

Resource Management Act 1991

Christchurch City Council

Application for Resource Consent

Application Number: RMA/2020/376 and RMA/2020/679

Applicant: Ryman Healthcare Limited

Site address: 78 Park Terrace, 100 – 104 Park Terrace, 20 Dorset Street

Description of Application: Construction, operation and maintenance of a comprehensive care retirement village

Minute 6 from Hearings Commissioners

A. Right of Reply

1. The purpose of this Minute is to identify some matters the Commissioners wish to see addressed in the applicants right of reply. The Council will advise the date for the resumption of the hearing for the presentation of the right of reply.

B. Matters arising out of Site Visit.

2. The Commissioners conducted a site visit on 15 February 2021. Arising out of that the applicant is requested to address cumulative effects in terms of shading from the proposed buildings on the neighbouring Salisbury Street and Peterborough St properties that is in addition to shading already experienced there from existing buildings to the north-east.

C. Other matters to be addressed in the right of reply

3. We wish to draw attention to the issue of light spill which was briefly mentioned by Ms Waddy in her statement of evidence on behalf of the 18 Salisbury St residents. This issue has not been addressed by the applicant's witnesses. It would be helpful if this matter is addressed in the right of reply.

4. In our Minute 5 we asked the applicant to address the implications of setting back the Buildings B01 and B03 to a distance of 4.0 metres from the respective northern boundaries. The applicant responded in a Memorandum dated 24 February describing the effects of moving the buildings in their entirety further into the site, with consequential effects on the functionality and attractiveness of the courtyard and the environs of the chapel, and on traffic circulation. The applicant is now requested to also address the implications of simply shortening the buildings at their northern ends without altering the position of their southern ends.
5. We also enquired what would be required to ameliorate late afternoon shading effects at 18 and 15 Peterborough St caused by buildings B07 and B08. The applicant responded by stating that it would be impossible to achieve this with buildings built up to the limits of the built form standards in the district plan but did not address how much the buildings would have to be reduced in scale below the limits of the built form standards to permit useful late afternoon sun at those properties. We note that in respect of the 15 Peterborough St it is sunlight into the units themselves that is the key consideration as there are no outdoor living spaces or courtyards. The applicant is requested to address that matter.
6. The matters we have identified above are in no way a limitation on the applicant's reply and we anticipate a full reply will be provided.
7. It will be readily apparent from discussions during the hearing that we would value detailed reply submissions on the "tension" within the policy framework which contemplates intensification and change while protecting and contributing to amenity and the quality of the environment and how that may be resolved. Mr Cleary spent some time on this issue in his submissions; several submitters expressed their concerns.
8. Again, we would benefit from detailed reply submissions on the "building envelope" or "plan anticipated" approach which was again addressed by Mr Cleary.
9. We acknowledge the issues identified in [7] and [8] were addressed in the oral reply but we consider them to be of considerable importance in our decision making process.

D.L. Mountfort

David Mountfort

Hearings Panel Chairman

3 March 2021