

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 **David Alan Pearson** 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 DAVID ALAN PEARSON ON BEHALF OF RYMAN HEALTHCARE LIMITED

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is David Alan Pearson.
- 2 I hold the degree of Bachelor of Architecture from the University of Auckland.
- 3 I have been registered as an architect for over 40 years. I am also an Associate of the New Zealand Institute of Architects.
- 4 In 1996, I founded Dave Pearson Architects with the aim of providing specialist heritage architectural services to the owners of heritage buildings. I have held the position of Principal of the company, now known as DPA Architects, since that time.
- 5 I have over 30 years' professional experience in heritage architecture. This experience has included the design and oversight of many significant projects. In particular I have acted as the heritage architect for the restoration of the Arts Centre in Christchurch since 2013. I am also familiar with a variety of techniques that can be used to seismically upgrade heritage buildings.
- 6 I am familiar with Ryman Healthcare Limited's (*Ryman*) resource consent application to construct and operate a comprehensive care retirement village (*Proposed Village*) at 100-104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street and 78 Park Terrace, Christchurch (*Site*). In this statement of evidence, I describe the parcel of land at 78 Park Terrace as the "Peterborough Site" and the parcel of land at 100-104 Park Terrace and 20 Dorset Street as the "Bishopspark Site". I refer to the Peterborough Site and Bishopspark Site together as the "Sites".
- 7 I prepared the Bishop's Chapel Technical Report - Heritage dated 24 March 2020 (*Heritage Report*). I also prepared a Temporary Protection Plan dated 24 June 2020 and a Design Report for the proposed pergola, dated 19 August 2020 and the heritage inputs for the Section 92 Responses dated 18 May, 13 July, 31 August and 17 November 2020 (*Further Information Responses*).
- 8 I have visited the Site and its surroundings on a number of occasions, including on 24 January, 20 November, and 18 December 2019 and 11 February and 18 March 2020.

CODE OF CONDUCT

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

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 10 My evidence sets out the following:
- 10.1 A summary of the Heritage Report and the Further Information Responses;
 - 10.2 My response to the heritage issues raised in submissions;
 - 10.3 My response to heritage issues raised in the Council Officer's Report, and particularly the Heritage Report prepared by Ms Suzanne Richmond, the Heritage Advisor;
 - 10.4 My comments on the draft conditions; and
 - 10.5 My conclusions.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 11 The former Bishop's Chapel (*Chapel*) was constructed in 1927 as the private chapel of the Anglican Bishop of Christchurch. It was used as a place of personal worship until 1984, when it was converted for use as part of the Bishopspark retirement village. The Chapel was damaged by the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence 2010-2012, and is considered to be "earthquake prone" under the Building Act 2004.
- 12 The Chapel and its setting is listed as 'highly significant' in the Christchurch District Plan (*District Plan*). Prior to the earthquakes, "Bishopspark Main Building and Chapel" were listed by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (*HNZPT*) as a Category 1 Historic Place, and this listing has not been updated.
- 13 The Chapel will be structurally upgraded and restored (as closely as possible) to its original form, so that it can be incorporated into the Proposed Village and used by the residents. This work will ensure that the Chapel's heritage values are retained and

enhanced. The Chapel will also have a new use, which will see it preserved for the future.

- 14 The Proposed Village is a more intensive development than the previous Bishopspark retirement village, although the new buildings will be located a similar or greater distance from the Chapel, compared to the previous buildings. An open space, village square, will also be provided around the Chapel. As a result, I consider the Chapel will have a greater presence within the Proposed Village than in the past.
- 15 The work to structurally upgrade the building will require the removal of significant amounts of heritage fabric, but the Chapel will be returned to near-original form. Although there will be some negative impacts arising from the proposed restoration work, I consider there will also be positive effects, including its structural upgrading, return to good condition, reinstatement of original elements, and the new use ensuring its continuing survival.
- 16 In response to submissions, I note that the area between Bealey Avenue and Peterborough Street was previously listed by HNZPT as the Park Terrace Historic Area. The heritage character of the area has changed considerably, particularly following the Canterbury earthquakes, and is undergoing a transformation with more intensive developments being constructed. This change prompted HNZPT to remove the Park Terrace Historic Area listing. I do not consider the Proposed Village will adversely impact the heritage character of the wider area.
- 17 In response to submissions, I note that the Dorset Street Flats (*Flats*) are listed as a Category 1 Historic Place by HNZPT and scheduled as a Highly Significant Historic Heritage Place in the District Plan. The Proposed Village does not try to emulate its older neighbours, which I consider is an appropriate response to the surrounding context, including the Flats. Building B01 is "U" shaped in plan and the upper level is stepped back to reduce its scale. In my opinion, any adverse effects on the heritage values of the Flats will be less than minor.
- 18 I agree with the Council Officer's Report that the proposed retention and restoration of the Chapel and its return to its previous use as a chapel associated with a retirement village is a very positive outcome.¹ I have reviewed the proposed conditions 45 to 57 set out in the Council Officer's Report, and with one amendment to condition 46(e), support the conditions proposed.

¹ Council Officer's Report, paragraphs 196 and 212.

- 19 In conclusion, the potential adverse heritage effects of the new Proposed Village buildings and the structural upgrading, restoration and refurbishment of the Chapel will be appropriately mitigated. The Proposed Village will also create a number of positive heritage benefits through the retention, seismic strengthening and restoration of the Chapel.

SUMMARY OF THE HERITAGE REPORT AND FURTHER INFORMATION RESPONSES

- 20 My role in the Proposed Village prior to the receipt of submissions was confined to considering options to restore the Chapel, which remains on the Site, and the potential effects on the Chapel and its wider heritage setting.
- 21 I prepared a heritage assessment of the Chapel and a subsequent Heritage Report. The latter document assessed the potential effects of the Proposed Village on the Chapel located on the Bishopspark Site.

The Chapel

History of the Chapel

- 22 The Chapel was constructed in 1927. It originally adjoined a larger building, Bishopscourt, the former residence of the Anglican Bishop of Christchurch (*Residence*). The Residence and the Chapel were designed by architect Cecil Wood. The Chapel was designed to be used as a private chapel and a place of personal worship for the incumbent bishops.
- 23 The Chapel continued to be used by the bishops until 1984 when the Site was redeveloped by the Anglican Diocese as a retirement village. A number of two-storied dwellings were then constructed on the Site with the Residence and the Chapel both being incorporated into the village. The Chapel continued to be made available for the use of the village residents.
- 24 The Residence was extensively damaged in the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence of 2010-12 and was subsequently demolished. The Chapel, although also damaged, survived. It is, however, still considered to be "earthquake prone" under the Building Act 2004.
- 25 Ryman propose to retain the Chapel for use by the residents of the Proposed Village. To enable that to occur, the Chapel will need to be seismically upgraded, restored and refurbished.

Location of Item and Extent of Setting

- 26 The Chapel is located towards the rear and eastern boundary of the Bishopspark Site. The Chapel was previously surrounded on three sides by buildings – to the west by the Residence and to the

north and south by the former retirement village buildings. These buildings have since all been demolished, leaving the Chapel as the only remaining building on the Bishopspark Site and the only visible evidence of the original use of the Bishopspark Site.

Architectural Style

- 27 The Chapel was designed in a simple Georgian Revival style, reminiscent of the country churches built in England during the reign of George III. In tune with its architectural style, the Chapel is a rectangular building featuring a pitched slate roof with a central lantern, plastered walls and round headed classical windows. The interior is more elaborate with a vaulted roof and panelled walls of black pine with decorative carvings and mouldings. The Chapel has significance as it is understood to be the only Georgian styled chapel in New Zealand.

Layout of the Chapel

- 28 The Chapel is single storied in height and oriented in a near east/west direction with plan dimensions of approximately 10 x 6.5 metres. The entry doors are located at the western end, where a covered way previously extended from the Chapel across to the Residence. An altar, since removed, was located at the eastern end of the Chapel. Two rows of pews extended along the side walls.
- 29 Two ornately carved seats are located at the western end of the Chapel on either side of the entry doors.

Construction

- 30 The external walls of the Chapel are made from unreinforced brick masonry which, by definition, makes it an earthquake prone building. The walls are supported on concrete foundations and are plastered externally and overlaid internally with timber panelling. The roof comprises timber trusses overlaid with slates. Internally, the curved ceiling was formed with timber laths over which plaster was applied. The entry doors are timber as are the fittings including the timber pews and carved seats. The windows are made from steel.

Changes to the Place

- 31 The Chapel essentially remains in its original form although some changes have occurred, particularly following the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence. External changes known to have taken place include the removal of the covered way that connected the Chapel to the Residence and a cupola (roof ventilator) from the roof.
- 32 Internally, the altar and lectern have been removed. The pews which previously faced each other across the aisle, together with their panelled front pieces, remain within the building. During the

earthquakes, the plaster ceiling collapsed, leaving the laths in place.

Assessment of Heritage Values

33 I assessed the heritage values of the Chapel using the criteria in the Christchurch District Plan (*District Plan*). I consider the Chapel has:

- 33.1 Historical and Social significance, as it was designed for the personal use of the Bishops of Christchurch;
- 33.2 Cultural and Spiritual significance, as a consecrated building and the centre for activities associated with the Diocese of Christchurch;
- 33.3 Architectural and Aesthetic significance, as an example of a Georgian styled building with classical detailing;
- 33.4 Technological and Craftsmanship significance, particularly for the fine internal timber finishing work; and
- 33.5 Contextual significance, as the only remaining part of the complex that was formerly the Anglican Bishopscourt.

Heritage Listing Christchurch City Council

- 34 Prior to the Canterbury earthquakes, the "*Bishopspark/former bishop's residence and Chapel and setting*" was scheduled as a Group 1 historic heritage place in the previous Christchurch City Plan.
- 35 Following the demolition of the Residence, the scheduled item in the District Plan now relates to the "*Former Bishop's Chapel and Setting*". The Bishop's Chapel is rated as being "*Highly Significant*". The setting now extends around the four sides of the Chapel to the boundaries of the previous buildings.

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)

- 36 Prior to the earthquakes, "*Bishopspark Main Building and Chapel*" were listed by Heritage New Zealand as a Category 1 Historic Place. Although the Residence has since been demolished, the listing has not been updated.
- 37 The Site was included in the "Park Terrace Historic Area". This entry has since been deleted from the HNZTP List due to the demolition of a number of houses along Park Terrace following the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence.

Planning context

- 38 Section 9.3 Historic Heritage of the District Plan contains objectives, policies and rules that apply to places of historic heritage value. The heritage upgrade works to the Chapel are a controlled activity under Rule 9.3.4.1.2 (C1) of the District Plan and the establishment of new buildings in the Chapel setting is a restricted discretionary activity under Rules 9.3.4.1.3 (RD2) of the District Plan. Accordingly, my assessment was informed by the matters of control and matters of discretion, as well as the relevant objectives and policies.
- 39 The relevant matters of control for heritage upgrade works are:
- 39.1 The form, materials, and methodologies to be used to maintain heritage values, including integration with, and connection to other parts of the heritage item;
 - 39.2 The methodologies to be used to protect the heritage item during heritage upgrade works, reconstruction and restoration;
 - 39.3 Documentation of change during the course of works, and on completion of work by such means as photographic recording; and
 - 39.4 Whether Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga has been consulted and the outcome of that consultation.
- 40 The relevant matters of discretion for the establishment of new buildings in the Chapel setting are:
- 40.1 Whether the proposal will provide for ongoing and viable use of the heritage item;
 - 40.2 Whether the proposal is consistent with maintaining the heritage values of the heritage items or heritage setting, having particular regard to (i) the design of the proposal; (ii) the extent of earthworks necessary; and (iii) the need to remove or transplant mature trees;
 - 40.3 The extent to which the works are in accordance with the principles in Policy 9.3.2.2.3(b), and whether the proposal is supported by a conservation plan or expert heritage report;
 - 40.4 Whether the proposed work will have a temporary or permanent adverse effect on heritage values (as well as any positive effects);
 - 40.5 The extent to which mitigation measures are proposed to be implemented to protect the heritage item; and

- 40.6 The functional need for utilities to be located in or in proximity to heritage items and heritage settings.
- 41 The relevant objectives and policies seek the following outcomes:
- 41.1 The overall contribution of historic heritage is maintained through the protection and conservation of significant historic heritage (including via adaptive re-use) (Objective 9.3.2.1.1);
- 41.2 Provide for the ongoing use and adaptive re-use of heritage items and heritage settings (including new buildings in heritage settings) in a manner that is sensitive to, and protects, the heritage values (Policies 9.3.2.2.3 and 9.3.2.2.5);
- 41.3 Undertake any work on a heritage setting in a manner that (i) focuses on areas that are able to accommodate change; (ii) conserves the authenticity of the heritage setting; (iii) minimise the risk of damage to heritage items or settings; (iv) documents the material changes in the heritage setting; and (v) is reversible where practicable (Policy 9.3.2.2.3(a)).

Work to the Chapel

Purpose of Work

- 42 The Chapel sustained some damage in the Canterbury earthquakes but has survived relatively intact. The west gable fared particularly badly with a number of bricks that are now loose. Cracks are also visible, particularly in the north wall.
- 43 Ryman explored various options in relation to the Chapel, including demolition, before deciding to retain it. The Chapel will be structurally upgraded and restored (as closely as possible) to its original form, so that it can be incorporated into the Proposed Village and used by the residents.
- 44 The setting of the Chapel has changed with the demolition of the Residence and the previous retirement village, and will change again as the Proposed Village is constructed. Nevertheless, the Chapel retains significant heritage values as the surviving remnant of the complex that was designed in the 1920s to accommodate the Bishops of Christchurch and their families.
- 45 Restoration of the Chapel including structural upgrading and remedial work will ensure that its heritage values are retained and enhanced. The Chapel will also have a new use, which will see it preserved for the future. The work required to achieve this outcome is detailed in the following section.

Structural Upgrading

46 The works required to structurally upgrade the Chapel have been identified by Ryman's engineers Mitchell Vranjes. I understand the following work is required:

- 46.1 Removal of all internal timber panelling and other detailing, including pews, built in seating, raised daises and likely sections of the floor;
- 46.2 Deconstruction of gable ends and removal of temporary bracing;
- 46.3 Removal of all slates from the roof and installation of a plywood diaphragm over the roof structure. Securing the diaphragm to the tops of walls;
- 46.4 Removal of all external plasterwork, repairing of all cracks and application of glass fibre mesh and proprietary hydraulic lime repair mortar on both sides of the walls;
- 46.5 Reconstruction of gable ends, as per the original details but with the external and internal surfaces overlaid with the mesh and repair mortar; and
- 46.6 Unlike the majority of the Bishopspark Site, the ground under the Chapel will not be excavated.

Restoration and Refurbishment Work

47 After the structural upgrading work has been completed, the Chapel will be restored and refurbished, as closely as possible to its pre-earthquake form. This work is likely to involve:

- 47.1 Reinstatement of existing roof slates and supply of new slates where existing slates have been broken;
- 47.2 Reinstatement of the roof ventilator including lead cupola;
- 47.3 Reconstruction of timber eaves, soffits and dentils;
- 47.4 Application of finish plaster coats and reinstatement of detailing, including quoins at corners and gable end mouldings and crosses;
- 47.5 Construction of a new entry porch based on the details of the original covered walkway between the Chapel and the Residence;
- 47.6 Refurbishment of external joinery, including windows, doors and gable end grilles;

47.7 Reinstatement of internal timber panelling, including carved seats;

47.8 Reinstatement of the curved plaster ceiling, upper level end wall panels and ornamental plaster mouldings; and.

47.9 Reinstatement of the sections of uplifted floor.

Adaptation for New Uses

48 The Chapel was originally designed for the personal use of the Bishop of Christchurch and was connected to the Residence by a covered way. The Chapel itself was set up with an altar located on a dais at the eastern end, two rows of pews facing each other along the side walls and two carved seats on either side of the entry doors at the western end.

49 The use of the building obviously changed when the Bishop left and the Bishopspark Site was redeveloped as a retirement village by the Anglican Diocese. From the evidence of historic photographs, the covered way to the Residence appears to have remained in place and was only demolished, along with the former Residence, following the Canterbury earthquakes. The interior of the Chapel appears to have remained intact up to the time of the earthquakes, after which the carved altar and lectern were removed by the Anglican Diocese and placed in storage where they remain.

50 The use of the Chapel is now likely to change again with less emphasis being placed on the building being used for religious purposes. I understand Ryman has not yet decided on the final use for the Chapel, but the intention is that it will continue to be used by the residents of the Proposed Village for a variety of activities. Some changes may need to be made to the building's internal layout to enable it to become a multi-functional space. It is noted that the interior of the Chapel is not protected under the District Plan.

51 The ground level in the vicinity of the Chapel will be lowered by approximately 600 mm as part of a requirement for level access across the Bishopspark Site, and particularly around the courtyard where the buildings open out and engage with the courtyard. Although the Chapel will remain at its original height, it will appear raised due to the lowering of the ground level. At the front of the building, a new terrace will be provided and steps will lead from that down to the new ground level. Along the north western side of the Chapel, a new accessible ramp with handrails will be provided. A new raised garden will be formed along the south eastern side of the Chapel to make up the difference between the original and the new ground level. The area between the Chapel and the new buildings will be paved.

Impact on Heritage Values

Proposed Village Works

- 52 The Proposed Village is a more intensive development that comprises a number of buildings that are considerably larger than the previous two storeyed structures.
- 53 Building B01 a four-level building located 5 metres to the south of the Chapel, and Building B04, the low-level pavilion located 8 metres to the north east of the Chapel will intrude into the Heritage Setting surrounding the Chapel. However, these buildings will be located a similar or greater distance from the Chapel, compared to the previous buildings. The design also provides views through to three sides of the Chapel.
- 54 Although the close proximity of some of the Proposed Village buildings to the Chapel and the intrusion of some of the new buildings into the heritage setting will impact on the Chapel's heritage values, in my opinion this impact will be appropriately mitigated by the creation of an open space around the Chapel, denoted as a village square.
- 55 The ground level immediately surrounding the Chapel will be lowered and then landscaped with paving and low level planting, which will have the effect of making the Chapel more prominent. A new terrace and covered pergola will be constructed at the front of the Chapel.
- 56 As a result, I consider the Chapel will have a greater presence within the Proposed Village than in the past. It will provide a focal point as one approaches the Proposed Village along the driveway leading from Park Terrace as it will be visible through the glazed reception area. It will also be centred within the Village square with views through from other directions.

Structural Upgrading, Restoration and Refurbishment

- 57 Ryman proposes to structurally upgrade the Chapel and to restore and refurbish it as near as possible to its original form. Some changes to the internal layout may be required to enable the building to function in a new role. On-site consultation has been undertaken with personnel from HNZPT to explain the work proposed for the Chapel.
- 58 The work to structurally upgrade the building will require the removal of significant amounts of heritage fabric, including all of the external plaster work to enable the application of new repair mortar to the underlying brick masonry.
- 59 Other heritage fabric that will need to be removed includes all the internal panelling and mouldings, as well as built in seating, pews and daises and sections of the tongue and groove flooring. This

work is required to enable the application of the new repair mortar to the inside face of the brick walls. The slate roof will also need to be removed to enable the ply roof diaphragm to be installed.

- 60 Once the structural work has been completed, the Chapel will be returned to near-original form. The intention of the restoration works is that there should be no evidence that any structural intervention has taken place.
- 61 Externally, the walls will be replastered and mouldings formed to recreate the original external form of the building. The existing roof slates will be re-laid and the roof vents, cupola and crosses reinstated. Within the Chapel, the original heritage fabric such as the timber panelling and mouldings, built in seating and areas of flooring will all be reinstated. Elements such as the curved plaster ceiling and plaster wall surfaces will be restored to their original form.
- 62 At the entry doors, Ryman intends to construct a new canopy to provide shelter. The canopy will reflect the original covered walkway that connected the Chapel with the Residence with similar details and materials. The original architect's drawings and early photographs have been reviewed to ensure the details are historically accurate.
- 63 The work proposed to be carried out on the Chapel will result in the permanent loss of some original heritage fabric, notably all the original external plasterwork. I consider this work will have a negative impact on the building's heritage values. However, this negative impact is unavoidable if the Chapel is to be preserved and it will be mitigated, in part, by the intention to replicate the form and finish of the original plaster.
- 64 Although there will be some negative impacts arising from the proposed restoration work, I consider there will also be positive effects as follows:
 - 64.1 The Chapel will have a new and viable use as an integral part of the Proposed Village, which will ensure its continuing survival;
 - 64.2 The Chapel will be structurally upgraded to ensure it is better equipped to withstand future seismic events;
 - 64.3 The Chapel will be returned to a good condition and all defects remedied; and
 - 64.4 Elements such as the ventilator on the ridge that were removed or were damaged in the earthquakes will be

reinstated. The new entry canopy will reflect the original walkway between the Chapel and the Residence.

Conclusion

- 65 Overall, I consider the Chapel's heritage values will be enhanced as a result of the proposed work and that positive outcomes of the proposed work will more than compensate for any potentially negative impacts. The work will generally enhance the Chapel's heritage values, while any potentially negative effects from the Proposed Village are considered to be minor.

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

- 66 I have reviewed all of the submissions, and have identified the following heritage related issues raised by submitters:
- 66.1 A number of submitters support the Proposed Village as a whole, including some submitters who specifically support the retention and restoration of the Chapel;
- 66.2 Some submitters² are concerned about potential impacts of the Proposed Village on the surrounding area, which they view as being one of the most historic areas of Christchurch. One submission was made by an occupant of a villa at 1 Dorset Street expressing concern that the Proposed Village did not take into account the heritage character of the neighbourhood. The villa in question is not scheduled in the District Plan;
- 66.3 The residents and owners³ of a group of eight flats, known as the Dorset Street Flats, located at 2-16 Dorset Street are concerned about potential impacts of the Proposed Village on the Flats. I comment specifically on potential heritage effects associated with these submissions;
- 66.4 Two submissions⁴ commented on potential adverse impacts of the Proposed Village on the Chapel. One submission also queries the proposed use of the Chapel; and
- 66.5 The submission from HNZPT strongly supports the retention of the Chapel and the proposal to seismically strengthen and

² Including submissions from: G. Bennett; S. O'Connor; R. Pearson; M. Rinaldo; Dr J. Roper-Lindsay; V. Zanetti; C. Garlick; Christchurch Civic Trust; R. Bluett; ICON; M. Pascuzzi; Dorset Street Flat Owners Group; P. Wells; B. & M. Logan; M. Cottle; Heritage New Zealand; and J. Stratford & G. Waddy.

³ Including submissions from Dorset Street Flat Owners Group (comprising of D. Turner, Dr J. Roper-Lindsay & J. Lindsay, C. Garlick, R. Pearson & C. McClintock); D. Turner; Dr J. Roper-Lindsay; C. Garlick; and R. Pearson.

⁴ Submissions from Christchurch Civic Trust and ICON.

repair it and provide for a continued use which aligns with its original purpose. The HNZPT submission states that the close proximity of buildings that are larger than those that they replace may reduce the heritage context of the Chapel and, if not managed sensitively, will result in adverse effects on its setting. I understand that the NZHPT submission points have been resolved by the proposed conditions.

- 67 In the following sections, I consider the heritage issues raised by the submitters in opposition to the Proposed Village. I address conditions to protect the Chapel later in my evidence.

Potential impacts on the heritage values of the surrounding area

- 68 As noted earlier in my evidence, the area between Bealey Avenue and Peterborough Street was previously listed by HNZPT as the Park Terrace Historic Area. This area was once the domain of wealthy citizens who lived in houses designed by the most fashionable architects.
- 69 The area was undergoing change prior to the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence with the development of apartments and a hotel. The rate of change accelerated following the earthquakes with five one-time large homes being demolished. At least three of these sites are now either being developed or have the potential to be developed. A new six level apartment block at 108 Park Terrace adjacent to the Bishopspark Site is currently under construction. The existing environment and planning context is addressed in the evidence of Ms Skidmore, Mr Burns and Dr Mitchell.
- 70 The area is not scheduled in the District Plan. There are now only four historic heritage sites scheduled in the District Plan in the area, with only two having a Park Terrace address, being the Chapel and a large dwelling at 128 Park Terrace. The other two scheduled buildings in the area are the Flats and a series of maisonettes on the corner of Dublin Street and Bealey Avenue. Both the Sites are zoned Residential Central City.
- 71 The heritage character of the area has changed considerably, particularly following the Canterbury earthquakes, and is undergoing a transformation with more intensive developments being constructed. This change has prompted HNZPT to remove the Park Terrace Historic Area listing. In my opinion, the heritage character of the area has been eroded to the point where relatively little remains. This trend is likely to continue as intensive developments such as the Proposed Village are encouraged under the District Plan zoning. Because of that, I do not consider the Proposed Village will adversely impact the heritage character of the wider area.

Potential impacts on the Dorset Street Flats

- 72 I understand the Council Officer's Report and the evidence of Dr Mitchell agree this matter is not a relevant consideration for this application. Nevertheless, I have been asked to respond to the submission.
- 73 The Flats are listed as a Category 1 Historic Place by HNZPT and scheduled as a Highly Significant Historic Heritage Place in the District Plan. The complex was designed in what would become known as the Brutalist style (from the French Brut meaning raw) by Miles (later Sir Miles Warren) and is recognised as one of the most significant Modern Movement buildings in New Zealand. The significant heritage values of the Flats are well recognised.
- 74 I acknowledge that the Proposed Village is larger in scale than the retirement village that was previously on the Bishopspark Site. The Proposed Village is also larger than nearby single storey villas and the two storeyed Flats. However, much of the recent development in the area is larger than the villas and Flats, and the scale of the Proposed Village reflects its Residential Central City zoning.
- 75 With respect to its design, the Proposed Village has been designed by Warren and Mahoney, a well-respected Christchurch architectural firm, as a contemporary development and one that clearly does not try to emulate its older neighbours (although it adopts some design inspiration from the previous use of the Bishopspark Site). In my opinion, that is an appropriate response to the surrounding context, including the Flats.
- 76 An image created by Young Architects was attached to the submission of the Dorset Street Flat Owners Group. The image shows the north-elevation of the Flats with proposed Building B01 superimposed behind them. Both buildings are shown as a true elevation – a view that, in reality, will never be seen - with the new building appearing as one large structure.
- 77 Building B01 is in fact "U" shaped in plan, with two wings enclosing a landscaped courtyard. Although the building is taller than the Flats, at four levels, the upper level is stepped back to reduce its scale. For this reason, when viewed from the street, I do not believe that the Flats will be overshadowed or dominated by the Proposed Village such that their heritage values would be adversely impacted. Ms Rebecca Skidmore and Mr Andrew Burns address the potential amenity effects on the Flats.
- 78 Some of the submitters described the end walls of the two wings of Building B01 as being largely blank. In fact, there are small windows at each level in the end walls with angled screens to

provide some texture and interest to the facades. The angled screens will also ensure privacy to the Flats.

79 I also note that a former stables building behind the Flats (*Stables*) that was demolished after the earthquakes is to be reconstructed. I understand that the new building will not be a replica and will, in fact be a modern building without any heritage values. It will, however, provide additional separation between the Flats and the Proposed Village.

80 In summary, the Flats face north, which means they will be facing away from the Proposed Village. Efforts have also been made to reduce the scale of the two wings of the B01 Building by stepping back their upper level. In my opinion, the heritage values of the Flats will not be adversely affected by the Proposed Village.

Potential impacts on the Chapel

81 The potential impacts of the Proposed Village on the Chapel are addressed in detail in my summary of the Heritage Report above.

82 The Chapel has been surrounded by buildings since the previous retirement village was established in 1984. The building to the north was only 4.5 metres from the Chapel and the building to the south only five metres. The Proposed Village design has a new building to the south (Building B01) five metres away and a new building to the north (Building B03) eight metres away. To the north east, the Building B04 is a low level pavilion which will be single storeyed directly behind the Chapel rising to two storeys to the south. To the southwest, the Building B01 main reception area will be single level. In summary, I consider the Proposed Village design will avoid the Chapel feeling closed in and the Chapel will not be "*dwarfed into insignificance*" as suggested by a submitter.

83 The reception area will be glazed to the front and rear, so visitors to the Proposed Village will have a view of the Chapel as they travel up the driveway. The reception space will also have a folded roof as a reference to the gabled roof of the chapel. Two new view shafts will also be created within the Proposed Village to either side of the Chapel. In my opinion, the Proposed Village design will result in the Chapel, located within its own square, taking on a greater prominence than it currently has. The low level pavilion and reception area ensure that the Chapel will not be surrounded by tall buildings.

84 Overall, I consider the design of the Proposed Village is an appropriate response to the Chapel's heritage values, and any effects on the Chapel and its wider heritage setting will be positive to adverse minor.

Use of the Chapel

- 85 In response to the Christchurch Civic Trust submission regarding the use of the Chapel, Ryman has stated that the Chapel will become an integral part of the Proposed Village and will be available for use by the residents. I consider this to be an appropriate use for the building. I agree with Ms Suzanne Richmond that this proposal continues its use as a private chapel.⁵

RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OFFICER REPORTS

- 86 I have reviewed the Council Officer's Report and the associated Heritage Report prepared by Ms Suzanne Richmond.

Chapel

- 87 The Council Officer's Report agrees that the proposed retention and restoration of the Chapel and its return to its previous use as a chapel associated with a retirement village is a very positive outcome.⁶
- 88 Ms Richmond notes the loss of heritage fabric, such as the external plasterwork, but accepts that the new plasterwork and detailing will replicate the former form and finish, with the reinforced mortar increasing the structural integrity of the building.⁷
- 89 Ms Richmond says it is unclear whether the new ramp will be fixed to heritage fabric. I can confirm that the new ramp and handrails will be separated from the Chapel and will not be fixed to it.
- 90 Ms Richmond notes that parts of the new buildings will encroach on the already small heritage setting. She also notes that the new buildings are higher structures than the previous buildings on the Bishopspark Site, except for the single storey wing of Building B04 which is in keeping with the modest scale of the Chapel. However, Ms Richmond considers that the Proposed Village layout and design compensates for the scale of the new buildings by the creation of a village square around the Chapel and the provision of viewshafts to the Chapel. She considers this design ensures that there will be breathing space around the Chapel, which will allow the building to be viewed from all sides.⁸ I agree with Ms Richmond's conclusions, and do not consider that any amendments to the Proposed Village design are required to address heritage effects.

⁵ Council Officer's Report, Appendix E – Heritage Report, page 4.

⁶ Council Officer's Report, paragraphs 196 and 212.

⁷ Council Officer's Report, Appendix E – Heritage Report, page 2.

⁸ Council Officer's Report, Appendix E – Heritage Report, page 2.

Trees

- 91 Ms Richmond suggests that retention of the oak tree and kowhai near the Chapel would strengthen the link to the former uses on the Site.⁹ The Council Officer's Report invites Ryman to comment on the feasibility of retaining the oak tree and kowhai tree near the Chapel.¹⁰
- 92 I understand from the Council's Heritage Assessment – Statement of Significance for the Former Bishop's Chapel and Setting that, as at the report date for the assessment, being 10 November 2014 and 29 March 2017, the broader Site was defined by formal lawns, wide paths and mature trees. At the time, five trees were listed, including a kowhai. However, I understand that the kowhai is no longer listed in the District Plan. I am not qualified to comment on the heritage or other values of the trees.

Dorset Street Flats

- 93 Ms Richmond considers the Proposed Village will have a "notable visual impact" on the heritage values of the Flats.¹¹ I disagree for the reasons sets out at paragraphs 72-80 above.

Conclusion

- 94 The Council Officer's Report and the Heritage Report do not raise any material conflicts with my own views and I have not identified any comments which lead me to change my earlier opinion on the heritage effects of the Proposed Village. I comment on the officer's proposed conditions below.

DRAFT CONDITIONS

- 95 I have reviewed the proposed conditions 45 to 57 set out in the Council Officer's Report, including the proposed new conditions 45, 50 and 57 and amended condition 46(e). I agree with the conditions with the exception of the amendment to condition 46(e). The proposed amendment is:

A methodology for preparation of the exterior surface of the chapel if this is required. The engineering report references sandblasting and high pressure water blasting of surfaces. Sandblasting is not considered an appropriate conservation technique and is not to be used as it can damage the heritage fabric. Significant care must be taken with water blasting to avoid damage to heritage fabric, for example, beginning with low pressure (garden hose pressure) and increasing the pressure slowly if required with constant monitoring.

⁹ Council Officer's Report, Appendix E – Heritage Report, page 4.

¹⁰ Council Officer's Report, paragraph 207.

¹¹ Council Officer's Report, Appendix E – Heritage Report, page 4.

- 96 I agree that sandblasting is not an appropriate conservation technique and should not be generally used on heritage fabric. In this particular case, however, I understand that the brick substrate must be free of any residual plaster to ensure that the new structural plaster system can adhere to the substrate. As the structural plaster will be a permanent finish, any damage to the brickwork will not be visible. I also do not consider that water blasting should be carried out in this case as the brick substrate could become water logged and result in long term detrimental effects to the heritage fabric. In my opinion, the condition should be amended as set out in the planning evidence.

CONCLUSIONS

- 97 The potential adverse heritage effects of the new Proposed Village buildings and the structural upgrading, restoration and refurbishment of the Chapel will be appropriately mitigated. The Proposal will also create a number of positive heritage benefits through the retention, seismic strengthening and restoration of the Chapel.

David Pearson
6 January 2021