

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

Summary of evidence of **David Alan Pearson** on behalf of Ryman Healthcare Limited

Dated: 25 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



SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF DAVID ALAN PEARSON ON BEHALF OF RYMAN HEALTHCARE LIMITED

- 1 My full name is David Alan Pearson. My qualifications and experience are set out in my statement of evidence dated 6 January 2021. I repeat the code of conduct statement contained in my statement of evidence.
- 2 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.
- 3 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.
- 4 With the demolition of the Residence, the Chapel is the surviving remnant of the complex that formerly occupied the Site. It will now 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.
- 5 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, the Village Square, will also be provided around the Chapel and view shafts from the surrounding streets will be provided. As a result, I consider the Chapel will be more prominent and have a greater presence within the Proposed Village than in the past.
- 6 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 the overall effects will be positive.
- 7 HNZPT lodged a submission in support of the proposal to retain and upgrade the Chapel and has confirmed that the proposed conditions are appropriate.

- 8 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, which 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 area.
- 9 Some submitters raised concerns regarding impacts on the Dorset Street Flats (*Flats*), which 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. I also note that the primary orientation of the Flats is towards Dorset Street and away from the Proposed Village. In my opinion, any adverse heritage effects of the Proposed Village on the Flats will be less than minor.
- 10 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 Council’s heritage advisor Ms Suzanne Richmond agrees with my conclusions that the effects on the former Bishop’s Chapel (*Chapel*) will be positive, and the effects on its heritage setting are minor.²
- 11 There are two minor differences of opinion between myself and Ms Richmond. The first relates to the effects of the Proposed Village on the Dorset Street Flats. I have set out my opinion above, however I understand those effects are not relevant to any matter of discretion.³ The second relates to the desirability of retaining an oak and kowhai tree on the Bishopspark Site.⁴ I understand that neither of these trees are listed in the District Plan and it is not possible for these trees to be retained.

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

² Council Officer’s Report, Appendix E – Heritage Report, p3.

³ Council Officer’s Report, Appendix E – Heritage Report, p4-5.

⁴ Council Officer’s Report, Appendix E – Heritage Report, p4.

- 12 In conclusion, I consider 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.

David Pearson
25 January 2021