

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

Summary of evidence of Yvonne Dawn McDonald on behalf
of Christchurch City Council

Dated: 28 January 2021

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF YVONNE DAWN MCDONALD ON BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

1. My name is Yvonne Dawn McDonald. I am employed as a Senior Subdivisions Engineer in the Resource Consents Unit of Christchurch City Council ("Council").
2. I have read the applicant's geotechnical evidence and noted the changed design at 15 Salisbury St, allowing for additional separation from the foundations to the pool. I will not comment on the joint witness statement from the geotechnical caucus, except to note that the foundation construction detail has been refined over time, and the design process will continue until a building consent is obtained.
3. I have made an error of transcription in my assessment, recording the generalised depth to peat in the subsoils as between 7.5-8m bgl, when it is between 3.2-4.0m bgl. I understood that the piles will be founded on the sands and gravels under this peat layer so the error has not affected my assessment.
4. In response to Mr Aramowicz's submissions about the avoidance of settlement at the Bishopspark site, I agree with Mr Mitchell's interpretation of the District Plan that the matters of discretion 8.9.4.3 do not require avoidance of damage.
5. In response to Mr Aramowicz's concerns set out in the geotechnical caucus about damage specifically to masonry fences, I accept Mr Mitchell's amendments to conditions 24 and 26 to include the masonry fences (structures) in addition to the buildings.
6. With regard to Mr Malan's evidence, I believe the proposed methodology, of installation, review and amendment, provides the best mechanism to ensure the installation provides for minimal settlement and therefore reduces the incidence of damage.
7. In response to the applicant's revised conditions, I accept Mr Mitchell's amended wording relating to the Construction Management Plan (CMP) proposed in condition 5, with the addition of a requirement for the presentation of this monitoring and methodology amendment report to Council for acceptance, consistent with the requirement for the initial CMP to be accepted by Council.
8. The joint witness statement proposed that the methodology amendment report be presented to the neighbours. I suggest that the Council's certification of the amendment be provided to them, rather than the proposed amendments.
9. Mr Malan confirmed (at paragraph 43 of his evidence) that the expected settlement will not exceed 10mm at the wall head, and that, in his discussion in reply to submitters and his verbal evidence, settlement will principally occur once the basement floor is poured and the temporary props are removed.
10. In response to submitters' general concerns about the timing of any potential repairs and on the basis of my paragraph 9, I propose that condition 26, regarding actions from the applicant's post construction survey, be tied to the completion of major construction on the adjacent site, rather than all works, to reduce the period of time the landowner could potentially be waiting for action.
11. On the basis of the above, I conclude that the proposed conditions will mitigate the land stability effects of the development and reduce the potential for subsidence or damage to structures to very low levels.