

*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 Suzanne Amanda Richmond on behalf of Christchurch City Council

---

Dated: 27 January 2021

## SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF SUZANNE AMANDA RICHMOND ON BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

1. My name is Suzanne Amanda Richmond. I am a Heritage Advisor at Christchurch City Council and have provided Council's heritage advice on this application. I last visited the application site at 100-104 Park Terrace on 24 January.
2. I support the proposed works to retain and upgrade the Former Bishop's Chapel - a nationally significant heritage building protected as a Highly Significant heritage item in the Christchurch District Plan (District Plan), and to return it to use as part of a retirement complex, subject to conditions which have been generally adopted by the applicant and accepted by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.
3. I have read the applicant's heritage evidence and heard Mr Pearson present his summary of evidence. I accept Mr Pearson's advice (at paragraphs 95-96 of his statement of evidence) about the need for sandblasting the chapel in this instance and avoiding water blasting, and accept the amended wording proposed by the applicant for the heritage condition now numbered 47e in proposed conditions dated 27 January).
4. Based on Mr Pearson's confirmation (at paragraph 89 of his statement of evidence) that the new access ramp and handrail will not be attached to the heritage fabric of the chapel, I am comfortable that proposed condition now numbered 55 (requiring fixing details where relevant) is now redundant.
5. With respect to the effects on the chapel's contextual heritage values and the new multi-storeyed buildings proposed around the edges of the chapel's small protected heritage setting, I share the concern of Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga in their submission that the taller buildings have the potential to visually dominate the chapel. However I generally agree with Mr Pearson's view that this adverse effect is mitigated by the space to be retained and developed as a courtyard around the chapel, the low rise structures behind, and the permeable atrium in front of the chapel. The proposal opens up new view shafts to the chapel that weren't previously possible, given that the chapel was constructed behind the (now demolished) bishop's residence and to the rear of the site, and was then surrounded by buildings in the 1980s as part of the previous retirement complex.
6. In response to the submissions concerned about the heritage effects on the adjoining Dorset Street Flats, which is also nationally significant and scheduled as a Highly Significant heritage item in the District Plan, I note that there is no explicit consideration of heritage effects on adjoining sites in the District Plan heritage matters of discretion. However as heritage values contribute to amenity values as you have heard from Ms Schröder in her discussion of the Dorset Street Flats at paragraphs 34, 36 and 37 of her summary of evidence, and in Dr Judith Roper-Lindsay's evidence, I have considered heritage as an aspect of amenity effects which are assessed in the retirement villages and bulk and location matters. I note here that amenity was an integral consideration in the Flats' design, both the design of the internal layout of the units and also the external spaces of the heritage setting, including the south facing rear communal space referred to in the owners' submissions, which is overlooked by building B01.
7. I agree with Mr Pearson in so far as the design of the new B01 building adjoining the Dorset Street Flats' southern boundary will offer some mitigation of the potential dominance effects on the contextual values of the Flats. However, the visual simulation attached to the submission of the Dorset Street Flats Owners Group depicts the development as forming a visual backdrop to the Flats which will adversely impact on views to the heritage building from Dorset Street and that views from the Flats within its heritage setting (the site at 2-16 Dorset Street) will also be adversely affected. I consider that there will be an associated loss of amenity for the public, owners, residents and visitors engaging with the Dorset Street Flats' heritage item and setting.

8. Further to Mr Pearson's comments (at paragraphs 91-92 of his statement of evidence and at paragraph 11 of his summary of evidence), I would like to understand from the applicant whether the retention of the remaining trees in the vicinity of the chapel has been considered. Ms Schröder has discussed the importance of retaining trees at paragraphs 31 and 32 of her summary of evidence. The oak, located in the southeast corner of the 100-104 Park Terrace site, which was protected as a Notable tree in the previous City Plan, sits outside the heritage setting, but is located in the same general area as the chapel at the rear of the site, and can be seen in views of the chapel from the north and west. It contributes to the contextual heritage values of the heritage item. It has a long history on the site, both during the time of the Bishop's residence and the retirement village. The kōwhai and also the lacebark identified in the chapel's heritage statement of significance in the District Plan referred to by Mr Pearson, are located immediately behind the chapel, within the heritage setting. Along with the beech to the northwest of the chapel which is more central to the site, these are well established trees which currently maintain a connection to the historic garden context of the chapel on the wider site. I understand the beech was investigated for relocation within the site, but I am not aware of whether the retention of the other trees has been considered.
9. I consider that the proposed conditions will be important in minimising the heritage effects of the works to the heritage item and the works in the heritage setting. Of particular importance is engaging a heritage professional to oversee the works to the chapel and the construction of the adjoining buildings and basement. The implementation of measures proposed in the Temporary Protection Plan (proposed condition – now 47) will be key to protecting the heritage item during the works to the chapel and also to avoiding impact damage and vibration effects on the chapel from the construction works.
10. The draft Temporary Protection Plan submitted following a Request for Information included a recommendation by the project engineer endorsed by Mr Pearson to undertake the structural upgrade of the chapel prior to the surrounding construction works. I would like to see this measure retained in the revised Temporary Protection Plan and allowed for in the construction sequencing to significantly enhance the chapel's ability to withstand potential construction vibration effects.
11. I conclude that overall the works to the heritage item will have positive effects and the works in the heritage setting will have adverse effects which can be mitigated via the proposed conditions to a minor level.