

Memorandum

To: Louisa Armstrong - Christchurch City Council

Date: 18 May 2020

Re: Further Information Response – RMA 2020 679 and RMA 2020 673, 78 Park Terrace and 100 Park Terrace, Christchurch Central

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide Ryman Healthcare Limited's ("**Ryman**") response to the further information requested by Christchurch City Council via email on 20 April 2020 pursuant to Section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("**RMA**"), in relation to the resource consent applications for a comprehensive care retirement village ("**Proposed Village**") at 78 Park Terrace and 100 Park Terrace, Christchurch Central.

2. HERITAGE

The further information request seeks the following with respect to heritage matters:

Please show the heritage setting overlaid on the site plan and in relation to the basement location so we can identify where buildings and earthworks will be undertaken in the heritage setting.

The updated resource consent and technical assessment drawings attached as **Appendix A** to this memorandum include the heritage setting from the Christchurch District Plan overlaid on the site plan and basement plan for the Bishops Park Site.

Assessment of earthworks in relation to the heritage earthworks standard in 8.9.2.1 P1 (i) beyond what is exempt under 8.9.3(a)(iv).

It is acknowledged that one of the triggers for resource consent being required under Rule 8.9.2.3 (RD1) is due to the proximity of earthworks to the heritage overlay of Bishops Chapel. The relevant matters of discretion for earthworks in an overlay are documented in Rule 9.3.6.1, and are the same as those summarised in section 4.2.11 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects ("**AEE**"). In this instance, the earthworks in the heritage overlay are necessary to establish the basement of Building B01 and to undertake the site improvements around the Bishops Chapel.

The Temporary Protection Plan, which will be prepared by a heritage professional and submitted to the Christchurch City Council for certification prior to the commencement of works on the Bishops Park site, will establish appropriate protocols and methodologies to ensure that the chapel is protected during earthworks on the site and the establishment of basements (including works within the heritage overlay).

Please show the location of the palisade wall to be constructed for protection of the chapel during excavation for the basement in relation to the heritage setting (referred to in DPA Architects' heritage assessment p12).

Mitchell Vranjes and Tonkin & Taylor have confirmed that palisade walls are no longer proposed / necessary in order to protect the Bishops Chapel during the construction of the basement of Building B01. The retaining walls proposed for the three sides of the basement will be sufficient to ensure the overall stability of the ground around the Bishops Chapel.

The engineering report and engineering drawings documenting options and selection of proposed approach for structural upgrade of the chapel.

The drawing set for the proposed upgrade of the Bishops Chapel by DPA Architects is attached as **Appendix B** to this memorandum. These drawings provide further detail on the proposed upgrade and reinstatement works to the Bishops Chapel that are proposed by Ryman.

Please provide details, assessment and plans for any building code upgrade proposed for the chapel in relation to fire and access, including details of the location and dimensions of the ramp described in the application (DPA Architects' heritage assessment p11).

Details on the fire safety upgrades required to the Bishops Chapel under the Building Act 2004 and the position of the ramp along the northern edge of the chapel are detailed in **Appendix C** to this memorandum. The proposed ramp is shown on the Warren and Mahoney site plan provided with the application.

A Temporary Protection Plan (TPP) identifying hazards and associated measures for protecting the chapel during the works (per recommendation in DPA Architects' heritage assessment p15).

The Heritage Assessment did not propose that the Temporary Protection Plan be provided with the resource consent applications for the Proposed Village. In this regard, the Temporary Protection Plan will need to be prepared once the construction methodology for the reinstatement of the Bishops Chapel is confirmed. It will seek to ensure that earthworks are appropriately controlled around the chapel and that works within the chapel itself are appropriately managed so that key features (e.g. roof slates and plaster work) is not damaged.

As such, it is proposed that the requirement for the Temporary Protection Plan be conditioned as follows:

“Prior to works commencing on site, the consent holder’s Heritage Professional shall prepare and submit for certification to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council (or nominee) a Temporary Protection Plan.

The Temporary Protection Plan shall set out the risks to the Bishops Chapel of the proposed works and how these risks will be managed to ensure that no unwarranted damage occurs to the chapel. Details should be included of how key elements of the Bishops Chapel will be protected in situ.”

A description and plans of the proposed canopy at the entrance to the chapel, including fixing details if it is to be attached (assessed in DPA Architects' heritage assessment, p15).

The drawing set for the proposed upgrade of the Bishops Chapel by DPA Architects, which includes details of the proposed canopy at the entrance to the chapel, is attached as **Appendix B** to this memorandum.

The fixing details for the canopy will need to be detailed once the specific construction / reinstatement methodology for the Bishops Chapel is confirmed by Ryman and its contractor (along with input from DPA Architects). As such, it is proposed that the fixing details of the canopy be conditioned as follows:

“Prior to works commencing on the site, the consent holder’s Heritage Professional and Engineer shall prepare and submit for certification to the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council (or nominee) details of the methodology for the fixing of the canopy to the façade of the Bishops Chapel.”

Please mark the location of signage on the site plan and confirm if freestanding or attached to the fence below the fence line.

Further detail on the location and design of the proposed signage at each site is provided in the landscape drawings prepared by Design Squared, which are attached as **Appendix C** to this memorandum.

Perspective drawing(s) showing how the chapel will be viewed from Park Terrace in particular, including a view from within the site taken from up the Park Terrace driveway in front of the B01 atrium through to the chapel. Depiction of view shafts from Dorset St and Salisbury St would also be useful.

Additional 3D visualisations of how the Bishops Chapel will be viewed in its surrounds are attached as **Appendix D** to this memorandum.

3. NOISE

The further information request seeks the following with respect to water supply for firefighting:

Please provide an assessment of apartments affected by Rule 6.1.7.2.1 given the apartments are within 20m of the nearest marked traffic lane of both Park Tce and Salisbury St.

Park Terrace and Salisbury Street are ‘Central City Local Distributor Roads’ in the Christchurch District Plan. As such, it is considered that they are subject to the 40 m standard in Rule 6.1.7.2.1 – as the sites are not located adjacent to a ‘Collector Road’.

The apartments are modern constructions and will be double glazed and insulated so that any bedroom meets the internal noise reduction requirements in Rule 6.1.7.2.1 of the Christchurch District Plan. Furthermore, and also in accordance with the rule, Ryman will provide the Christchurch City Council with a design report (prior to construction) and a design certificate (prior to occupation) prepared by a suitably qualified acoustics specialist stating the design proposed is capable of meeting the applicable noise standards.

4. EARTHWORKS

The further information request seeks the following with respect to ground levels at the boundaries:

No existing site levels have been provided so the exact effect of works on the boundary cannot be determined. The applicant states the Peterborough (or Bishopspark – the AEE is inconsistent with the civil report) site will be retained around the boundary but provides no detail of the height difference or if resource consent is needed for these structures.

A response from Beca to this request will be provided as soon as possible.

5. URBAN DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING

The further information request seeks the following with respect to urban design and landscaping matters:

A plan for each of the sites noting existing trees, with notations of those to be retained and those to be removed (this relates to the extent to which the applicant address the existing context and to identify whether there are existing trees with some amenity value that we consider that there would be some value in retaining).

All of the existing trees on both sites will be removed as part of the construction of the Proposed Village, with the exception of the Copper Beech Tree at the Bishopspark site (which will be relocated) and the Common Lime Tree on the Peterborough site (which will be retained in situ). The proposed location of the Copper Beech Tree is provided on the Landscape Concept Plan (Drawing SK100) included in Volume 3 to the AEE.

Construction details including dimensions (interior - width and depth) of the areas containing trees across both sites both on top of the basement car parking, and well as the extent of the areas around the periphery of the sites.

A landscape management plan given the extent of tree planting proposed within planter boxes, including soil medium, irrigation, maintenance programme (for reasons noted above), particularly given the intensity of the site development, over-height components of the development and need for longevity of the trees.

Detailed information, including elevations and cross sections of the street interfaces for each of the site frontages.

Cross sections – east to west and north to south of the Bishopspark site (this is required to understand interfaces as well as depths of planters, basement area and relative building height etc).

The above information is addressed in the drawing package prepared by Design Squared, which is attached as **Appendix C** to this AEE.

Explanation of how the landscape proposal meets mana whenua cultural values (currently mostly exotic tree species).

The Proposed Village requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity in the Residential Central City Zone under Rule 14.6.1.3, with the matters of discretion limited to those matters set out in Rule 14.15.9. None of the matters of discretion reference landscaping meeting Mana Whenua cultural values. Further, whilst it is noted that Objective 14.2.4 refers to residential neighbourhoods reflecting the Ngai Tahu heritage of Otautahi – the policies that follow only identify a course of action in this regard for residential development on the Port Hills and in Banks Peninsula.

As such, it is unclear what the assessment basis is for this request for further information.

Notwithstanding the above, the principal focus of the landscaping treatment for both sites (which are private sites) has been to provide specimen trees that reflects the surrounding environment around Park Terrace and Hagley Park, and which provide a garden-type environment that is pleasant for residents.

Concern is raised about the potential overshadowing. Please provide hourly shade diagrams starting at 9am and finishing at 5pm for both sites at the equinox.

Updated solar studies for both sites at the Equinox have been prepared by Warren and Mahoney and are attached as **Appendix A** to this memorandum.

There is only one diagram per site indicating building materials and finishes, and it notes indicative only. Are these anticipated for every building on each of the sites? More detail is required to understand overall visual density across the sites and noting request below.

Additional drawings showing the building material and finishes to be utilised across both sites is provided in the technical assessment drawings by Warren and Mahoney, which are attached as **Appendix A** to this memorandum.

A set of 3D visualisations for both sites. As a general comment there were more presented at pre app and panel stage than as part of the applications.

Viewpoints provided for the photo visualisations are predominantly angled and from within the Hagley Park, in some cases behind trees. Please provide visualisations front on (with adjacent sites included) from the shared path on the western side of Park Terrace and adjacent streets.

Additional 3D visualisations and visual simulations and of both sites are attached as **Appendices D** and **E** to this memorandum.

6. STORMWATER

The further information request seeks the following with respect to stormwater management:

The 300 m³ attenuation and discharge via the 75 mm outlets are meant to help achieve stormwater neutrality between the pre and post development phases. However, it is noted that in addition to the direct discharges from the storage you also have other outlets discharging directly to the CCC network. One of these outlets is at the south west corner of Park Street and two are on Westwood Terrace. Can they confirm how the total discharge from the site is controlled in order to match the nominated predevelopment discharge?

It is correct there are several outlets to the public main. As discussed in section 7.1 of the Civil Design Report, the site consists of three catchments. Two of these catchments are attenuated. One of the catchments (C3) is not. However, Catchment C3 has been reduced in area compared to existing to match the existing peak flow rates whereas Catchments C1 and C2 have been attenuated to reduce peak flows for a range of events and durations.

The supporting calculations and catchment plan are provided in Appendix C to the Civil Design Report - which show the difference in pre and post development flows for each of the events assessed. The Christchurch City Council has reviewed and approved these calculations in accordance with the network discharge consent they hold for the discharge of stormwater throughout the City. The acceptance is provided in Appendix B of the Civil Design Report.

Some of the basement drainage appears as if it will be pumped to the stormwater network. This should ideally discharge to sewer.

Ryman understands that previously the stance of the Christchurch City Council has been for:

- Covered drainage to discharge to the wastewater network; and
- Drainage open to vertical rainfall to discharge to the stormwater network.

The basement ramps at both sites will be exposed to vertical rainfall, and as per Ryman's previous experience, it is understood that this should be discharged to the stormwater network. If the preference of the Christchurch City Council is now to discharge to wastewater in this instance, then Ryman would be happy to accept this as a condition to the consent and incorporate the requirement into the building consent application.

7. TRAFFIC

The further information request seeks the following with respect to traffic matters:

Council requires three road safety audits undertaken by an independent safety audit team for any works proposed on Council controlled legal roads. The first of these is for the scheme plan stage and this will be required as part of the further information. Note that the RSA will be required as a Word document with Designer responses completed. Council staff will provide Safety Engineer comments and Project Manager comments.

The pedestrian signals proposed on Salisbury Street have previously been discussed with the applicant and the issue of weaving on the Salisbury Street approach was raised during those discussions. This aspect of the proposal has not been resolved. Could you please provide some further discussion around this issue.

Can you expand/clarify on the comment on P16 of the ITA that the exit onto Salisbury Street is 'considered to comply', particularly given the location of landscaping shown on the accompanying plans.

Please provide an assessment of cycle parking requirements and location of staff and visitor parking.

Section 8 of the ITA discusses the design of the internal layout for a 9.2m rigid truck but then states that they have provided tracking paths for an 8 m truck. Could you please clarify this?

Please note that any works carried out on legal road will require Community Board (or in the case of the signals Council) sign off under the LGA irrespective of any decisions under the RMA.

A response by Commute Transportation Consultants to the above matters is attached as **Appendix F** to this memorandum. This response has been prepared following further discussions between Commute and Mr Mike Calvert at the Christchurch City Council, and it is noted that there is no longer any need for any widening works / right turn bay on Park Terrace.

A copy of the safety audit being undertaken by Stantec will be provided as soon as it is available.

Could you please provide further detail around the location and split of car parking between resident / visitor / staff / mobility spaces on the site.

By way of clarification, six on-grade carparking spaces and 138 basement carparking spaces will be provided at the Bishops Park site (of which four will be mobility spaces). This comfortably exceeds the 100 carparking spaces required under the Christchurch District Plan.

Six on-grade carparking spaces and 77 basement carparking spaces will be provided at the Peterborough site (of which three will be mobility spaces). This also comfortably exceeds the 73 carparking spaces required under the Christchurch District Plan.

The assignment of parking to residents, staff and visitors is typically undertaken by Ryman's Village Operations Manager prior to the opening of a new village, and has not been undertaken at this time. However, resident and staff parking will all be located within the basements at both sites. The on-grade car parking spaces at both sites will be primarily utilised by visitors to the Proposed Village, with additional visitor carparking provided in the basements.

Overall, it is considered that sufficient parking will be provided for residents, visitors and staff at each site - such that the Proposed Village does not impact on the supply of parking in the surrounding street network.

8. ARBORICULTURAL MATTERS

The further information request seeks the following with respect to arboricultural matters:

A detailed scaled plan of the tree in relation to the development buildings and basement with distances from buildings and fences, any utilities to be laid around the tree and depth of the basement etc specified on the plans.

The AP report states that the dripline radius of the Lime tree was 14.6 m. The radius is taken from the base outwards to the widest part of the canopy, which is approximately 8 m (to the north side of the canopy). Therefore, 14.6 is the total crown width not the radius. Based on the District Plan rules it would be a circle around the tree at a radius of 8 m from the base, giving a crown width of 16 m.

A tree plan (Drawing SK102) illustrating the location of the Common Lime Tree relative to Building B08 is attached as **Appendix C** to this memorandum. This drawing includes the corrected radius of the dripline of the Common Lime Tree – which has been measured at 7.8 m. The extent of infringement into the dripline of the Common Lime Tree is actually 2.4%, not 0.0036 % as previously quoted in the Arborists Assessment.

The building distances from the crown of the Common Lime Tree are:

- East – West: A separation of approximately 2 m;
- North – South: A separation of approximately 1 m;

The basement depth is approximately 3.4 m and the Common Lime Tree is located within 1 m of the existing western boundary fence. A new boundary fence is also proposed along the Peterborough Street frontage. As noted in the Arborist Assessment attached to the AEE, the proposed construction is four piles, approximately 300 mm diameter, with an above ground beam supporting the fence panels.

No utilities will be laid within the dripline of the Common Lime Tree. To this extent, the Proposed Site Services Plan for the Peterborough site (Drawing 038-RCT_401_C0-023) has been updated to ensure the stormwater outlet from the Proposed Village is outside of the dripline of the Common Lime Tree. This drawing is attached as **Appendix G** to this memorandum.