provide a relevant guide as to the degree of change, and therefore the scale of development that can generally be readily and appropriately accommodated by the environment. I note however that the built form standards do not establish a 'permitted baseline'.
- 86 I also note that the former towers on the Peterborough Site do not provide a baseline for assessment of effects. Nevertheless, this former environment does provide an indication of character and amenity expectations in this Central City location.
- 87 My assessment is also informed by the Ministry of Justice "National Guidelines for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design In New Zealand" and the Council's 'Safer Canterbury: Creating Safer Communities' (2004). These guidelines set out how the design of buildings and the arrangement of streets, parks and other outdoor spaces can influence the opportunity for crime and the level of fear of crime. It sets out ways that environmental design can help prevent crime and make an environment feel safer and more comfortable.

Landscape and visual effects assessment

- 88 The methodology I used for the assessment of landscape and visual effects is consistent with the NZ Institute of Landscape Architect's 'Landscape Assessment and Sustainable Management Best Practice Guide (10.1)'.
- 89 *Landscape* is the cumulative expression of natural and cultural features, patterns and processes in a geographical area, including human perceptions and associations. The following assessment evaluates the effects of the Proposed Village on landscape character and amenity in relation to the landscape features of the area identified in Section 4 above.
- 90 *Visual* effects are somewhat different from many other environmental factors because their assessment requires information on perceptions as well as on resources. Because

visual experience is a combination of physical stimulus and psychological response, some aspects of visual effects are undeniably subjective. To understand and assess the visual effects of a project, we must therefore understand not only the project and its context, but also anticipate the probable responses of the people who will see it.

- 91 While the Sites form part of an established neighbourhood, I note that due to the earthquakes, the area has, and continues to experience a greater level of change than is often the case in established neighbourhoods. For example, the Peterborough Site previously contained residential towers that were considerably higher than the Proposed Village. Further, a number of sites in the immediate vicinity have been recently redeveloped, are currently under construction, have resource consents for re-development, or remain vacant.
- 92 My assessment analyses the potential landscape and visual effects that may be generated by the Proposed Village. My visual effects assessment is based on:
- 92.1 The background and context within which the Proposed Village will be viewed;
 - 92.2 The proportion of the Proposed Village that will be visible, determined by the observer's position relative to the objects being viewed;
 - 92.3 The number and type of viewers and their location in relation to the Sites;
 - 92.4 Comments provided in public submissions that assist in understanding people's perceptions; and
 - 92.5 The ability to mitigate any identified adverse visual effects.
- 93 My assessment identifies the groups that comprise the primary viewing audience and sets out an assessment of visual effects in relation to each of these groups.
- 94 There is a distinction between the magnitude of change resulting from the Proposed Village (when viewed by the various groups comprising the viewing audience), and the effect resulting from that change.
- 95 The magnitude of visual change resulting from the Proposed Village will vary considerably for the different groups that comprise the viewing audience. The magnitude of visual change is influenced by a number of factors including: the proportion of the view the Proposed Village occupies; the distance from the viewer;

the duration of the view (i.e. whether it is transient or static); and the contrast from the existing view.

- 96 While the magnitude of visual change may be high, the effect of that change may be viewed as positive or adverse depending on the perceptions of the viewer and may vary between different people that comprise the audience. The factors that contribute to the magnitude of the assessed effect resulting from the visual change include: sensitivity of the view to change; number of viewers; characteristics of the viewing group; and the viewer's values and attitudes towards the proposed activity. As discussed above, the DP framework provides some guidance on the reasonable expectation for change in the Residential Central City zone (e.g. as acknowledged in Rule 14.15.9).

URBAN DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSOCIATED AMENITY EFFECTS

Effects on the Wider Environment - Urban Structure and Character

- 97 While the Sites are physically separated, I consider the Bishopspark Site and the Peterborough Site will function as a single comprehensive care retirement village. The Sites are well-located in close proximity to a broad range of amenities and services within Central Christchurch. In particular, the Sites are in close proximity to the evolving arts precinct that contains the Canterbury Museum, Arts Centre and Art Gallery. Of particular value is the direct relationship of the Sites to Hagley Park providing both visual amenity and a distinctive recreation resource.
- 98 While the locational features of the Sites lend themselves to the establishment of a comprehensive care retirement village, there are a number of features of the Sites and their surrounding context that have required a tailored design response. While being mindful of the functional requirements of the Proposed Village, considerable effort has been applied to create a layout and collection of building forms and spaces that respond to the particular characteristics of the location. In my opinion, this outcome has been successfully achieved.

Bishopspark Site

- 99 The Bishopspark Site has an unusual boundary configuration. I consider the Site layout works with this configuration, responding to the differing characteristics of the various boundary interfaces. The Proposed Village layout has been designed to create a strong and direct axis from Park Terrace to the heart of the Village that provides the former Chapel as a distinctive focal point. The main Village entrance leads directly from Park Terrace to the main reception area within a visually light and highly glazed pavilion that provides a visual link to the Chapel beyond. The central

facilities provided within Building B01 have been configured to open onto a central courtyard that will function like a traditional village plaza.

- 100 The configuration and massing of the various building forms around this central communal focal area has been distributed in response to the characteristics of the surrounding land-uses, building forms and street characteristics.
- 101 In my opinion, the building forms have been visually broken into a cohesive series of distinct forms through:
- 101.1 Physical separation of the various building wings, while maintaining functional connectivity;
 - 101.2 Creation of a distinctive roofline, with the upper level of a number of building forms differentiated through set back and material differentiation; and
 - 101.3 Façade articulation created through the patterns created between solids and voids and recessed balconies, and subtle variations in materials and colours.
- 102 While accommodating an efficient site layout, the buildings have been configured around a series of communal open spaces. As noted above, the primary open space focus is located around the former Chapel. To the north this links directly with a linear open space that connects through to Dorset Street. In my opinion, this will create a 'green linkage' that complements the more formal spatial qualities and character of the Village square. In the western area of the Site, a bowling green between Buildings B01 and B02 will provide a recreational focus accessed directly from the main east-west axis through the Site. An enclosed and secure garden space will provide a passive amenity area and outlook space for the two dementia wings of Building B01 in the southern area of the Site. A courtyard area containing a pool and communal terrace also provides an amenity space between the eastern and western wings of the northern part of Building B01. This area is accessed directly from the dining room within the communal facilities core.
- 103 In my opinion, the Site layout provides legible and direct circulation around the Site in a manner that is uncluttered by surface parking. The majority of carparking is located in a basement accessed directly off the main entrance from Park Terrace under Building B02. Servicing is discretely located with access provided from Dorset Street adjacent to the eastern boundary.

Peterborough Site

- 104 The Peterborough Site is located on a prominent corner of Park Terrace, with the intersection with Salisbury Street having an open curved alignment. The street configuration creates a pocket park on the street corner within the road reserve. The Peterborough Site has a more regular proportion being generally rectangular with a narrower southern extension linking to Peterborough Street.
- 105 In my opinion, the proposed Site configuration responds to its prominent corner location and relationship to Hagley Park by creating a strong definition to the western edge and stepping down to the east to interface with the lower adjacent buildings fronting Salisbury Street.
- 106 In response to an earlier concept design, the UDP suggested exploring how the Peterborough Site could better reflect its neighbourhood, and its specific Christchurch context, giving the example of expressing penthouse suites as a legible roof level.
- 107 To respond to those comments, considerable amendments were made to the architectural concept for the Site. In particular, these amendments included a revised approach to the roof design and the way the vertical termination of the building is expressed, with the upper level of the western wing of Building B07 set back from the primary facades and utilising a distinctive roofline and contrasting material. The overall material palette was also revised to better reflect the Christchurch context and provide cohesion with the Bishopspark Site. In my opinion, these were positive changes resulting in a building form that better reflects its context.
- 108 In my opinion, the western wing of Building B07 will act as a suitable marker of the street corner. The Proposed Village expresses a strong design aesthetic and high architectural quality that will make a positive contribution to the evolving character of this area.
- 109 The UDP also suggested reducing the scale and dominance of the building fronting Park Terrace.
- 110 As noted above, the architectural concept for the Site was considerably revised in response to the UDP feedback. The western wing of Building B07 retains seven levels stepping down to four levels at the southern end. However, the vertical scale, as perceived from the surrounding environment, was reduced by stepping the upper level back from the Park Terrace façade and expressing it as a differentiated roof form. The base of the building is also more clearly expressed, so that the overall building form is vertically broken into a clear base, middle and top. Further refinement of the material palette and the introduction of feature louvres and timber soffits to the balconies also assists to soften the building form and reduces its dominance in relation to the

adjacent street. In my opinion, these changes have resulted in a more nuanced design response that better responds to the wider neighbourhood character.

- 111 The Site configuration adopts an efficient and legible structure, with vehicular access connecting through from Park Terrace and Salisbury Street with the main entrance and communal focus located in a highly glazed pavilion between the two primary building elements. This pavilion provides the southern edge to a landscaped plaza that creates a strong pedestrian north-south axis through the Site to Salisbury Street.
- 112 Building B08 has a less direct relationship to the core of the Site, being more directly related to Peterborough Street. In my opinion, the location of Building B08 creates a positive engagement with and frontage to Peterborough Street and provides a secondary entrance to the Proposed Village.

Overall Village

- 113 While located on two Sites separated by Salisbury Street and able to function separately, the Proposed Village has been designed to function as a single, comprehensive care retirement village. In my opinion the configuration and distribution of accommodation types and communal facilities is appropriate within the inner city urban environment.
- 114 The structure for the Sites and the distribution of accessways, open spaces and building mass has been carefully determined in response to the characteristics of the surrounding context.
- 115 While the building forms for the Sites differ in proportion, reflecting the differing site qualities, I consider they express a cohesive design language that will read as a single Village entity. In a similar vein, consistency within the planting palette will also assist to create a cohesive Village character.
- 116 In my opinion, collectively the Proposed Village will make a positive contribution to the evolving urban character of this area as it recovers from extensive earthquake damage.

Street Interface

Bishopspark Site

Drawing reference: S01 A0-030, B02A2-010, SK100, SK102 and the Visual Simulation package

- 117 The Proposed Village has a primary street address to Park Terrace with the main village access from this street. Building B02 is located and configured to have a direct relationship to the street. This maximises the amenity for residents to enjoy an outlook over the street and beyond but also effectively creates a positive edge

and activation of the street environment. In response to feedback provided by the UDP, the two ground floor units were configured and designed to provide direct pedestrian access to the adjacent street. This access is via outdoor terraces that lead directly to the living space. These terraces are slightly elevated above street level, providing a suitable edge definition and sense of privacy. In my opinion this configuration creates a positive integration with the public realm.

- 118 I consider the setback between Building B02 and the street will enable planting that complements both the building form and streetscape to create a positive edge treatment. The boundary treatment will consist of a mix of brick raised planters and open style aluminium fencing with specimen trees and hedging in front of the fence (see Visual Simulation from Viewpoint 1-2 and SK102 of the Design Squared drawing set). In my opinion, the proposed boundary treatment is compatible with the range of boundary treatments along the corridor. Given the busy character of Park Terrace, many properties have relatively solid and high boundary walls to provide privacy. In my opinion, the proposed boundary treatment strikes an appropriate balance between openness and solidity, with the hedging contributing to the vegetated quality of the streetscape.
- 119 Building B02 has five levels and exceeds the 14 m height standard by a maximum of 4.238 m. The top level of the building is clearly differentiated from the primary building form by being set back from the main facades, having a different façade treatment that utilises a different material and patterning of solid and void and providing an angled roof profile. In my opinion, the building design provides a positive vertical termination. Given the broad dimension of Park Terrace and the open character of the Avon River corridor and Hagley Park to the west, I consider the vertical scale proposed will provide a suitable level of enclosure to the street.
- 120 The UDP suggested there was scope for the setback from the Park Terrace frontage to be reduced to 3 m if offset by the addition of appropriately large scale trees and ensuring direct street access to the ground floor apartments. While the primary building façade complies with the 4 m setback, the ground level terraces and upper level balconies project into the setback by up to 1 m. Direct access from the ground level units is provided to Park Terrace. In my opinion, the proposed boundary and landscape treatment strikes an appropriate balance between defining the boundary and creating some separation from the street, while creating a positive and engaging interface.
- 121 The Bishopspark Site has a narrower frontage to Dorset Street, with the end of Building B03 fronting this street. The upper level is set back from the primary façade facing the street. The feature

roof treatment of the four-level building results in a small exceedance of the 14 m permitted height standard (dimension of infringement 1.15 m). As with Building B02, the upper level of the building is clearly differentiated and creates a positive vertical termination to the building. In my opinion, Building B03 creates a positive street interface with large areas of glazing and balconies overlooking the street. I consider that the narrow width of the building results in a scale and proportion that sits comfortably in its street context.

- 122 Overall, I conclude that the Proposed Village will create a positive address to the streets adjacent to the Bishopspark Site in a manner that enhances the streetscape character.

Peterborough Site

Drawing reference: S02 A0-030, SK100, SK103 and the Visual Simulation package

- 123 The Proposed Village layout acknowledges the primacy of the Park Terrace frontage and the importance of its intersection with Salisbury Street by creating a strong built edge and address to Park Terrace. As with the Bishopspark Site, an earlier concept design was amended in response to a recommendation from the UDP to provide direct street access from the ground floor units. The four ground floor units fronting Park Terrace have individual street addresses with pedestrian accessways directly from the street to units. At level 3, communal amenities include dining and outdoor terraces directly overlook the street and Hagley Park beyond. At all other levels, units are oriented to provide living spaces and balconies overlooking the street and landscape beyond.
- 124 The boundary treatment along Park Terrace will consist of mixed brick wall and open style aluminium fencing, with specimen trees and other planting (see Visual Simulations from Viewpoint 2-5 and Viewpoint 2-501 and SK103 of the Design Squared drawing set). In my opinion, the proposed boundary treatment strikes an appropriate balance between solidity and openness to create definition and enclosure of outdoor terraces and maintaining good engagement with the adjacent street.
- 125 The DP recognises the suitability of the Peterborough Site to accommodate an increased scale of buildings with a 20 m height standard applying across the Site. The Proposed Village provides a more nuanced massing that creates increased scale at the northern portion of the western edge of the Site (the western wing of Building B07) that responds to the open aspect of the street intersection. This scale steps down to a lower form along the eastern edge (the eastern wing of Building B07) and steps down to the south and the interface with the neighbouring dwelling. The western wing exceeds the height standard by a maximum of 4.976 m, accommodating seven levels.

- 126 In my opinion, the Building B07 design adopts a clear and elegant architectural concept that expresses a differentiated base, middle and top. In a similar vein to the architectural concept adopted for the Bishopspark Site, the upper level is clearly differentiated as a terminating element. Portions of the primary façade extends above the balcony of the top level creating a stepped parapet that forms the balustrade to the balcony. At this top level, the building form itself is setback from the primary frontage, reducing its prominence in relation to the immediately adjacent street.
- 127 The horizontal mass of Building B07 is broken down by stepping the building away from its highest point at the street corner to four levels at the southern end. The creation of a series of linked building forms with a vertical emphasis is created through physical stepping and angling of the primary façade/ balconies, variation in materials and patterns of glazing. Visual richness of the façade is further achieved through the layering and shadowing created through recessed balconies, use of louvers, and application of timber-look aluminium battens to the soffits.
- 128 As the Proposed Village turns the corner to Salisbury Street, a clear visual break between the two primary wings is created with views to the low-level, visually light entry pavilion beyond. The five-level eastern wing complements the more prominent building form along the primary Park Terrace frontage, providing a transition to the lower, neighbouring apartments.
- 129 While the end walls of the two building wings are located to create a strong street edge, I consider that, with the physical break between the wings, the associated planting of specimen trees and the articulation of the end walls, Building B07 will create a positive street interface that is suitable in its urban setting (see Visual Simulations from Viewpoint 2-502 and Viewpoint 2-503). In my opinion, the scale of the proposed buildings is suitable in relation to the wide and open dimension of the Park Terrace / Salisbury Street intersection and the broad dimension of Salisbury Street itself.
- 130 The UDP suggested maximising windows on the north façade to Salisbury Street, both for internal amenity of apartments and to minimise the visual dominance of sheer walls. In response, the extent of glazing on the northern façade of Building B07 was considerably increased, with floor to ceiling opening windows from living spaces providing a positive engagement with Salisbury Street. In my opinion, this change has improved the visual quality of the building and improved its engagement with the adjacent street.
- 131 In my opinion, the two building forms are well articulated with variations in materials and glazing used to create a formal and elegant organisation to the buildings. Overlooking and

engagement with the adjacent street environment is achieved through generous areas of glazing. While the Salisbury Street building frontages will be viewed as secondary to the Park Terrace frontage, I consider this is appropriate in relation to the street hierarchy. In my opinion, the Proposal, including the two wings of Building B07 and the adjacent specimen tree planting, will provide a positive street interface.

- 132 Building B08 presents its narrow end to Peterborough Street with a secondary façade stepped back from the primary frontage. It is the living space in the apartments at each level that extends to the primary frontage. I consider the generous glazing and balconies off these living rooms provide a positive engagement with the adjacent street. The primary building form is three levels, with the fourth level stepped back considerably from the street front and differentiated through material change and creation of a roof form that echoes other building forms in the Proposed Village.
- 133 The stepping of the primary frontage enables the retention of the prominent Common Lime tree adjacent to the street edge.
- 134 Overall, I consider the Proposed Village will create an elegant building form that creates an appropriate edge to this important Park Terrace street corridor, the Park Terrace / Salisbury Street intersection, Salisbury Street and Peterborough Street.

Amenity of Surrounding Properties

- 135 A comprehensive and iterative design process has been used to develop the Proposed Village design. This process included consideration of the characteristics of surrounding properties in order to maintain a suitable level of amenity for them, having regard to the site configuration, building proximity, orientation and existing features of these properties as far as practicable. This process also recognised the site constraints and the need to provide for the range of accommodation, amenities and functional and operational requirements required on the Site.

Bishopspark Site

Plan Reference: S01 A0-070 and S01 A0-071

- 136 The extent of the Proposed Village building envelope as it relates to the DP built form standards is shown in Sheets A0-070 and A0-071. A detailed shading analysis in relation to surrounding properties is provided in Appendix 1 to my Report Addendum (Further Information response dated 17th November 2020).

108 Park Terrace

- 137 Adjacent to 108 Park Terrace, the proposed Building B02 extends to five levels, and projects through the height and recession plane standards. There is also a small projection through the recession plane off the western boundary for the western wing of Building B01.

- 138 Construction of a consented six-storey apartment building has begun at 108 Park Terrace. The building has been designed to orient away from the Bishopspark Site, with a relatively solid southern façade designed to avoid overlooking of the Site. The upper level of the building is also designed with a generous setback from the primary building facades.
- 139 The northern units of Building B02 are generally oriented to the east and west with solid (albeit stepped) walls facing 108 Park Terrace. This design avoids overlooking of this property. The exception is the eastern unit at the top level of Building B02, which has a deck opening from the lounge wrapping around the northern face of the building. The parapet of the floor below forms a solid balustrade to the deck. Given the orientation and setback of the neighbouring apartment building, I consider undue overlooking will be avoided.
- 140 Similarly, while a portion of the upper level of the western wing of Building B01 projects through the recession plane of the eastern boundary of 108 Park Terrace, given the setback and orientation of apartments in the consented building, I consider undue overlooking from the Proposed Village will be avoided.
- 141 In my opinion, based on the characteristics of the building at 108 Park Terrace and the Proposed Village, the adverse overlooking/privacy amenity effects of the Proposed Village will be less than minor.
- 142 The Proposed Village will cause shading at 108 Park Terrace. In mid-winter, the shading gradually moves off the property and by 1pm it is mostly free from shade. During the Equinox, the shading moves off the property earlier in the day. In mid-summer, the shading only extends onto a small portion of the rear of the property at one point in the morning. In comparison to the magnitude of shading that would result from a building complying with the built form standards, for a short time between the Equinox and mid-summer, the Proposed Village will result in a very small area of additional shading will be cast over the driveway and roof of the apartment building. As the property will only receive limited shading at different times of the day through the year, I consider the adverse amenity effects resulting from the shade generated by the Proposed Village will be less than minor.
- 5/2A and 6/2A Dorset Street*
- 143 5/2A Dorset Street contains a 3-level townhouse, and 6/2A Dorset Street contains a 2-level townhouse. The units are oriented to the north with their primary outdoor living spaces to the north between the dwellings and Dorset Street, which open out from indoor living spaces. The dwellings have a generous setback from the Site boundary, accommodating vehicle manoeuvring and garaging. At the upper level, bedrooms with ensuites are located

on the southern side of the dwellings. The third level of Unit 5 is located towards the northern side of the site, with the roofline sloping down to the south.

- 144 The shorter end wall of the western wing of Proposed Building B01 faces these properties. In this location, part of Building B01 exceeds the recession plane standard. The portion of Building B01 that exceeds the standard will look towards the roofline of the dwellings and will not result in overlooking of the first floor bedrooms.
- 145 In my opinion, the buildings are suitably separated to ensure that the adverse overlooking/privacy amenity effects the Proposed Village on these properties will be less than minor.
- 146 Being located to the south of these properties, the Proposed Village will not result in shading of these properties.
- 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16 Dorset Street*
- 147 The units at 2-16 Dorset Street (the Dorset Street Flats) are configured over two levels in two buildings. The units are currently being renovated. As with the neighbouring units at 2A Dorset Street, these units have a primary orientation to the north with their outdoor living spaces (in the form of courtyards at ground level and balconies at the upper level) on the northern side of the property, facing away from the Site. The consent drawings for the building alterations show the southern building facades as being relatively solid with both small scale windows and larger windows screened with louvres.
- 148 Rather than presenting a single building form along the boundary with the Dorset Street Flats, the shorter end walls of an eastern and western wing of Building B01 face these properties. The wings are separated by a communal courtyard. Windows on the northern face of proposed Building B01 have associated angled louvres to avoid overlooking. A single unit is located at the upper level (Level 4) of each wing of Building B01. These units open to an upper level deck, with the parapet of floor below creating a solid balustrade to the balcony. These units will look across the top of the Dorset Street Flats and will not look into the units.
- 149 Overall, given the characteristics of Building B01 and the orientation of the Dorset Street Flat units, I consider any adverse overlooking/privacy effects on the Dorset Street Flats from the Proposed Village will be negligible.
- 150 The Proposed Village will result in a small amount of shading of Units 12 and 16 at the Equinox only. For Unit 12, the shading will fall on the first floor unit and extend across the kitchen window for a short time. By 10am, the shade has completely moved off the property. For Unit 16, the shading will fall on the ground floor unit

and extend across the kitchen window for a short time. By 10am, the shade has completely moved off the property. In my opinion, the adverse amenity effects of this shading of Units 12 and 16 will be less than minor given the small amount, and where it occurs.

4A Dorset Street

- 151 A resource consent has been granted to reconstruct the former 'stables' building at 4A Dorset Street. The consented building contains garaging at ground level and a one-bedroom unit at the upper level. The building is located 600 mm off the Site boundary. The unit is contained in the roof space that rakes away from the Site. A row of windows from the kitchen and hallway punctuate the dormer roofline facing the Site.
- 152 The end walls of Building B01 facing this property are punctuated with narrow vertical windows. However, these windows will have associated louvres that will avoid views to the unit. As a result, in my opinion, the adverse overlooking/privacy effects of the Proposed Village on 4A Dorset Street will be less than minor.
- 153 The Proposed Village will result in shading at this property. In mid-winter and through to the Equinox, there will be shading over the upper-level unit in the morning. This shading will have fully moved off the property by the middle of the day in mid-winter and by 10am at the Equinox. The additional mid-winter shading over and above the shading that would result from a building complying with the built form standards is marginal. In my opinion, the adverse amenity effects of this shading will be less than minor because of the limited duration of shading in the day, the limited times of the year shading will occur and the extent of shading generally accepted in this zone.

18 Dorset Street

- 154 The north-eastern wing of Building B01 interfaces with western portion of the rear boundary of 18 Dorset Street. The upper levels project through the recession plane standard and the northeastern corner clips the height standard. The northern end of Building B03 interfaces with the property's eastern boundary. The upper level of this building also projects through the recession plane and the height standards.
- 155 The property at 18 Dorset Street contains a 3-level dwelling. This dwelling also has a primary orientation to the north. From Dorset Street, a driveway runs along the eastern boundary adjacent to the Site, accessing carparking at the rear of the property. The dwelling is therefore located towards the street front of the property. A stairwell is located along the southern building edge. At the middle level, bedrooms (with windows) and a bathroom run along the eastern side of the dwelling. The living and kitchen spaces are located at the upper level, with a large skylight in the steeply sloping roof.

- 156 Windows in the northern façade of Building B01 are screened by angled louvres avoiding overlooking of this property. Proposed Building B03 is configured with apartments oriented towards 18 Dorset Street. However, I consider suitable separation is provided between Building B03 and the adjacent dwelling.
- 157 Given the location and orientation of the dwelling at 18 Dorset Street and the location and design of Buildings B01 and B03, and in the context of the built form standards for the zone, I consider the Proposed Village will not result in undue overlooking.
- 158 In my opinion, the adverse overlooking/privacy effects of the Proposed Village on 18 Dorset Street will be less than minor.
- 159 Being located to the south of 18 Dorset Street, the Proposed Village will not result in shading of this property.

155 Victoria Street

- 160 The four-storey Building B03 is located adjacent to this property. Building B03 projects slightly above the recession plane standard off the eastern boundary where it interfaces with 155 Victoria Street.
- 161 The property at 155 Victoria Street is currently being redeveloped, with the five storey Centro Hotel under construction. The resource consent for the mixed-use development on this property locates access and carparking adjacent to the Site. The proposed hotel includes a number of rooms oriented towards the Bishopspark Site.
- 162 Building B03 contains limited glazing in the direction of this property, and is substantially setback from the hotel units. In my opinion, any overlooking/privacy effects on the development will be avoided.
- 163 The Proposed Village will result in a small amount of shading extending into the western edge of this property, where access and carparking is located. In the late afternoon, this shading extends to the hotel rooms at the rear of the building, although this shading is less than would result from a building complying with the built form standards. Overall, I consider the adverse shading amenity effects on this property will be less than minor because of the short-term nature of the hotel use and the minimal extent of shading.

Other Victoria Street properties

- 164 These properties are located to the east of the Bishopspark Site. The properties are used for commercial purposes, which I consider are less sensitive to change than residential properties. Buildings B03 and B04 are located on the eastern boundary of the Bishopspark Site. Building B04 is located close to the eastern boundary. Buildings B03 and B04 project, to a very small extent,

through the recession plane off this boundary. In my opinion, the scale of the Proposed Village is appropriate in this context and will not adversely overlook or affect the privacy or shading amenity of the adjacent commercial properties.

13, 15 and 17 Salisbury Street

- 165 The properties at 13, 15 and 17 Salisbury Street adjoin the southern boundary of the Bishopspark Site in the vicinity of the southern wings of Building B01. In this location, small portions of the southern end of the eastern dementia wing of Building B01 project through the recession plane and an area of the feature roof form projects through the height plane.
- 166 17 Salisbury Street is adjacent to the eastern dementia wing of Building B01. A row of 6 two-level townhouses, with each dwelling accessed from Westwood Terrace, has recently been constructed at 17 Salisbury Street. The outdoor living spaces for these townhouses are located on the western side of units. The northern wall of Unit 6, facing the Bishopspark Site, has limited windows and does not look directly into the Bishopspark Site. In my opinion, the Proposed Village will not result in overlooking to an extent that diminishes the amenity of this property.
- 167 During mid-winter, extensive shading will extend across this property during the day. However, the shading experienced over and above that resulting from a building complying with the built form standards will be for a limited time and extent. At the Equinox, the shading is limited to Unit 6, and the additional shading is limited to the garden of Unit 6 towards the end of the day. I consider the overall adverse shading amenity effects will be less than minor for Units 1 – 5 due to the lack of shading for most of the year, with the shading experienced in mid-winter being generally consistent with that which would be enabled by the built form standards. For Unit 6 I consider the adverse shading effect to be minor as this unit will be extensively shaded in winter and through to the Equinox either side of winter, but not considerably more than the extent of shading generally accepted in this zone. Given the inner-city location, and having regard to the scale of development anticipated in the zone, I consider the extent of shading to be acceptable.
- 168 The property at 15 Salisbury Street contains a two-level dwelling. This property is located adjacent to the garden courtyard between the two dementia wings of Building B01. In my opinion, the Proposed Village configuration will ensure adverse overlooking/privacy amenity effects on this property will be less than minor.
- 169 This property will be extensively shaded in mid-winter, although the extent of the shading will not be any greater than that resulting from a building complying with the built form standard.

Around the Equinox, the very rear of the property will be variously shaded through the day, with the additional shading over and above that associated with the built form standard extending over only a small area near the rear boundary. This property has an extensive rear garden. In my opinion, the adverse shading amenity effects on this property will be less than minor because of the limited extent of shading over the extent of shading generally accepted in this zone.

170 The property at 13 Salisbury Street is adjacent and to the south of the western dementia wing of Building B01. It contains a two-level building set back from the rear boundary and accommodating four units. A large carport/garage is located adjacent to the boundary.

171 The adjacent dementia wing is configured with care rooms oriented away from this property. There are limited windows facing south towards 13 Salisbury Street and, at the upper level of this wing, service rooms are located at the southern end of the building. In the context of the Site layout of 13 Salisbury Street with vehicle storage and manoeuvring located adjacent to the Site, in my opinion, the Proposed Village will not result in overlooking that will diminish the amenity of this property.

172 The property will experience considerable shading in mid-winter, although only a small extent of the shading will be greater than that resulting from a building complying with the built form standard. The property will not experience shading at the Equinox and mid-summer. Overall, I consider adverse shading effects on the amenity of the units at 13 Salisbury Street will be less than minor given the limited extent of the shading.

5 Salisbury Street

173 The property at 5 Salisbury Street is currently vacant.

174 As this property is currently vacant, the Proposed Village will not cause any overlooking effects.

175 The Proposed Village will result in shade moving across the property at different times of day from mid-winter and either side to the equinox. The shading over and above that arising from a building comply with the built form standards is over a very small portion of the property. It is unlikely that this area would provide the primary outdoor living area for subsequent site development. Most of the property is free from shading all day. In my opinion, the adverse shading effects on this property will be less than minor.

84 Park Terrace

176 A recently constructed two-storey dwelling has recently been constructed at 84 Park Terrace. The dwelling has a primary

orientation towards Park Terrace with large windows providing views to the Park beyond. This property is separated from Building B02 by 90 Park Terrace. Given the separation and design of Building B02, I do not consider there will be any overlooking of this property.

177 The short rear boundary of this property adjoins the Site boundary in the vicinity of the south western wing of Building B01. This contains care and assisted living suites with two apartments on the top level with balconies oriented to face this property. Given the separation between building and the primary orientation of the dwelling at 84 Park Terrace, I consider adverse overlooking effects will be less than minor.

178 The Proposed Village will not shade the front portion of this property at any time throughout the year. The rear of the property will be extensively shaded in the morning and afternoon in mid-Winter but free from shade in the middle of the day. Around the Equinox the very rear of the property will be shaded for a short time in the early morning. Given the inner-city location of the property and location of the dwelling at 84 Park Terrace, I consider the adverse shading effects resulting from the Proposed Village will be less than minor.

90 Park Terrace

179 As written approval has been provided from the owner of 90 Park Terrace, I have not assessed amenity effects on this property.

Peterborough Site

180 The Peterborough Site has an increased height standard (20 m). As noted above, the Proposed Village has been designed to respond at a finer grain to the qualities of the Site and its surrounding context, rather than simply reflecting the height standard. This design response results in an increased vertical scale towards the northern portion of the Park Terrace frontage and a reduced scale to the eastern and southern areas of the Site that adjoin residential properties. As noted above, this Site previously contained residential towers up to 10 storeys (31m) (now demolished), which is an indication of the character and amenity that previously existed in this location.

181 The eastern wing of Building B07 sits well below the height plane, however small portions of the projecting wing walls infringe the recession plane off the eastern boundary. Building B08 only extends to four storeys. However, Building B08 is located on the very narrow portion of the Site connecting through to Peterborough Street. As a result, Building B08 projects through the recession planes on the eastern and western boundaries.

1-8/18 Salisbury Street

- 182 The property at 18 Salisbury Street contains two rows of two storey townhouses. These have solid end walls facing the Peterborough Site. The elevated balconies are recessed within the main building form and include movable louvres across the front, which limits any overlooking of these units.
- 183 This property sits to the east of Building B07. Building B07 is separated from the eastern boundary by the accessway and sits comfortably within the height standard for this Site, while marginally extending through the recession plane off this boundary.
- 184 Given the characteristics of the townhouses and Building B07, I do not consider the Proposed Village will result in overlooking that will diminish the amenity of this property.
- 185 The Proposed Village will result in shading of this property. The shading will be extend across parts of the property in the late afternoon. In all cases, the shading is less than the shading that would result from a building complying with the built form standards. This property doesn't have any outdoor living spaces that could be affected by shading (its balconies are covered with a roof and wing walls). In my opinion, the adverse shading effects on this property will be less than minor.

15 Peterborough Street

- 186 The property to the east of Building B08 at 15 Peterborough Street contains an apartment building comprising four connected blocks with Blocks C and B extending to six levels (with a mezzanine on the sixth level). The units have balconies off the living spaces, which face west towards the Site.
- 187 Building B08 projects through the recession plane off the boundary with 15 Peterborough Street. It is configured with its primary orientation away from 15 Peterborough Street, with relatively narrow windows on the western façade. In my opinion, any adverse overlooking effects of Building B08 on this property will be negligible.
- 188 The Proposed Village will result in some shading of 15 Peterborough Street in the late afternoon in mid-winter and mid-summer. This shading will not be greater than the shading that would result from a building complying with the built form standards. Around the Equinox, shade will move onto and across the property in the afternoon. However, it is only for a short time that this shading exceeds the shading from a building complying with the built form standards. I note that dense planting along the boundary within the property currently shades the lower level apartments. In my opinion, where the additional shading will fall on indoor and balcony living spaces, albeit for a limited time, the

Proposed Village will result in minor adverse shading amenity effects. For all other units, the adverse shading amenity effects will be less than minor.

12 Peterborough Street / 54 Park Terrace

- 189 As written approval has been provided from the owner of 12 Peterborough Street, I have not assessed amenity effects on this property.

62 Park Terrace

- 190 This property is located to the west of Building B08, and is currently vacant. The southern end of Building B08 interfaces with the eastern boundary of this property. Building B08 projects through the recession plane in this location, with the upper level including a balcony oriented towards this property. In my opinion, given the current undeveloped nature of the Site, the adverse overlooking effects on this property will be less than minor.

- 191 The Proposed Village will result in some shading of this property. In mid-winter, the property will be largely shaded in the morning with the shade moving across and off the property in the afternoon. The additional shading over and above that associated with a building complying with the built form standards will extend across the central area of the property in the middle of the day. At the Equinox, the property will be shaded in the morning, with only a small additional area of shadow across the property over this period. In mid-summer, the property will be shaded for a short period in the morning, with only a small area of additional shading in the eastern portion of the site. In my opinion, given the current undeveloped nature of the Site, the adverse shading amenity effects on this property will be less than minor.

76 Park Terrace

- 192 The property at 76 Park Terrace is located to the south of the western wing of Building B07 and to the west of Building B08. This property contains a two-level dwelling. At ground level, the western end of the dwelling contains a living space opening to a porch/sunroom to the north. At the eastern end, a family room opens onto an outdoor living space to the north and east. At the upper level bedrooms have windows to the north. Dense vegetation is located along the northern boundary with the Site.

- 193 The Peterborough Site layout has been configured with the main entrance off Park Terrace located adjacent to this property. As a result, the western wing of Building B07 is set back from the boundary. While the western wing of Building B07 does extend above the height plane by up to 5.09 m at one point and a corner projects slightly through the recession plane, it steps down to a four storey element at its southern end adjacent to this property.

- 194 At these lower levels, the southern apartments of Building B07 include windows from the lounge and kitchen area that face the neighbouring property, but the primary orientation of the apartments is to the west, looking out to Park Terrace and Hagley Park beyond. With the separation and vegetation along the neighbour's boundary, and in the context of the inner city residential environment, I consider undue overlooking will be avoided.
- 195 The southern wall of the higher building form projects more substantially through the recession plane, although it is set back further from the boundary. At these upper levels of the building, windows at the southern end of the building provide light into the corridors. Considering the intermittent use of corridors and the distance from the boundary, I consider any undue overlooking of the property at 76 Park Terrace will be avoided and the adverse effects will be less than minor.
- 196 Building B08 also interfaces with the rear boundary of this property, with the upper two levels including elements that project through the recession plane off the boundary. The building includes apartments with an orientation towards this property with glazing and balconies facing the property. The two top level apartments are setback from the primary façade with their balconies projecting to the façade edge. While there will be some overlooking from the upper levels of Building B08, given the location of the dwelling at 76 Park Terrace towards the front of the property and its primary orientation to the north and west, I consider adequate separation is provided to ensure resulting adverse amenity effects will be minor.
- 197 The Proposed Village will result in shading across much of this property in mid-winter. However, this shading is not greater than the shading that would be generated a building complying with the built form standards. At the Equinox, additional shading extends mostly across the driveway and northern boundary garden from mid-morning. In the middle of the day, the additional shadow does extend to the northern face of the dwelling. By 1pm, it moves off the dwelling. The shading does not extend to the outdoor terrace area adjacent to the dwelling. In mid-summer, a small portion of shading extends over an area of driveway and garage in mid-morning. This shading will not diminish the residential amenity to any noticeable extent. Overall, I consider the adverse shading effects on the amenity of this property will be minor.

On-Site Amenity

- 198 I understand there is no matter of discretion relating to on-site amenity. Nevertheless, I have briefly addressed this topic.

- 199 The Proposed Village has been designed to provide a premiere living environment that offers a range of accommodation options for the differing requirements and preferences of the future elderly residents. This design aligns well with the policy direction set out in the DP (including Policy 14.2.1.3 and Policy 14.2.1.8), although I note that on-site amenity is not a relevant matter of discretion for retirement villages under Rule 14.15.9.
- 200 The Proposed Village will be accommodated across two separate Sites. While this creates some dislocation, given the other benefits of the location described above, the separation is considered to be acceptable and assists to integrate the Proposed Village with its surrounding context. The Sites are separated by Salisbury Street and a new signalised pedestrian crossing is proposed to facilitate easy pedestrian movement.
- 201 The Proposed Village offers a diverse range of amenities including various dining and entertainment areas, library, craft room, pools and gym. While the communal amenities will be available for all residents across the Sites, both Sites accommodate key amenities for convenient access.
- 202 The Bishopspark Site contains a range of communal open spaces that are easily accessed from the primary circulation routes through the Site and from the indoor communal facilities. The spaces provide both active/social spaces where residents can feel included as part of the community and quieter more reflective spaces. The courtyard around the former Chapel will provide an open space focus for the Proposed Village.
- 203 The main outdoor space on the Peterborough Site is focussed on a landscaped terrace area. This terrace area provides a strong axis from Salisbury Street (with resident access provided from the street) though to the main entrance/lounge pavilion. The spaces contains an avenue of specimen trees, which will provide a vegetated outlook from apartments above.
- 204 I understand that Ryman has found that the creation of fragrant and colourful gardens is highly valued by residents. Full-time maintenance staff will actively manage the planting to ensure that on-going amenity is maintained.
- 205 The Sites have been designed to provide easy, safe and legible circulation around the Proposed Village. Resident carparking is discretely located below grade, so that carparking and vehicular movement does not dominate or detract from the amenity of the ground level spaces.
- 206 Overall, I consider the Proposed Village will provide a very high level of on-site amenity for its residents.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

- 207 My CPTED assessment was guided by the "*National Guidelines for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design In New Zealand*" prepared by the Ministry of Justice and the *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Guidelines by Safer Canterbury (2004)* as detailed in my Urban Design, Landscape and Visual Report.
- 208 Ryman is very aware of the importance of creating safe environments for its residents and CPTED principles are critical to the design of Ryman's villages. In my opinion, the CPTED principles set out in my report have been addressed in the Proposed Village design. A key aspect of the retirement village model that sets it apart from a more traditional suburb, is the creation of a shared living environment that includes a range of communal spaces and facilities. This sense of shared ownership and overarching management and maintenance makes a particular contribution to the safety of the Village.
- 209 As noted above, the layout of the Proposed Village provides safe and legible connections through the Village with clear sightlines to key destinations.
- 210 While the Proposed Village provides secure boundaries, it has also been designed to integrate and engage with its surrounding context. Buildings have been located, oriented and designed to front and provide eyes on the adjacent streets. This design assists to contribute to the safety of the surrounding environment.
- 211 At the detailed design phase, lighting of communal outdoor spaces will further contribute to the safety of the Village environment.

LANDSCAPE EFFECTS

Bishopspark Site

- 212 As set out in the evidence of Mr David Pearson, the Bishopspark Site has a long and rich history. For some time prior to its current vacancy, it accommodated a retirement village in a range of buildings. As many sites along the Park Terrace sustained considerable earthquake damage, the corridor has seen considerable deconstruction and some redevelopment since the earthquakes. In my opinion, the proposed Site layout, configuration of building forms and architectural expression is responsive to the characteristics of this primary street corridor and its other boundary interfaces.
- 213 In particular, the location of Building B02 and its orientation to create a strong and engaging edge to Park Terrace will make a positive contribution to the evolving character of the street corridor. As discussed in the urban design assessment above, the set back of the upper level and its distinctive treatment results in a

building scale that is suitable in relation to its immediate and wider context.

- 214 An overall design cohesion is adopted across the Site to reinforce an architectural style that is grounded in the Christchurch vernacular and referencing the former heritage of the Site. This design principle is described further in the evidence of Mr McGowan.
- 215 In my opinion, the provision of carparking in a basement is beneficial as it reduces the dominance of vehicle accessways and surface carparking above ground. However, it does place constraints on the ability to accommodate large specimen trees. Where possible, the basement has been set back from the boundaries and to provide additional depth to enable planting of specimen trees in some areas.
- 216 As shown in the Landscape Concept Plan, specimen trees will create a strong vegetated edge to Park Terrace and will assist to define the main axis into the Site. In other locations, a combination of specimen trees and lower level planting will provide a vegetated quality to the Proposed Village. In my opinion, the proposed planting, including the proposed amendments set out in the evidence of Sean Dixon will complement the built elements of the Proposed Village and will assist to embed the Village in its wider context. The scale of planting proposed is suitable for the inner city residential location.

Peterborough Site

- 217 As described above, the Peterborough Site has a number of characteristics that make it suitable to accommodate taller buildings as indicated by the higher height standard that applies to this site.
- 218 In my opinion, the proposed Site layout, configuration of buildings and architectural approach has responded to the qualities of the Peterborough Site and will make a positive contribution to the evolving character in this area of the city.
- 219 The scale and form of the western wing of Building B07 will provide a strong and engaging interface with Park Terrace in a manner that reinforces its intersection with Salisbury Street. The stepping down of the eastern wing provides a sensitive transition away from the street corner to the adjacent two-level townhouses. The single-level, pavilion-like connecting element creates a visual break between the two wings and provides a visual link into the Site from Salisbury Street.
- 220 As with the Bishopspark Site, the use of basement carparking for the Peterborough Site avoids a dominance of vehicle entrances, circulation and carparking above grade. However, it does create

some constraints to specimen tree planting. As shown in the Landscape Concept Plan, specimen trees are located around the periphery of the Site to create a soft green edge and will be used to reinforce the primary axes through the Peterborough Site. The specimen trees will be complemented by lower level planting. As with the Bishopspark Site, I consider the proposed planting will complement the built elements of the Proposed Village and will assist to embed the village in its wider context. The scale of planting proposed is suitable for the inner city residential location.

Overall Village

- 221 While located on two separate Sites, I consider the Proposed Village will be legible as a single village because of the cohesive architectural approach and consistency in the planting palette and boundary treatments. The variation in the overall scale and buildings typologies will provide a visual richness that reflects the complexity of this urban environment.
- 222 Being operated as a single Village, I consider it is important to strike a balance between ensuring cohesion between the Sites (so that they are understood as a single Village) and creating visual interest and a grain that respects the surrounding context. I think a suitable balance has been achieved by the proposed design. As noted above, I consider the configuration and design of the Proposed Village has responded well to the differing characteristics of the different Site interfaces and wider urban conditions, together with the more general Christchurch vernacular, so that it will make a positive contribution to the landscape character that is gradually re-establishing after the considerable damage inflicted by the earthquakes.
- 223 The cohesive approach to the landscaping and boundary treatments across the Sites, will further reinforce the Proposed Village as a Village and will provide a vegetated edge that contributes positively to the adjacent streetscapes.

VISUAL EFFECTS

Reference: Visual Simulation package

- 224 I consider the primary viewing audiences for the Sites will be:
 - 224.1 Users of the surrounding street network;
 - 224.2 Residents and users of immediately adjoining residential and commercial properties;
 - 224.3 Residents and users of properties in the wider neighbourhood; and
 - 224.4 Users of Hagley Park.

225 The following sections contain a visual effects assessment in relation to each of these viewing audiences.

Users of Surrounding Street Network

226 For those travelling in the surrounding street network by foot, bicycle or car, views towards the Site will be transient. Therefore, this viewing audience is less sensitive to change than audiences that experience a static view.

227 The characteristics of the surrounding streets are described above.

Bishopspark Site

228 Building B02 provides the primary interface with Park Terrace (see Visual Simulation from Viewpoint 2-1 and 2-3). In my opinion, Building B02 is of a scale and form that complements other buildings along the street. While the building exceeds the height standard and infringes the front yard standard, I consider it provides a suitable enclosure to the wide street corridor. The setback of the upper level and its distinctive treatment to create a roof profile that is differentiated from the primary building façade avoids any inappropriate visual dominance effects. As the proposed specimen trees along the street edge mature, they will make a positive contribution to the visual amenity of the streetscape, particularly for pedestrians walking along the street.

229 A visual connection to the heart of the Village is provided down the main entrance through the highly glazed reception area to the Chapel. In my opinion, this connection assists to create a visual link between the Proposed Village and the adjacent public realm. While Building B01 has a large footprint, it is divided into a number of wings, which are connected by the reception area. The whole of Building B01 will not be seen from the adjacent street and therefore will not be seen as incongruous when viewed from Park Terrace.

230 Dorset Street is the other location where the Proposed Village has a direct relationship to the street (see Visual Simulation from Viewpoint 2-5). The northern end of Building B03 fronts onto Dorset Street, near its intersection with Dublin Street. Building B03 is three-levels at the street frontage with a step back to a recessed fourth level. The pattern of development along these street corridors is eclectic and comprises a mix of stand-alone dwellings, terrace houses, apartments and larger commercial buildings towards the Victoria Street corridor. In my opinion, from Dorset Street and from Dublin Street to the north, Building B03 will not appear incongruous with the scale of buildings in the surrounding context (see Visual Simulation from Viewpoint 2-4).

231 The Bishopspark Site does not directly front onto Salisbury Street and Victoria Street. Glimpses will be obtained from those streets to various built elements of the Proposed Village (see Visual

Simulation from Viewpoint 2-6). These elements will be viewed in the context of the larger building forms along the Victoria Street commercial corridor. In my opinion, the Proposed Village will appear subservient to these larger building forms. The Proposed Village will not appear prominent from Salisbury Street and will be viewed with a foreground of established development including apartments, terrace houses, and large stand-alone dwellings.

- 232 In summary, I consider that when viewed from the surrounding streets, the visual change resulting from the establishment of the Proposed Village on the Bishopspark Site will range from low to moderate and the resulting effects will be positive.

Peterborough Site

- 233 The Peterborough Site is in a prominent location at the broad and open intersection of Park Terrace and Salisbury Street, with the wide road reserve adjacent to the Site creating a small 'pocket park'. The current vacant nature of the Site contributes little to the visual quality of the neighbourhood. The DP framework acknowledges the potential of the Peterborough Site to accommodate increased building scale to define the corner through an increased height standard.
- 234 Building B07 interfaces with Park Terrace and Salisbury Street. The way the building form relates to these adjacent streets is set out in the urban design assessment above. Building B07 has a primary frontage to Park Terrace creating a strong and positive edge to the street. As the building turns the corner to Salisbury Street, the built pattern becomes more broken, with a generous separation between the western and eastern wings of the building and a clear step down to the eastern wing. The greater scale at the Park Terrace corner reinforces the corner site and intersection.
- 235 From both these streets, the Proposed Village will result in very high visual change. An analysis of the appropriateness of the design and its relationship to the neighbourhood character is set out in the urban design assessment above. In my opinion, the Proposed Village will act as a suitable landmark when viewed from these primary street corridors and will result in positive visual effects (see Visual Simulations from Viewpoints 1-1, 1-5, and 1-6).
- 236 As with the specimen tree planting for the Bishopspark Site, I consider that as the trees mature, they will make a positive contribution to the visual quality of the immediately adjacent streetscape, reinforcing the widened corner as a 'pocket park'.
- 237 From the intersection of Salisbury Street and Victoria Street, the Proposed Village will be prominent (see Visual Simulation from Viewpoint 1-7). Given the viewing distance, I consider it will not appear incongruous with the varied scale and form of the foreground built environment.

- 238 Building B08 has a direct relationship to and fronts onto Peterborough Street. Building B08 is lower than Building B07. The scale of Building B08 will be subservient to other buildings in the street corridor, that include the George Hotel, various apartment buildings and the substantial former Teachers College building on the corner of Peterborough Street and Montreal Street. The retention of the protected tree adjacent to the street, will provide a visual foil to the building and will continue to contribute to the vegetated quality of the streetscape.
- 239 Overall, I consider that when viewed from the surrounding streets the visual change resulting from the establishment of the Proposed Village on the Peterborough Site will range from moderate to very high and the resulting effects will be positive.

Residents and users of immediately adjoining residential and commercial properties

- 240 In this section, I highlight characteristics of the adjoining properties that are particularly relevant to my assessment of visual effects. Other characteristics of the properties that have informed my visual effects assessment have already been set out in the assessment of overlooking and shading amenity effects above. I do not repeat the building height and recession plane exceedances that have been previously outlined.

Bishopspark Site

108 Park Terrace

- 241 The apartment building currently under construction at 108 Park Terrace has been designed to have a primary orientation away from the Bishopspark Site.
- 242 Building B02 and the western façade of Building B01 are located adjacent to this property. While the northern walls of Building B02 have a relatively simple appearance, the façade is considerably stepped in plan. The upper level is stepped back and clearly differentiated from the primary building form with a different material and dark colour finish. This design creates a clear termination to the building and reduces its visual prominence. The main façade of the western façade of Building B01 facing 108 Park Terrace is well articulated with the primary façade punctuated by areas of glazing and balconies and using variations in materials and colours to create visual interest. In a similar vein to Building B02, the top level is recessed from the primary façade and clearly differentiated from the primary building façade, reducing its visual prominence.
- 243 In my opinion, considering the separation between buildings, the configuration of units within the apartment building at 108 Park Terrace and the design characteristics of the Proposed Village, including the elements that project above the height standard, will

result in low visual change and negligible adverse visual effects when viewed from this property.

2A, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16 and 18 Dorset Street

244 These properties are generally oriented away from the Bishopspark Site with their primary living spaces (both indoor and outdoor) facing north away from the Site.

245 Building B01 is located adjacent to these properties. While Building B01 has a large overall footprint, it is the narrow end walls of the eastern and western wings that interface with these properties. These buildings are separated by a landscaped communal pool courtyard. The relatively simple northern facades are punctuated by vertical windows and associated angled louvre screens. Specimen trees are placed to complement the building form. At the upper level the recessed and differentiated treatment of this level will reduce the vertical emphasis of the building form.

246 Having regard to the orientation of these neighbouring properties and the design characteristics of the Proposed Village, I consider the Proposed Village will result in moderate visual change. In the context of considerable change that the DP provides for on this Site (i.e. intensive residential development), I consider that the adverse visual effects resulting from the Proposed Village will be very low.

4A Dorset Street

247 As discussed above, the consented Stables building includes an upstairs unit. The unit will be located very close to the Site's northern boundary in the vicinity of the eastern wing of Building B01 and the open space that separates that wing from the western wing.

248 The small balcony off the western end of the unit will interface with the open space area between the two Building B01 wings. The simple form of the end wall of Building B01 will create a subdued backdrop to the unit when viewed from within the unit. With the fourth level of the end wall recessed from the primary building frontage, it will not be visually prominent from this unit. From the unit balcony, the courtyard space between the eastern and western wings of Building B01 will provide an open aspect despite the building at 4A Dorset Street being located so close to the boundary.

249 While the visual change experienced from the upstairs unit on this property will be high, in the context of the residential intensification anticipated on the Site by the DP, I consider the adverse visual effects will be low.

18 Dorset Street

- 250 While the property at 18 Dorset Street interfaces with both Building B01 along part of its back boundary and Building B03 along its eastern boundary, the three-level dwelling has a primary orientation to the north. A driveway and carparking on the property separates the dwelling from the boundaries with the Site. In my opinion, given the separation between buildings, the orientation of the dwelling, and in the context of the inner city environment and the considerable change that the DP provides for on the Site, the adverse visual effects will be very low.

Commercial properties to the east

- 251 The properties to the east of the Bishopspark Site accommodate commercial uses, which are less sensitive to visual change than residential uses.
- 252 Building B04 adjoins the boundary with these commercial properties. Building B04 is a single level building located along the western boundary of the Site. It has a simple façade treatment facing these commercial properties and provides a clear definition and edge to the Proposed Village. The lower Building B04 provides a separation to the higher Buildings B03 and B01 behind. I consider the simple treatment of the primary facades are suitable, given the commercial character of the interface. As with other areas in the Proposed Village, the upper level of Building B03 is clearly differentiated as a roof form. I consider its dark colour finish will serve to reduce its visual prominence when viewed from these properties.
- 253 From these properties, I consider the visual change will be low to moderate. In the context of the DP providing for considerable change in this location, I consider that adverse visual effects from the Proposed Village will be negligible.

155 Victoria Street

- 254 The hotel currently under construction at 155 Victoria Street will contain a number of rooms facing the Bishopspark Site's eastern boundary and Building B03.
- 255 In my opinion, the generally short-term habitation of hotel rooms reduces the viewer's sensitivity to change. The back wall of Building B03 will be viewed from this property. The solid façade treatment on this wall of Building B03 is punctuated by vertical windows giving some relief to the horizontal emphasis of the building form (without resulting in overlooking effects). While not recessed from the primary façade, the upper level is differentiated by a change in material finish and being a dark colour. I consider this design assists to reduce the vertical emphasis of the building.
- 256 From this property, the visual change will be high. The Proposed Village buildings and hotel will be separated by accessways on

both sites and carparking on the 155 Victoria Street property. In my opinion, the layout of both sites will maintain a suitable separation in this inner-city living environment. In my opinion, having regard to the considerable change anticipated by the DP in this location and the sensitivity of the viewers, adverse visual effects when viewed from the hotel rooms facing the Bishopspark Site will be very low.

5, 13, 15 and 17 Salisbury Street

257 These properties adjoin the southern boundary of the Bishopspark Site, and interface with the shorter end walls of the eastern and western dementia wings of Building B01. The two wings are separated by a landscaped courtyard. The building forms include three generous steps away from the boundary as it extends to the upper level. As with other locations in the Proposed Village, the setback and differentiation of the top level creates a clear termination to the building forms that reduces its vertical prominence.

258 Having regard to the site and dwelling layout of development on the adjoining properties along Salisbury Street (5, 13, 15 and 17 Salisbury Street), I consider that the magnitude of visual change will be moderate. In the context of the considerable change provided for by the DP in this location, I conclude that the Proposed Village will result in negligible visual dominance. In my opinion, the adverse visual effects on these properties will be negligible.

90 Park Terrace

259 As written approval has been provided by the owner of 90 Park Terrace, I have not assessed the effects of the Proposed Village on 90 Park Terrace.

84 Park Terrace

260 The property at 84 Park Terrace is a long rectangular site with a narrow frontage to Park Terrace. It is separated from the western part of the Site and Building B02 by the property at 90 Park Terrace. The narrow rear boundary interfaces with the Site.

261 Given the location of the dwelling on this site towards its Park Terrace frontage and its primary orientation to the west, and in the context of the inner city environment and considerable change provided for by the DP in this location, I consider any adverse visual effects resulting from the Proposed Village on 84 Park Terrace will be negligible.

Peterborough Site

18 Salisbury Street

262 The units on this property are oriented with solid walls facing the Site. The lower eastern wing of Building B07 interfaces with this property. This stepping down of building height was deliberate to

manage potential effects on this neighbour. The Peterborough Site accessway also provides some separation of the building from the boundary. The horizontal extent of Building B07 is broken by angling of the façade elements and stepping of the roof profile. The building façade is well articulated with punctuations created by covered balconies and areas of glazing and variations in material and colour finishes. As the specimen tree planting along the boundary with this property matures, it will provide a soft visual foil to the building.

- 263 As there will not be a direct visual connection from units to the Proposed Village, I consider the magnitude of visual change experienced from this property will be low-moderate, and will primarily be experienced when moving to and from the units within the property. In the context of the considerable change that the DP anticipates for the Site, I consider the Proposed Village will not result in increased visual dominance. In my opinion, the adverse visual effects on this property will be negligible.

15 Peterborough Street

- 264 The property at 15 Peterborough Street contains a seven-level apartment building (with the seventh level contained in a roof loft space). The units are oriented to the west towards the Proposed Village. A number of the units have balconies opening from indoor living spaces on the western side of the building.
- 265 The four-level Building B08 interfaces with this property. The building complies with the height standard, but does project through the recession plane adjacent to this property. The relatively simple façade treatment facing the neighbouring property is punctuated by narrow vertical windows. The upper level is differentiated as a roof form through the change in material and dark colour finish. It is also stepped back from the northern edge (by a small amount) and from the southern end (by a considerable extent). The roof-form nature of the upper level serves to reduce the verticality of the building form.
- 266 For units at the lower levels of the apartments at 15 Peterborough Street, vegetation within the Site, together with proposed hedging along the boundary and specimen trees adjacent to Building B08 will provide a vegetated visual foil to the building.
- 267 In my opinion, when viewed from 15 Peterborough Street, the visual change will be moderate – high.
- 268 For the units facing the Site with their lounges and balconies oriented directly towards Building B08, the proximity of Building B08, together with its height, will result in some visual dominance over and above that which could be anticipated based on the built form standards. The design of the building, including the way the simple articulation will create a subdued interface with the upper

level creating the appearance of a roof form that terminates the building, and the use of planting along the boundary will mitigate those effects to some extent.

- 269 In my opinion, the adverse visual effects of the Proposed Village on this property will be low.

62 Park Terrace

- 270 The property at 62 Park Terrace fronts onto both Park Terrace and Peterborough Street. It is currently vacant.

- 271 The southern end of Building B08 interfaces with this property, and projects through the recession plane on this boundary. The façade of the primary three-level building form is well articulated being punctuated by glazing and recessed balconies, together with variations in the use of materials and colours. The upper, fourth level is considerably set back from the southern end of the building and is also recessed from the primary western façade. The large Common Lime tree that will be retained and whose canopy extends into this property will provide a strong visual containment to the building.

- 272 From this property, I consider the Proposed Village will result in moderate visual change. In the context of the reduced sensitivity of this vacant property and the considerable change that the DP anticipates in this location, I consider the adverse visual dominance effects from the Proposed Village will be very low.

76 Park Terrace

- 273 The property at 76 Park Terrace contains a stand-alone, two-storey dwelling set in an established garden. Dense boundary planting at the interface with the Site will limit views to the Proposed Village to some extent.

- 274 The western wing of Building B07 is located to the north and Building B08 is located to the west of this property. As noted previously, Building B07 is set back from its southern boundary and is considerably stepped to reduce the building scale immediately adjacent to this property. The rear boundary of the property also interfaces with Building B08. The western façade of this building is well articulated with recessed balconies, variations in materials and glazing punctuation and a clear setback and differentiation of the upper level.

- 275 Given the Peterborough Site wraps around this property, the Proposed Village will result in very high visual change when viewed from this property.

- 276 As noted previously, the DP anticipates a fundamental change in the visual character of the Site. Building B07 exceeds the height and recession plane standards, and Building B08 exceeds the

recession plane standards. I note that previously the Site accommodated high residential towers, so in the past, residents have experienced a visual context of high buildings.

- 277 Careful consideration has been given to the way Building B07 interfaces with the neighbouring property, with the stepping down to four levels at its southern end. Building B07 has been set back from the boundary with the access into the Site located in between. Boundary planting will create a vegetated edge along the boundary. The separation between the eastern and western wings of Building B07 will be readily apparent, creating an open interface with the single level entrance pavilion connecting the two wings. In my opinion, together with the proposed planting of specimen trees along the boundary, this provides a sensitive transition between Building B07 and the residential dwelling at 76 Park Terrace. I understand Ryman intends to propose a darker and more recessive colour for the lift shaft area of Building B07. In my opinion, this colour change will provide additional visual richness and will reduce the visual dominance of this part of the building. I support the change.
- 278 Despite this sensitive transition, the overall vertical scale of the building form means Building B07 will give rise to visual dominance effects on the dwelling at 76 Park Terrace and its outdoor terrace to the rear of the dwelling. The proposed Building B07 is of a high architectural quality, with a well ordered façade organisation and use of robust materials.
- 279 Given the location of the dwelling towards the front of the property and its primary orientation, Building B08 will appear as a less prominent feature.
- 280 Overall, in my opinion, having regard to the considerable change anticipated by the DP in this location, the adverse visual effects of the Proposed Village when viewed from this property will be low.

12 Peterborough Street / 54 Park Terrace

- 281 As written approval has been provided from the owner of 12 Peterborough Street, I have not assessed visual effects on this property.

Residents and users of properties in the wider neighbourhood

- 282 Residents and users of properties in the wider neighbourhood will variously obtain views towards the Sites. As noted above, the area has undergone and will continue to undergo considerable visual change since the earthquakes, and this is anticipated by the DP framework. Change is an anticipated quality of the living environment in this location.

Bishopspark Site

- 283 The Bishopspark Site has a limited viewing catchment outside the immediately adjoining properties.
- 284 For properties on the northern side of Dorset Street, Building B03 and Building B01 (behind dwellings on the southern side of Dorset Street) will be visible. I consider these buildings will integrate well with the surrounding context and will not appear incongruous. In my opinion, the visual change experienced will be low-moderate, and the effect of that change will be positive.

Peterborough Site

- 285 The surrounding streets provide a level of separation from the Peterborough Site.

82 Park Terrace

- 286 The property at 82 Park Terrace is located on the Park Terrace/Salisbury Street intersection and contains a four-level apartment building. While the southern face of the building is punctuated by large windows, these windows do not face the Site as the property is located to the west of the Site. There are limited windows on the apartment buildings' eastern façade.
- 287 The Proposed Village will be clearly visible from this property. However, the location of the building means that only oblique views will be obtained from the southern windows of the apartments. In my opinion, the magnitude of visual change will be high. The more prominent western wing of Building B07 will be viewed in the context of the lower form of the eastern wing. A degree of separation is provided by the broad intersection, the pocket park and planting along the street edge. As discussed earlier, the DP framework provides for considerable visual change at this location. Overall, I consider the adverse visual effects from the Proposed Village on this property will be very low.

13, 15 and 17 Salisbury Street

- 288 These properties are located on the northern side of Salisbury Street. The wide street provides considerable separation from Building B07 in addition to the various setbacks of the residential units on these sites. Prior to their removal, these properties would have had clear views to the higher residential towers that were previously located on the Peterborough Site.
- 289 Building B07 will be clearly visible from these properties and the magnitude of visual change will be moderate to high, with the magnitude of the change varying in dependence on the locations of dwellings on their sites, the internal layout of dwellings and the placement of windows. The relationship between the western and eastern wings of Building B07 and the separation between the two wings will be more readily apparent from these properties (compared to 82 Park Terrace). In my opinion, the configuration

of building mass on the Site creates a well-ordered configuration. A degree of separation is provided by the wide street and planting along the street edge. As discussed earlier, the DP framework anticipates consideration visual change at this location. In this context, I consider that the visual effects from the Proposed Village on these properties will be negligible adverse to positive.

Users of Hagley Park

- 290 The Site is separated from Hagley Park by the wide street corridor of Park Terrace and the Avon River corridor.

Bishopspark Site

- 291 A pathway runs alongside the eastern edge of Hagley Park, along the Avon River and is a popular recreational route. This pathway affords views to the Bishopspark Site, variously obscured by intervening mature trees. From this walkway, views are primarily obtained to Building B02 as it fronts onto Park Terrace (see Visual Simulation from Viewpoint 2-2). Building B02 is well articulated to create a visual organisation of a series of vertical elements, terminated by a distinctive roofline. As the street front specimen tree planting matures, it will complement (rather than replicate) the planting within Hagley Park to reinforce the vegetated quality of the neighbourhood. In my opinion, the Proposed Village will result in moderate to high visual change from this pathway, and the Proposed Village will make a positive contribution to the visual richness of the varied built edge to Park Terrace.

- 292 From locations further within Hagley Park, the layering of mature trees in the foreground will variously obscure Building B02 so that, together with the distance of views, it will not be a prominent feature. From those locations, the Proposed Village will result in low to negligible visual change, and the resulting effect will be positive.

Peterborough Site

- 293 Similarly, the pathway affords views to the Peterborough Site, variously obscured by intervening mature vegetation. The large, mature trees within Hagley Park and on the street side of the River provide a visual foil to the building. From this pathway, in the immediate vicinity of the Site, intermittent views will be obtained of the western wing of Building B07. Building B07 will create a strong definition to the Park Terrace / Salisbury Street corner (see Visual Simulations from Viewpoints 1-2, 1-3 and 1-4). In my opinion, the building façade is well articulated and organised to visually breakdown the horizontal extent of the building form. The setback of the upper level and its distinctive roofline treatment will create an effective vertical termination to the building. As the specimen trees along the street front mature, they will complement the tree planting within the adjacent road reserve and will assist to provide a vegetated foundation to the building form. In my opinion, the Proposed Village will result in moderate to high

visual change from this pathway, and the Proposed Village will make a positive contribution to the visual richness of the varied built edge to Park Terrace.

- 294 From locations further within Hagley Park, the layering of mature trees in the foreground will variously obscure Building B07 so that, together with the viewing distance, it will not be a prominent feature. From those locations, the Proposed Village will result in moderate to low visual change, and the resulting effect will be positive.

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

- 295 I have reviewed all of the submissions. A range of submissions, both in support and opposition to the Proposed Village, address urban design, landscape and visual effects issues. I consider the issues raised by the submissions can be summarised into the following themes:

295.1 The location of the Site and its appropriateness to accommodate the Proposed Village;

295.2 Neighbourhood character, including potential effects on Hagley Park;

295.3 Residential amenity effects;

295.4 Concerns about non-compliances with the built form standards; and

295.5 Use of Visual Simulations.

- 296 I consider each of these issues below.

Site location and suitability to accommodate the Proposed Village

- 297 A number of supporting submissions note the suitability of the Sites to accommodate the Proposed Village.² These include submissions from a number of people that currently live in the central city or previously lived in the Bishopspark Retirement Village, highlighting the range of amenities available in close proximity to the Sites.³

² Including The George; J. Svensson; G. Pickering; C. Sleigh; J. Fitzgerald; E. Ellis; B. Le Valliant; R. Irving; J. Thomson; M. Cordner, W. and J. Gilroy; P. and H. Yeatman; D. Deyell; P. and A. Ellis; R. and W. Perry; R. Robertson; M. and C. Strange; J. and R. Dunlop; S. Church; J. Burns; L. Quinn; G. Crothers, M. Tiller; L. Reece; and S. Stevens.

³ Including G. Pickering; S. Ashton; L. Davies; C. Sleigh; H. Peate; J. Robin; C. Marks; S. and D. D. Robison; R. Irving; J. Thomson; D. Pringle; B. Rose;

298 From an urban design perspective, I agree that the Sites' location is very well suited to accommodate a comprehensively designed retirement village that can integrate with the established neighbourhood and enable residents to access and enjoy the amenities provided in close proximity. In particular, and as identified in submissions, the Sites are in close proximity to the evolving arts precinct that contains the Canterbury Museum, Arts Centre and Art Gallery. Also of particular value is the direct relationship of the Sites to Hagley Park, providing both visual amenity and a distinctive recreation resource.

Neighbourhood Character

299 A number of submissions consider the Proposed Village is of a scale, intensity and design that is not compatible with the established neighbourhood character.⁴ I address this general theme, before moving on to address some specific points made by some submitters.

300 As described in my evidence, the locational features of the Sites and the applicable planning context lend themselves to the establishment of a comprehensive care retirement village. Nevertheless, there are a number of features of the Sites and their surrounding context that have required a tailored design response. While being mindful of the functional requirements of the Proposed Village, considerable effort has been applied to create a layout and collection of building forms and spaces that respond to the particular characteristics of the location. As set out in my analysis above, I consider this has been successfully achieved. In my opinion, the Proposed Village is of a scale and intensity that is suitable for its inner City location. I consider that the design of both the building forms and the open spaces associated with the Proposed Village are appropriate to this central Christchurch setting and will make a positive contribution to this neighbourhood as it recovers from the considerable damage caused by the earthquakes.

J. Hastilow; W. and J. Gilroy; R. Milford; P. and H. Yeatman; D. Deyell; P. and A. Ellis; R. and W. Perry; G. Crozier; A. Wilson; E. Harrop; G. Gyde; J. Cleland; S. Church; J. Burns; D. and M. Gray; L. Quinn; T. Tyler; M. Bristow and M. Dwan; G. Crothers; S. and G. Thomas; K. Soster; R. Shearer; B. Purdue; E Cooke; J. Andrews; P. and G. Penlington; N. Berry; J. Ledingham; J. Harris; R. Roberton; M. and C. Strange; and S. Stevens.

⁴ Including R. Begg; Centro Roydvale Ltd; C. Glasson; R. and M. Lucas; S. O'Connor; R. Pearson; M. Rinaldo; Southwest Terraces Ltd; D. Turner; P. Wells; V. Zanetti; J. Hay, B. and M Logan; S. Russell and J. Leung; D. Cottle; E. Thompson; J. Stratford and G. Waddy (on behalf of collective owners at 1-8/18 Salisbury Street); P. and L. Trustuum; Christchurch Civic Trust; R. Bluett; D. and L. Worthington; ICON; M. Pascuzzi; V. Zanetti; L. Goodland; C. Bennett; G. Bennett; H. and M. Conibear, D. and A. McLean; Dorset Street Flat Owners Group; J. McCormick; Dr J. Roper-Lindsay; and C. Garlick.

- 301 The submission by J McCormick⁵ suggests that the Sites would be better suited to accommodate a range of different apartment styles and sizes. As I have set out above, while there is a level of cohesion across the Sites, there is also variation in the scale and form of buildings, responding to the differing characteristics of the Sites and their relationship to the surrounding context. The Proposed Village will also provide a range of different living environments that accommodate different needs and lifestyle preferences of residents. In my opinion, the Proposed Village will make a positive contribution to housing choice in this inner city environment.
- 302 The submission on behalf of the Dorset Flats Owners Group (by Clare McClintock) expresses the opinion that the Proposed Village will not contribute to the character of the Dorset Street/Dublin Street area and the blank end walls of Building B01 suggest it is turning its back on these character areas.⁶ The end walls referred to do not have a direct relationship with the public realm of Dorset Street. Where the Bishopspark Site does have a frontage to the street, Building B03 has a highly glazed and positive street interface. The two end walls of Building B01 that adjoin the boundary with the Dorset Street Flats are punctuated with vertical glazing and associated louvres to minimise overlooking. These walls will be viewed from the street as being behind the established dwellings along Dorset Street and will provide a visually subdued backdrop.
- 303 The submission by C Glasson describes the difference in character of the Proposed Village compared with the previous Bishopspark Retirement Village.⁷ As noted previously, the DP framework anticipates an evolution and change within the Residential Central City zone, and the Proposed Village reflects this expectation. In support of the view that the Proposed Village is incompatible with the character of the Park Terrace corridor, the submission describes a number of existing buildings along the street, concluding it is 'an established and leafy residential zone'. The submission identifies two larger buildings along the corridor being, the Parkbridge Apartments and the George Hotel, highlighting the setbacks of these buildings from the street frontage.
- 304 However, this is an incomplete description. The street corridor also contains a number of apartment and terrace buildings (such as the neighbouring five-level apartment building under construction at 108 Park Terrace, the four-level apartment building at 82 Park Terrace and the three level terrace houses at 110 Park

⁵ 'RMA2020673 All Submissions' at page 295-296.

⁶ 'RMA2020673 All Submissions' at page 178-189.

⁷ 'RMA2020673 All Submissions' at page 111-127.

Terrace) that are located in close proximity to the Sites. As set out in my assessment, I consider the Proposed Village will sit comfortably in its context. In particular, I consider Buildings B02 and B07 will provide a positive interface with and enclosure to the broad street corridor of Park Terrace.

Effects on Residential Amenity

- 305 A number of submissions from owners and residents of surrounding properties raise concerns about the adverse effects on their residential amenity.⁸ I note that a number of the submissions refer to the current relationship of their properties to the Sites or the relationship to the former Bishopspark Retirement Village.⁹ As set out above, the DP framework anticipates change in this inner City residential neighbourhood.
- 306 I have set out in detail my assessment of the amenity effects (overlooking, shading and visual dominance) above. In summary, the majority of the properties surrounding the Sites are residential, although some commercial properties are located to the east of the Bishopspark Site. The potential for overlooking/privacy amenity effects on surrounding properties has been addressed through the orientation of buildings and units, separation from the neighbouring buildings, setbacks of facades, and the location, size and treatment of windows and balconies. I consider the Proposed Village will not result in inappropriate overlooking or loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.
- 307 The Proposed Village will result in varying degrees of shading of neighbouring properties. However, shading is expected in a central city environment. The potential for shading amenity effects on surrounding properties have been addressed through compliance with the recession plane standards to the extent possible and the location and massing of buildings. I consider the Proposed Village will not result in inappropriate shading effects for neighbouring properties.
- 308 I consider the potential for adverse visual amenity effects on residents and users of immediately adjoining properties has been addressed through the separation from the neighbouring buildings, modulation, angling and articulation of the building facades, the location, size and treatment of windows and balconies, and variations in materials and colours to create visual interest. The proposed planting is not intended to generally mitigate any visual

⁸ C. Bennett; G. Bennett; R. Bluett; B & M. Logan; S. O'Connor; L. Goodland; ICON; R. & M. Lucas; D. & L. Worthington; C. Glasson; J. McCormick; D. & A. McLean; E. Thompson; V. Zanetti; and Southwest Terraces Limited & G. MacKinnon.

⁹ C. Bennett; G. Bennett; L. Goodland; B & M. Logan; ICON; R. & M. Lucas; D. & L. Worthington; and C. Glasson.

effects on neighbours, but in some cases will provide a soft visual foil between proposed buildings and neighbouring properties. The Proposed Village will result in considerable visual change when viewed from a number of surrounding properties. However, such change is consistent with the DP expectation of higher density residential development. I consider the Proposed Village will result in negligible – low adverse visual effects on the users of immediately adjoining properties.

- 309 For the users of properties in the wider neighbourhood, including those on Dorset Street, the Proposed Village will integrate well with the surrounding context and will not appear incongruous. For users of properties facing the Peterborough Site, particularly those on the northern side of Salisbury Street, the magnitude of visual change will be high. However, separation is provided by the wide intersection/street, the pocket park and planting along the street edge. Building B07 also creates a well-ordered configuration. I consider the Proposed Village will result in positive – low adverse visual effects on these properties.

Non-compliances with built form standards

- 310 A number of submissions consider the Proposed Village should comply with all built form standards in order to avoid adverse amenity effects.
- 311 Built form standards apply at a zone-wide level and are a relatively blunt tool. While being cognisant of the built form standards, the Proposed Village scheme has been developed through a design-led process. The site layout, configuration and design of buildings, and the design of open spaces has been determined in relation to the characteristics of the Sites and their surrounding context. In my opinion, in many respects, the Proposed Village will result in better amenity outcomes than might be achieved through strict compliance with the built form standards.

Use of Visual Simulations

- 312 The submission by Centro Roydvale Ltd. is critical of the visual simulations contained in Volume 3 of the resource consent application.¹⁰ The submission notes that the simulation for Viewpoint 1-401 does not show the hotel proposed on their site at 155 Victoria Street correctly. The proposed building outline (to demonstrate its bulk and location) has been modelled, rather than the detail of the building, in order to show the relationship of the Proposed Village to the general scale and location of development on the Centro property together with established development in the surrounding context.

¹⁰ 'RMA2020673 All Submissions' at pages 140 – 143.

313 The submission also questions the angle of view of a number of viewpoints, suggesting that the images have been prepared to show the Proposed Village in its best light. I note that the visual simulations have been prepared in accordance with the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects Visual Simulations Best Practice Guide. The viewpoints have been selected as representative locations from the surrounding public realm and were selected in consultation with the Council's urban design reviewer. I also note that visual simulations are a useful tool for understanding the way a proposal sits in its context. However, they do not replicate reality and should be viewed in combination with field observations. I consider the visual simulations are a useful assessment tool.

RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OFFICER'S REPORT

314 I have reviewed the Council Officer's Report dated 14 December 2020 and the associated Urban Design Report prepared by Josie Schroder (Appendix B of the Council Officer's Report) and the Landscape Report prepared by Jennifer Dray (Appendix H of the Council Officer's Report). I have also reviewed the Arborist Report prepared by John Thornton, as both Ms Schroder and Ms Dray rely on that report (Appendix F of the Council Officer's Report).

315 Ms Schroder broadly supports the Proposed Village and notes a number of positive aspects including: the general scale and intensity is consistent with the Central City location¹¹, the approach to the site layout (including the retention of the Chapel as a focal point of the Bishopspark Site)¹², and a generally good level of visual quality and interest¹³. Areas of agreement are set out in paragraph 22 of Ms Schroder's evidence. Ms Schroder also agrees that CPTED has been effectively addressed across each of the Sites and that pedestrian and vehicle access is legible.¹⁴ Ms Schroder identifies the following areas of concern:¹⁵

315.1 Consideration of the following contextual matters:

- (a) Removal of the existing trees, particularly on the Bishopspark Site;

¹¹ Council Officer's Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraphs 51, 56, 100, 132, 135.

¹² Council Officer's Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraphs 63, 100.

¹³ Council Officer's Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraphs 89, 122, 140.

¹⁴ Council Officer's Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraphs 126, 127.

¹⁵ Council Officer's Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraph 23.

- (b) Limited scale of the new trees proposed;
- (c) Heritage values of the Dorset Street Flats. I note that I have assessed potential amenity impacts on the Dorset Street Flats in my evidence above, but Mr Pearson addresses potential heritage impacts;

315.2 Streetscape effects, particularly on Dorset Street and Salisbury Street;

315.3 Amenity impacts on neighbouring properties, particularly on 76 Park Terrace and 15 Peterborough Street; and

315.4 The visual quality of the northern and southern facades of Building B02 and the eastern façade of Building B08.

316 Ms Dray agrees that the Proposed Village massing and density is appropriate to the location, and notes the on-site and streetscape amenity provided by the proposed landscaping.¹⁶ The Landscape Report focusses primarily on the 'adequacy' of the proposed tree planting on the boundaries of the Sites, rather than providing an assessment of the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Village. Ms Dray makes a number of recommendations related to tree planting to assist with integration of the Proposed Village into the context. I have reviewed Mr Dixon's response to those recommendations.

317 I address these matters in some detail in the main body of my evidence above, so in this section I briefly respond to each of the key matters raised in the Urban Design Report and the Landscape Report.

Consideration of context

318 Ms Schroder considers the scale, form and density of the Proposed Village to be generally appropriate in this location.¹⁷ However, she raises concerns about the removal of mature trees, particularly from the Bishopspark Site, and the scale of the new trees proposed to be planted, particularly at the Site boundaries. Ms Schroder considers the Proposed Village will not effectively respond to those contextual matters.¹⁸ Ms Dray expresses a similar opinion.

319 As discussed above, I consider the DP anticipates considerable change in this location, including intensification of residential activity. This view is shared by Ms Schroder. While I agree that

¹⁶ Council Officer's Report, Appendix H – Landscape Report, paragraph 69.

¹⁷ Council Officer's Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraph 18.

¹⁸ Council Officer's Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraph 63.

vegetation makes an important contribution to the character and amenity of the neighbourhood, the vegetation needs to be of an extent and scale that is compatible with a higher density living environment. The DP objectives and policies and the zone description do not emphasise the role of natural vegetation in this environment and the vegetation, apart from the Common Lime Tree, is not protected in any way. The retention of existing vegetation within the Bishopspark Site would compromise the ability to achieve a suitable site layout that meets the functional and operational needs of the Village and provides a clear and logical structure. In my opinion, the comprehensive approach to planting associated with the Proposed Village will contribute to the amenity of both the Site and its surrounding context, in a manner that can be suitably integrated with the site layout and intensity of activity proposed.

320 Both Ms Schroder and Ms Dray highlight the limitations created by the extent of basement carparking on both the retention of existing trees and the planting of new large scale trees. There is an important amenity benefit of accommodating carparking in a single basement carpark on each of the Sites. This approach avoids the adverse amenity effects of carparking and vehicle accessways dominating the ground plane or unsightly garaging above ground level. In this context, I consider the best outcome has been achieved by providing basement parking and accommodating specimen trees in tree pits over the basement podium.

321 Ms Schroder and Ms Dray suggest that medium and large scale trees are required to integrate the intensity, scale and height of the Proposed Village.¹⁹ In my opinion, it is not appropriate to seek to accommodate large scale trees within a higher density living environment. I consider it is the public realm, including Hagley Park and the Avon River corridor, that is the most suitable location in the neighbourhood to accommodate large-scale specimen trees. The tree planting in the residential environment should seek to complement, rather than replicate, the tree planting in the open space environment. Further, as set out in my evidence above, I do not consider tree planting is required to mitigate the landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Village (and planting could not mitigate the scale of the buildings proposed).

Streetscape interfaces

322 Both the Urban Design and Landscape Reports raise concerns about the tree species proposed in relation to a number of the Site interfaces, the ability of those trees to grow in raised planters and

¹⁹ Council Officer's Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraphs 68, 105. Council Officer's Report, Appendix H – Landscape Report, paragraphs 32, 41, 50, 53.

the proposal to maintain the trees to a certain size. The Council Officer's Report recommends a condition of consent to address this concern and this condition is discussed further below and in detail in the evidence of Sean Dixon.

- 323 In relation to the Dorset Street boundary, Ms Schroder agrees Building B03 is "of a grain, form and scale suitable to the street". Nevertheless, she considers a greater building setback is required to ensure that the boundary treatment, including tree planting, is effective in reducing the visual dominance of the building.²⁰ Ms Dray also suggests a larger setback is required to accommodate the trees.²¹ In response, I note that Dorset Street does not have a strong vegetated character, with residential properties containing only limited, small-scale trees adjacent to the street boundary. Towards the Victoria Street corridor, the buildings are located immediately adjacent to the street boundary. As I have set out in my evidence above, I consider the scale and form of Building B03 and the way it engages with and contributes to Dorset Street is compatible with the character of this street. I consider the inclusion of small-scale specimen trees along the street front will complement the pedestrian axis into the central area of the Site and is appropriate in this context. Mr Dixon has proposed changes to the tree species to be planted on this boundary, to allow for growth to their natural height, and I agree with his recommendations.
- 324 In relation to the Salisbury Street boundary, Ms Schroder and Ms Dray both consider the scale of the proposed vegetation will not be effective in mitigating adverse visual dominance effects of Building B07.²² In response, I note that the planting along this street edge is not proposed as a mechanism to mitigate an identified adverse visual effect resulting from Building B07, as I consider the building to be an appropriate built feature, with a high quality design, in this location. The reasons for this opinion are set out in my evidence above. The planting is proposed as a vegetated element that will assist to 'ground' the Proposed Village with a vegetated base and contribute to the immediately adjacent streetscape. Ms Dray acknowledges that the proposed trees will provide good amenity for users of the street.²³
- 325 In relation to the Park Terrace boundary, Ms Schroder agrees that the street interface and boundary treatment is appropriate to

²⁰ Council Officer's Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraphs 74-75.

²¹ Council Officer's Report, Appendix H – Landscape Report, paragraph 35.

²² Council Officer's Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraphs 112-113. Council Officer's Report, Appendix H – Landscape Report, paragraph 50.

²³ Council Officer's Report, Appendix H – Landscape Report, paragraph 50.

context.²⁴ Ms Dray considers larger scale planting is required to provide a more suitable response to the surrounding context.²⁵ I disagree, for the reasons set out above.

326 In relation to the landscape amenity and natural character of Hagley Park and the Avon River, Ms Dray again considers that additional planting of large scale trees (capable of growing to a minimum height of 15m at maturity) is required on the Park Terrace frontage of both Sites in order to mitigate adverse effects.²⁶ While I agree that the treed environment of Hagley Park provides an important amenity for the neighbourhood, I do not consider it is necessary to create a similar vegetated quality within the residential neighbourhood on the other side of Park Terrace. I also do not read the relevant objectives and policies for the zone to direct that outcome. Given the broad separation created by the street, I consider a different character to be quite appropriate and consistent with the different uses of the residential and open space areas (including the amendments to the landscaping set out in the evidence of Mr Dixon). I have set out my assessment in relation to visual effects experienced by users of the Park in above, with reference to the visual simulations, and do not consider that planting is required to mitigate any identified adverse effects.

Amenity effects for neighbours

327 While using a different rating scale of effects, and with some differences of opinion about the magnitude of effects, Ms Schroder's assessment of effects on neighbouring properties is generally aligned with the assessment I have set out above, which concludes that adverse amenity effects on neighbouring properties will be at most minor.

328 At paragraph 81, Ms Schroder refers to the large windows on the southern face of the Dorset Street Flats at 2 and 6 Dorset Street and considers Building B01 will appear visually dominant from this aspect. I note that the resource consent drawings for the renovation of these flats shows louvres obscuring views from the central area of the windows from the kitchen. Other windows on the southern façade are small. This limits a visual connection to the Site. As set out above, in the context of considerable change that the DP provides for on this Site (i.e. intensive residential development), I consider that the adverse visual effects resulting from the Proposed Village will be very low.

²⁴ Council Officer's Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraphs 72, 73, 108, 110.

²⁵ Council Officer's Report, Appendix H – Landscape Report, paragraphs 32, 41.

²⁶ Council Officer's Report, Appendix H – Landscape Report, paragraph 53.

- 329 At paragraph 118, Ms Schroder refers to the visual effects of Building B07 on the property at 76 Park Terrace and expresses the opinion that the scale of the lift shaft area in the eastern portion of the southern end of the building (projecting through the recession plane) will result in a moderate impact on the outdoor living space and north-facing first floor rooms of 76 Park Terrace. She also considers that “the lack of articulation of the lift shaft emphasises its verticality, resulting in an element that will appear out of scale and over-height, resulting in a low to moderate level of visual dominance, above that of a permitted proposal”.
- 330 I note that the windows at the southern end of the building provide light into the corridors. Considering the intermittent use of corridors and the distance from the boundary, I consider any undue overlooking of the property at 76 Park Terrace will be avoided and the adverse effects will be less than minor.
- 331 The windows also provide articulation to the southern façade. I agree that the more eastern portion of the façade has a simple treatment. In my opinion the vertical element of this component is compatible with the balance of the Building B07 eastern wing. As I have set out in my assessment, I consider Building B07 has a well ordered façade organisation and utilises high quality robust materials. Despite the sensitive transition created by the stepping down of the building form, I consider the overall vertical scale of the building form means Building B07 will give rise to low (minor) visual dominance effects on the dwelling at 76 Park Terrace and its outdoor terrace to the rear of the dwelling. As noted above, I understand Ryman intends to propose a darker and more recessive colour for the lift shaft area, reducing the visual dominance of this element to a certain extent. I support the change.
- 332 Ms Schroder concludes that the effects of Building B08 (on the Peterborough Site) on the visual amenity and outlook of the apartments on the second and third levels at 15 Peterborough Street will be moderate to high. In contrast, my assessment concludes that the adverse overlooking effects will be negligible due to the primary orientation of Building B08 away from this property with relatively narrow windows punctuating the eastern façade.
- 333 My assessment found that the visual change experienced from the units at this property that face the Site will experience moderate – to high visual change and the proximity of Building B08, together with its height, will result in some visual dominance over and above that which could be anticipated based on the built form standards. Considering the location of vegetation adjacent to the Site boundary within the property at 15 Peterborough Street, the proposed planting in the Site and the design of the building, including the way the simple articulation will create a subdued interface with the upper level creating the appearance of a roof

form that terminates the building, the adverse visual effects will be low (minor).

Visual quality – building design

- 334 Ms Schroder considers the overall visual quality of the Proposed Village is positive.²⁷ However, she raises concerns about particular facades of some buildings.

Bishopspark Site

- 335 Ms Schroder comments on the blank design of the northern and southern facades of Building B02 on the Bishopspark Site, and says this results in visual dominance effects.²⁸ While these walls have a relatively simple façade treatment, I consider this design is helpful to avoid overlooking effects on adjacent properties. In my opinion, a blank appearance is avoided through physical stepping and angling of the walls, together with the setback and different material and colour finish of the upper level. There will be limited visibility of the northern wall, given the location of the neighbouring apartment building at 108 Park Terrace. When travelling from the south, the southern wall will be viewed in the context of the large protected Oak tree on the neighbouring site at 90 Park Terrace, which provides a vegetated counterbalance to the wall. Overall, I consider the northern and southern facades of Building B02 create appropriate visual quality and interest, while also balancing the need to mitigate overlooking effects.

Peterborough Site

- 336 Ms Schroder considers the eastern façade of Building B08²⁹ on the Peterborough Site does not achieve an adequate level of visual interest, given that it is the primary outlook for a number of apartments at 15 Peterborough Street.³⁰
- 337 I consider the restrained treatment of this façade to be appropriate. Given the orientation of the façade away from the public realm and interfacing with another property, I do not consider a highly articulated façade that includes large areas of glazing and balconies would be appropriate. The eastern façade is punctuated by windows, but these are limited in scale to avoid overlooking effects on the adjacent property. The differentiation of material and colour of the upper level also provides a clear termination to the building. In my opinion, the design of this façade provides a suitable interface with the neighbouring property

²⁷ Council Officer’s Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraph 89, 122.

²⁸ Council Officer’s Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraphs 94-96.

²⁹ Incorrectly identified in the Council Officer’s Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report as B07.

³⁰ Council Officer’s Report, Appendix B – Urban Design Report, paragraph 123.

(noting my assessment above, that the location and scale of the building will result in low adverse visual effects when viewed from 15 Peterborough Street).

DRAFT CONDITIONS

- 338 Conditions 58 – 62 in the Council Officer’s Report relates to landscaping. Condition 62 is a new condition recommended by the Council Officer requiring a revised landscape plan to be prepared addressing various landscaping changes that are sought.
- 339 As set out in the evidence of Sean Dixon, having considered the opinions of the Council Officer and the recommended condition, Ryman has requested that an amended landscape plan be prepared to address these points where feasible. In my opinion, the amendments to the landscaping set out in Mr Dixon’s evidence are suitable and do not alter the opinions set out in my assessment.

CONCLUSIONS

- 340 The Proposed Village will extend across two Sites. The Sites both have primary frontage to Park Terrace, which is one of Christchurch’s premier streets that lead into the City centre. Immediately opposite Park Terrace from the Sites, the Avon River and Hagley Park are two landscape features that make a particular contribution to Christchurch’s sense of place. To the east of Park Terrace, the surrounding context has a diverse built character that reflects the long and rich history of the area. Extensive damage by the earthquakes has exacerbated change in the area. While some sites remain vacant, there has also been considerable re-development. The DP provides a framework for the neighbourhood to continue to evolve as a high density inner city residential environment.
- 341 The proposal to establish a comprehensive care retirement village across the two Sites has been through a rigorous and iterative design process that has been guided by a series of design principles, the relevant DP provisions and feedback provided by the UDP (in relation to an early concept).
- 342 Overall, I consider that the Sites are well positioned to accommodate the Proposed Village. The site configuration, architectural approach and landscape concept responds to the characteristics of the Site and its surrounding context and will offer a high quality living environment for the elderly. In my opinion, it will make a positive contribution to this evolving neighbourhood

that is gradually re-establishing after the considerable damage inflicted by the earthquakes.

Rebecca Anne Skidmore
6 January 2021