

Proposed Comprehensive Care Retirement Village at Park Terrace, Christchurch

*Urban Design, Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment
Report Addendum*

1 Introduction

- 1.1 I prepared the Urban Design, Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment dated March 2020 (“Report”) in relation to the Proposed Comprehensive Care Retirement Village (“Proposed Village”) at Park Terrace, Christchurch (“Site”). That Report was included in the resource consent application AEE as Appendix C.
- 1.2 I also prepared a memorandum dated 7th July 2020 responding to a number of matters raised in a request for further information from Christchurch City Council (“CCC”)(“Memo”). That Memo was included as Appendix K in the overall further information response by Ryman Healthcare Limited (“Ryman”) dated 13th July 2020.
- 1.3 This memorandum responds to a further information request from the Council dated 2 November 2020. In responding to this further information request, Ryman has asked me to consider how and to what extent my assessment of effects in the Report and Memo relies on the Christchurch District Plan (“District Plan”) built form standards.

2 Assessment of Effects

- 2.1 Section 3 of my Report provides a summary of the planning context from the District Plan that guided my assessment. At Section 5, I set out the methodology I used to carry out my urban design, landscape and visual effects assessment. At a broad level my urban design assessment is informed by the best-practice guidance provided by the NZ Urban Design Protocol by the Ministry for the Environment (2005). At a more detailed level, the assessment is informed by the District Plan framework that is summarised in Section 3.

Built form standards

- 2.2 My Report and subsequent Memo relies to some extent on the potential effects of exceedances of the built form standards as:
 - a) The District Plan directs that the effects of exceedances of the built form standards be expressly considered (Rule 14.6.1.3.RD5, Rule 14.15.27, Rule 14.15.28, Rule 14.15.29 and Rule 14.15.30 in this case); and
 - b) More generally, the built form standards are part of the assessment context in that they provide an indication of the scale of activities / buildings anticipated by the District Plan and the effects that are generally considered appropriate in the Residential Central City Zone (noting some properties may have unique characteristics).

- 2.3 I am advised that this approach to using the built form standards to inform my assessment is appropriate in light of the District Plan and wider planning context and in particular Objective 14.2.8(b), Policy 14.2.8.2, Rule 14.15.9 and Rule 14.6.1.RD4(b) of the District Plan, with the proviso that the built form standards do not establish a 'permitted baseline'.

Matters of discretion

- 2.4 I note that the Proposed Village is a restricted discretionary activity in accordance with Rule 14.6.1.3(RD5). The matter of discretion for retirement village buildings (Rule 14.15.9) begins by stating that "while bringing change to existing environments" the proposal should be considered as to whether it is "appropriate to its context", taking into account a range of factors.
- 2.5 As noted in my Site and Context analysis (Section 2 of my Report), the Site is located in an inner City neighbourhood that contains a diverse range of building scales and forms. In terms of expectations around residential amenity outcomes for neighbours, in such an inner City environment there will be an inter-relationship between neighbouring properties, with some implications for amenity such as privacy, shading and outlook. Amenity expectations in a city centre living environment are different from those in a suburban or rural residential living environment, given high density developments are located much closer to one another.
- 2.6 I also note that due to the earthquakes, the area surrounding the Site has and continues to experience a greater level of change than is often the case in established neighbourhoods. For example, the Peterborough Site previously contained residential towers that were considerably higher than the Proposed Village. Further, a number of sites in the immediate vicinity:
- a) have been recently re-developed (e.g. the dwelling at 84 Park Terrace),
 - b) are currently under construction (e.g. the apartment building at 108 Park Terrace),
 - c) have resource consents for re-development (e.g. the town houses at 17 Salisbury Street), or
 - d) remain vacant (e.g. the property at 62 Park Terrace).
- 2.7 As noted, the Proposed Village also requires assessment in relation to the matters of discretion for not meeting the building height standard (Rule 14.15.27), daylight recession planes (Rule 14.15.28), street scene (Rule 14.15.29) and minimum building setback from internal boundaries (14.15.30).

Overall Approach

- 2.8 Overall, I consider there is a reasonable expectation for considerable change in the neighbourhood. The built form standards provide a relevant guide as to the degree of

change, and therefore the scale of development that can generally be readily and appropriately accommodated by the environment.

2.9 The following sections consider the Report and Memo in light of this approach.

Urban Design – proposed use and location, effects on the wider environment, street interfaces, on-site amenity and CPTED

2.10 I have reviewed the Report and Memo sections that address urban design matters in relation to:

- a) the proposed use and location;
- b) effects on the wider environment (urban structure and character),
- c) street interface,
- d) on-site amenity; and
- e) Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (“CPTED”).

2.11 My Report and Memo take into account the relevant built form standards for the zone, but my assessment is not limited by these standards. Applying urban design principles, I have also assessed in a more general sense, the way the Site is configured and buildings designed (including orientation, setback, location of entrances, windows and balconies) in relation to the Sites’ character buildings and mature trees, adjacent streets and the character of the wider context. I have also considered the integration of accessways and carparking. In relation to a consideration of CPTED principles, I have been guided by the Ministry of Justice “National Guidelines for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design In New Zealand” and the Christchurch City Council’s ‘Safer Canterbury: Creating Safer Communities’ (2004).

2.12 When considering the relevant matters of discretion for retirement village buildings (Rule 14.15.9) as they relate to the above urban design matters, my assessment in the Report and Memo does not rely solely on the relevant built form standards in support of my conclusions. Accordingly, I do not have any additions to make to my assessment.

Urban design – amenity of surrounding properties – overlooking/privacy and shading

2.13 In relation to the assessment of effects on amenity for neighbours, my Report and Memo are focused on the effects arising from exceeding the built form standards, as required by Rule 14.6.1.3(RD5).

2.14 While I have not fully discounted the effects that would occur from an ‘anticipated development scenario’ for the purposes of my assessment, I accept that parts of my assessment could be read as relying primarily on the built form standards and the effects of any breaches of those standards. I have therefore reviewed my assessment to identify if any clarifications to the assessment are required.

Overlooking

- 2.15 My assessment of overlooking effects was based on the expected privacy in this environment, the layout of the Proposed Village and, particularly, the location of windows and balconies, and their setback from neighbouring properties. In relation to the properties I assessed in my Report, my assessment of privacy effects resulting from overlooking of neighbouring properties remains unchanged.

As noted in the Section 92 request, my original assessment did not include the consented redevelopment of the 'stables' building at 4A Dorset Street (which is yet to occur). The consented building contains garaging at ground level and a one-bedroom unit at the upper level. The building is located very close (600mm) to the Site boundary. The unit is contained in the roof space that rakes away from the Site. A row of windows from the kitchen and hallway punctuate the dormer roofline facing the Site. In my opinion, the design of the end walls of Building B01, with long slot windows screened with angled louvres, will ensure that overlooking of this property is avoided.

Shading

- 2.16 In response to an earlier request for further information from Council, more detailed shading diagrams were provided. As noted above, I prepared a Memo that included in Appendix 1 additional analysis in relation to potential amenity effects resulting from shading. That analysis took into account the site layout of neighbouring properties and how shading will affect the likely use of these properties. The analysis used the built form standards of the District Plan as a starting point for the analysis. These seek to protect amenity values for residents. I note that there is no objective industry-accepted standard that guides shading analysis, and therefore the District Plan framework provides the only objective guideline for assessment of shading effects in a particular context.
- 2.17 For the purposes of clarity, I have now expanded that shading analysis to identify the magnitude of shading resulting from the Proposed Village, as well as the magnitude of shading additional to the shading resulting from a building built within the built form standards. Both considerations have been used to inform my overall assessment of the amenity effect of the shading, both in terms of time, extent and relationship to site layout and use and amenity expectations guided by the District Plan built form standards.
- 2.18 I note that none of the neighbouring properties have unique characteristics. Accordingly, I consider the built form standards are a useful guide to the appropriateness of amenity effects in all cases. However, I have provided an expanded analysis in Appendix 1 of this Report Addendum. Although I have provided more detailed reasons to support my assessment, in most cases my assessment is unchanged. As a result of this additional analysis, my assessment of effects has changed slightly for a limited number of properties.

2.19 I have clarified that the following additional properties will experience some shading from the Proposed Village (albeit that shading is less than shading resulting from a building built within the built form standards):

- 3 & 4 / 13 Salisbury Street;
- 1-7/18 Salisbury Street;
- 20 Salisbury Street; and
- 22 Salisbury Street.

The shading is minimal in terms of extent and length of time, and I therefore consider the amenity effects of that shading on those properties will be less than minor.

2.20 In relation to 17 Salisbury Street, I have amended my assessment of adverse effects to distinguish between the individual units (rather than considering the property as a whole). As a result, I conclude that the effect of shading from the Proposed Village on the amenity of Unit 6 will be minor (while the effects of shading on the other units will be less than minor). This assessment is due to the extent and length of time (both through the day and through the year) that Unit 6 will be in shade, even though this shading is mostly consistent with the shading that would arise in relation to a building built within the built form standards.

2.21 In relation to the residential unit at 4A Dorset Street, there will be shading over the unit in the morning in mid-winter and either side through to the Equinox. This shading will have fully moved off the building by the middle of the day in mid-winter and by 10am at the Equinox. This shading is very similar to that associated with a building built within the built form standards. Overall, I consider this shading will result in less than minor amenity effects.

2.22 I note that the section 92 request refers to an “updated sunlight and daylight study”. I have assessed the shading effects of the Proposed Village as set out above. I do not consider any separate daylight study is required. For completeness, I note that I consider the Proposed Village will not limit access to daylight for any surrounding property.

Landscape effects

2.23 In terms of the assessment of landscape effects, I have reviewed the Report assessment. I remain of the opinion that, collectively, the Proposed Village will result in positive landscape effects, particularly in relation to the evolving urban landscape character of the neighbourhood.

Visual effects

2.24 I have also reviewed the assessment of visual effects in the Report (which addresses the matters of discretion relating to outlook). I note that my assessment of visual effects

on neighbouring properties identifies the visual change those properties will experience, and then considers the effects of that change in this context. Considering the effects holistically in the context of an environment that is undergoing considerable change, my assessment has not changed.

3 Conclusions

- 3.1 Overall, I remain of the opinion that the combined Bishopspark and Peterborough Sites are well positioned to accommodate the Proposed Village. The site configuration, architectural approach and landscape concept responds to the characteristics of the Site and its surrounding context and will offer a high quality living environment for the elderly and will make a positive contribution to the neighbourhood.



Rebecca Skidmore

Urban Designer/Landscape Architect
November 2020