

ADDENDUM – RESPONSE TO MINUTE 9 – RMA/2020/679
LOUISA ARMSTRONG ON BEHALF OF 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
retirement village at 78 Park Terrace, Christchurch

between: **Ryman Healthcare Limited**
Applicant

and: **Christchurch City Council**
Consent Authority

4 October 2021

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Louisa Armstrong and I am employed as a Senior Planner at Beca Limited. I have been engaged by Christchurch City Council to process this application on their behalf. I was previously employed by Christchurch City Council as a Senior Planner and was the processing planner for this application.
2. The following response is in regard to the Commissioners Minute 9 dated 24th September 2021, and the Memorandum of Council on behalf of Ryman Healthcare Limited dated 8 September 2021. The memorandum included amended plans which revised the design and layout of the proposed village and included amendments to buildings B07 and B08. These were provided in response to concern over shading effects and visual dominance on the existing multi-unit developments at 18 Salisbury Street and 15 Peterborough Street. Both sites are located immediately to the east of 78 Park Terrace.
3. In summary the following amendments to the original design are now proposed:
 - B07 – Eastern Wing – Level 5 has been removed in full.
 - B07 Eastern Wing – Level 4 has been removed in part and reconfigured with a recessed penthouse option adopted from the top level of the Western Wing. The materials and colours of the façade have been amended to address the new height and scale of the Eastern Wing to correlate with the Western Wing.
 - B07 Western Wing – Two apartments have been added to Level 3.
 - B08 – One level has been removed in full with the Level 4 (penthouse) being adopted on Level 3. The penthouse level has been slightly reconfigured and shifted 1205mm west from the primary façade.
 - B08 Eastern façade – Materials will be the same as those on the western façade.
4. The above changes will result in B07 and B08 complying with the relevant District Plans built form standards along the boundary with 15 Peterborough Street and 18 Salisbury Street (rule 14.6.2.1 Building height, 14.6.2.2 Daylight recession planes and 14.6.2.4 Minimum building setbacks from internal boundaries).
5. Written approvals have been received in respect of these amended plans from the owners of 4/18, 5/18 and 6/18 Salisbury Street and 7/15, 9/15, 10/15, 20/15 and 22/15 Peterborough Street. Effects on these properties must be disregarded. The written approvals provided from 5/18 and 6/18 Salisbury Street, 7/15 and 9/15 Peterborough Street are incomplete as not all owners have signed. It is also noted that the body corporate for the building at 15 Peterborough has not provided their written approval for the proposal. Given this, effects on these properties have not been disregarded.
6. I have sought advice from Council's Principal Advisor Urban Design, Ms Josie Schröder and this advice is attached as Appendix A and discussed below. Given the discrete nature of the issues raised in the Commissioner's interim decision I have not sought advice from other Council experts.

7. In summary, for the reasons I set out in the discussion below, I consider that the adverse effects associated with the proposed amendments are acceptable in the context of a central city environment and the outcomes sought by the District Plan.

Discussion

8. As outlined above, the plans for B07 have been amended to reduce the number of storeys and the overall height from five to four storeys and set in the upper floor, effectively providing a more staggered height in respect to the eastern boundary with 18 Salisbury Street. I agree with Ms Schroder that this has not removed all shading from 18 Salisbury Street, particularly in respect to units 1/18 and 8/18 which are in closest proximity to the proposal. However, I note that these properties do not have windows on their western elevations and I agree with Ms Schroder that a certain level of shading can be anticipated in a central city environment such as this.
9. The amended comparative shading analysis submitted and the amended drawings have reduced the extent of shading on the outdoor living spaces on the remainder of the adjacent units at 18 Salisbury Street and now allow these areas to receive a greater level of sun to their outdoor living spaces.
10. In regard to 15 Peterborough Street, I concur with Ms Schroder that the reduction in height of B08, in conjunction with the set back of the upper floor, will lessen the extent of shading to a level that could be anticipated within a central city environment such as this, with the extent of shading effects similar in extent to B07. I also agree with Ms Schroder that the changes to the eastern roof and façade treatments, in conjunction with planting proposed, will also reduce the visual dominance of the building on the adjacent properties at 15 Peterborough Street.
11. In summary, I agree with the applicant who considers that the amendments to the scale and design of the eastern wing of Building B07 and B08 meet the requirements of the Commissioners Interim Decision and result in significantly less effects on the units of concern at 15 Peterborough Street and 18 Salisbury Street. The amendments will allow for a reduction in shading over most of the units at 18 Salisbury Street in the late afternoon/early evening and will also ensure that the building will be compatible with the western wing of the of the building.
12. I also agree with the applicant who considers that the amendments to Building B08 will significantly reduce visual dominance effects for west facing units at 15 Peterborough Street, and shading effects will significantly be reduced providing increased sunlight for ground, first and second floor units during the late afternoon at midsummer.
13. The proposed village will bring about considerable change to the area, however the amendments will ensure that a suitable level of amenity for surrounding properties is maintained in the context of a central city environment and the outcomes sought by the District Plan subject to the proposed conditions.

Conditions

14. I concur with the applicant that the proposed conditions will closely match the conditions of the Bishopspark Site (decision dated 21 July 2021) and agree that this is with the exception of those mentioned in paragraph 13 of the Memorandum of Council dated 8 September 2021.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L. Armstrong', with a stylized, cursive script.

Louisa Armstrong
Senior Planner

Appendix A

ADDENDUM – RESPONSE TO MINUTE 9 – RMA/2020/679
JOSIE SCHRÖDER ON BEHALF OF 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
retirement village at 78 Park Terrace, Christchurch

between: **Ryman Healthcare Limited**
Applicant

and: **Christchurch City Council**
Consent Authority

5 October 2021

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Josie Schröder. I am the Principal Advisor Urban Design at Christchurch City Council and have to date provided Council's urban design advice on this application.
2. The following response is in regard to the Commissioners Minute 9 dated 24th September 2021, and more specifically to the updated plans provided by Ryman Healthcare Ltd received on the 8th September 2021 for the site at 78 Park Terrace. These plans include amendments to buildings B07 and B08, provided in response to shading effects on existing multi-unit developments at 18 Salisbury Street and 15 Peterborough Street. Both sites are located immediately to the east of 78 Park Terrace.
3. I also note the completed written approvals received in respect of these amended plans from the owners of 4/18, 5/18 and 6/18 Salisbury Street and 20/15 and 22/15 Peterborough Street. As such these are no longer considered as affected parties.
4. The amended plans dated 25th August 2021 include:
 - B07 - Four storey east wing - including three full storeys and inset upper storey mansard style rooftop apartments, and changes to materials and colour.
 - B08 – Three storey – including two full storeys and inset upper storey apartments within a mansard style roof, and additional articulation of the eastern facade.
5. I have read the updated material including Appendix 2 provided by Mr Burns and Ms Skidmore, and agree with their conclusions in respect to the level of effect resulting from the amendments to the proposal.
6. I note that I was invited by the Ryman Healthcare team to review draft amendments to the proposed plans for 78 Park Terrace on two occasions. I provided an email response following the second meeting, which was on 22nd of August 2021, noting that this was in support of these amendments. In respect to the amended plans subject to this Addendum the email response included the following comments:
 - “B07 - I consider that a four storey building is more in keeping with the central city location as well as balancing the scale (i.e. stepping down from) the western wing of B07. In addition I consider that any adverse effects on neighbours will be comparable or less than those in respect to the amended B08, which I discuss further below. As such I am supportive of the amended B07 east wing at 4 storey (including roof apartment).
 - B08 - The building has been reduced in scale, both by removing a floor and setting the upper floor in, similar in effect to B07, with the total building being 3 levels. The reduction in both scale and height will reduce the extent of overshadowing and dominance effects on adjacent neighbours to the east, particularly at levels 3 and 4. Further façade articulation has been provided on the east elevation to visually break up the length of the building.

- In combination with previous changes proposed to the planting, I am also supportive of the amended design for B08.

Overall I consider the changes positive and will address my concerns.”

7. In summary, for the reasons I set out in the discussion below, I consider the proposal as per the amended plans provided on the 8th September 2021, will have adverse shading effects on 18 Salisbury Street and 15 Peterborough Street. I consider these adverse effects are low or low-moderate, equating to less than minor effect. In addition, the visual dominance effects of B08 on 15 Peterborough Street will at most be low-moderate as a result of changes to the height, roof and eastern façade treatment, in conjunction with planting previously proposed.

Discussion

18 Salisbury Street

8. I did not provide written expert evidence on the overshadowing of the units located at 18 Salisbury Street for the purpose of the Hearing as I had not considered they were affected parties. However during the Hearing I was asked my view by the Commissioners as to the likely impact of shading from B07 on the townhouse units, including as a result of the length of time and the location of overshadowing on the outdoor living spaces in particular. I noted the importance of afternoon/early evening sun in respect to the outdoor living spaces, which was where and when the shading from B07 largely occurred, at the most important times of the year for their use.
9. The plans for B07 have been amended to reduce the number of storeys i.e. the overall height from five to four storeys and set in the upper floor, effectively providing a more staggered height in respect to the eastern boundary with 18 Salisbury Street. This has not removed all shading from 18 Salisbury Street, particularly in respect to units 1/18 and 8/18 which are in closest proximity to the proposal. However, I do not expect there to be no shading effects in a central city environment such as this. The amendment has reduced the extent of shading on the outdoor living spaces on the adjacent units through the summer, allowing some late afternoon/early evening sun, when in my experience these spaces are most likely to be utilised. With the exception of units 1/18 and 8/18, which I consider to experience low-moderate effects, the remainder of the units in my view will experience a low level of effect.

15 Peterborough Street

10. In regard to 15 Peterborough Street, I provided written and oral advice that B08 would have both adverse shading and visual dominance effects that varied in the level of effect but included adverse effects that were moderate to high on west facing apartments. This included those located at levels 3 and 4 in regard to shading, and further, apartments on level 1 and 2 in regard to visual dominance effects.
11. I concur with Mr Burns and Ms Skidmore that the reduction in height of B08, in conjunction with the set back of the upper floor, will lessen the extent of shading to a level that could be anticipated within a central city environment such as this, with the extent of shading effects similar in extent to B07. In addition, changes to the eastern roof and façade treatments, in conjunction with

planting proposed, in my view also reduce the visual dominance of the building on neighbours' to the east i.e. to 15 Peterborough Street, and will reduce these impacts to at the most low-moderate, or equivalent to less than minor.

Conclusion

12. I consider that the proposed amendments to B07 and B08 will reduce the extent of adverse shading and visual dominance effects raised through the course of the Hearing such that they will be no greater than low-moderate in respect to neighbouring occupants of 18 Salisbury Street and 15 Peterborough Street.