

**BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act')

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** Of Resource Consent Application RMA/2020/2852 for the Canterbury Museum Trust Board for a comprehensive redevelopment of the Canterbury Museum complex including the Robert McDougall Gallery

**BETWEEN** **THE CANTERBURY MUSEUM TRUST BOARD**  
Applicant

**A N D** **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**  
Local Authority

---

**EVIDENCE OF ALAN DAVID TITCHENER ON BEHALF OF THE CANTERBURY MUSEUM TRUST BOARD**

**Dated 25 MAY 2021**

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1 My name is Alan David Titchener. I am a descendent of Ngāi Tahu.
- 2 My current role is Consultant Landscape Architect, practising as Principal of Alan Titchener Landscape Architect. I have been in this role since 2015.
- 3 I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Horticulture (Massey, 1973) and Diploma in Landscape Architecture (Lincoln, 1975).
- 4 I have practised as a landscape architect since 1975, initially as Landscape Architect for the Ministry of Works and Development (1975-77), then in private practice trading as Alan Titchener and Associates Landscape Architects (1978 - 89), then as Principal of Titchener Monzingo Aitken Ltd Landscape Architects (1989 - 2015), then in my current role.
- 5 I am a Life Member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects Inc (NZILA) (now known as Tuia Pito Ora), having been admitted as Associate in 1977, becoming a Fellow in 1997, and Life Member in 2017. I am a Past President of the NZILA (1993 - 95), and a Past President of the Asia Pacific Region of the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) (2011 - 12).
- 6 In my role as NZILA Delegate to IFLA from 2006 to 2012, I was introduced to, and developed an appreciation of, many outstanding examples of important Cultural Landscapes, which inevitably included heritage components. Because of my interest in this area I served for some of my time as IFLA Delegate as a member of the IFLA Cultural Landscapes Committee.
- 7 I have Kahui Whetu status of Ngā Aho (Māori Design Professionals collective) and am a member of Te Tau-a-Nuku (Māori Landscape Architects collective).
- 8 I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note (dated December 2014) and agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. I confirm that the issues addressed in this statement of evidence are within my area of expertise.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

- 9 In my evidence I address the following issues:
  - (a) relevant background matters;
  - (b) a review and commentary on Mandy McMullin's Heritage Landscape Assessment (HLA), including a reassessment of the key landscape / visual amenity issues arising from the proposal using the NZILA's recently adopted draft Landscape Assessment Guidelines (known as Te Tangi a te

Manu - Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines), with particular reference to:

- (i) the proposed modifications to the Roger Duff Wing, and the related effects on landscape / visual amenity,
  - (ii) brief comments on the landscape / visual amenity effects related to the proposed introduction of a gap between the Centennial Wing and the Mountfort Buildings; and
- (c) response to Jeremy Head's Peer Review of Ms McMullin's HLA;
  - (d) response to Amanda Ohs' Heritage Evidence; and
  - (e) consideration of the relevant matters of discretion from Christchurch District Plan.

## **BACKGROUND**

- 10 I have been engaged by the Canterbury Museum Trust Board (the Board) to replace Mandy McMullin, Heritage Landscape Architect, who previously prepared a Heritage Landscape Assessment for the Board in relation to an application for Resource Consent for the redevelopment of the Canterbury Museum.
- 11 The need for a replacement for Ms McMullin arose as a result of her decision towards the end of 2020 to pursue other interests, which precluded her from providing further heritage landscape architectural advice to the Board.
- 12 I understand I was recommended by Ms McMullin as being a suitably qualified and experienced replacement for her, and I was subsequently engaged by the Board to take her place.
- 13 I do not describe myself as a Heritage Landscape Architect. Indeed, as far as I am aware, there is no such formal designation or category of Landscape Architects in New Zealand, although I am aware that some practising landscape architects with a particular interest in heritage matters relating to landscape prefer to refer to themselves as Heritage Landscape Architects, as a means of differentiating themselves from colleagues who apply their skills to a wider spectrum of subjects.
- 14 However, there is arguably a heritage component in many landscapes that are the subject of landscape assessment that derives from the historical and cultural associations of people and place. I do not believe that not specialising in heritage matters lessens my ability to assess properly the landscape (including visual) effects of a subject such as this proposed Canterbury Museum redevelopment. As Ms McMullin's replacement, I have a dual responsibility, as detailed in the Scope of Evidence above, for both reviewing and commenting on Ms McMullin's assessment,

as well as responding to the review and commentary of her findings and the assessment process she used.

- 15 Ms McMullin used as the method for her assessment the landscape assessment guidelines promulgated by the (UK) Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013), Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition (GLVIA3).
- 16 Since Ms McMullin prepared her assessment, the NZILA has unanimously adopted (in May 2021) a new set of guidelines for landscape assessment, known as Te Tangi a te Manu (TTatM). Whilst these guidelines are still technically in draft form, the current version has been confirmed as being the approved guidelines for use in landscape assessment in Aotearoa New Zealand.
- 17 The guidelines apply to all components of landscape including cultural and heritage elements. I have therefore used TTatM as current best practice in New Zealand and as the appropriate basis for my review and commentary input.

#### **REVIEW AND COMMENTARY ON MS MCMULLIN'S ASSESSMENT**

- 18 I have read Ms McMullin's Heritage Landscape Assessment (HLA) for the proposed Canterbury Museum (the Museum) redevelopment.
- 19 Overall, I find Ms McMullin's HLA very thorough, and sets out very well her Introduction (pp2-5), the Context and Setting for the Museum (pp6-18), the Summary of the Proposed Redevelopment (p19), and the Legislative Context (pp20-25). I therefore support in full her Sections 1-4.
- 20 However, I disagree with some aspects of Ms McMullin's Visual and Landscape Assessment (pp26-50). In my opinion, Ms McMullin in her assessment of effects seems to conflate change to mean effect, whereas the purpose of a landscape assessment is to assess the effect of change, as distinct from assessing the amount of change.
- 21 In taking this different approach to assessing landscape (including visual) effects I have adopted the approach of TTatM clearly set out at Chapter 6 which deals with Landscape Effects:
- a landscape effect is a consequence of changes in a landscape's physical attributes on that landscape's values. Change is not an effect: landscapes change constantly. It is the implications of change on landscape values that is relevant.*
- 22 This change in approach to assessment of effects is most pronounced in relation to Ms McMullin's selected viewpoints 4, 5 and 6, which focus primarily on the effects of

the proposed redevelopment of the Roger Duff Wing. I will return to these issues later in my evidence.

- 23 Having made the points in Paras 20-22 above, I am in agreement with Ms McMullin's thorough documentation of:
- (a) the Heritage Significance;
  - (b) exterior Changes as a result of the Proposed Redevelopment;
  - (c) the Relevant Policies and Implementation of the Canterbury Museum Conservation Plan; and
  - (d) in general, with her assessments in terms of the physical attributes that will be affected by the proposed redevelopment works.

24 I therefore do not intend to reproduce Ms McMullin's documentation relating to the aspects identified in Para 23 (above).

25 Where my views on Assessment differ from those of Ms McMullin, I will point these out in my review of Ms McMullin's HLA in relation to each of her selected viewpoints below.

26 In the interests of achieving a greater level of consistency of presentation, I will adopt the TTatM model of a 7 point effects assessment scale as prescribed in those guidelines.

27 I have reproduced the TTatM scale from the draft guidelines as follows:

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
less than minor	minor		more than minor		significant	

## **REVIEW OF MS MCMULLIN'S HLA FROM SELECTED VIEWPOINTS**

28 I agree with the number and location of viewpoints selected as being sufficient in number and location to provide an appropriate range of viewpoints to allow a thorough landscape assessment.

### **Viewpoints 1 and 2**

29 Viewpoints 1 and 2 are from Worcester Street looking towards the eastern facade of the 1877 Mountfort Building, the 1878 porch and the eastern face of the Centennial Wing.

30 I agree with Ms McMullin's assessment and rating of effects.

31 In terms of the TTatM 7 point scale I rate the adverse effects as very low. In my opinion, therefore, I assess the adverse effects will be less than minor.

### **Viewpoint 3**

32 Viewpoint 3 is from Rolleston Avenue looking along the northern boundary between the Museum site and Christ's College. The northeastern corner of the Centennial Wing is visible as well as a glancing view of the northern face of the Centennial Wing and in the distance, the night entry to the Robert McDougall Art Gallery (RMAG). The view also takes in the southeastern corner of the Christ's College building immediately to the north of the boundary and a glancing view of the Christ's College buildings further to the west of the corner building.

33 I agree with Ms McMullin's list of Heritage Significance, Exterior Changes that will result from the redevelopment, her list of relevant Policies and Implementation provisions, and her assessment of the extent to which the proposed changes address the considerations set out in Policies 8.7 and 8.8 of the Canterbury Museum Conservation Plan (CMCP).

34 I agree with most of Ms McMullin's findings in her assessment of effects, with the exception that I find her assessment of effects is inconclusive, where she states ..."the new building has the potential to adversely affect the immediately adjacent significant heritage fabric within Christ's College", but neglects to provide a rating of the extent of this potential adverse effect.

35 I find the vertical rectangularity of the cantilevered part of the proposed new exhibition hall does echo the proportions of the corner Christ's College building (and the void over which the cantilevered part of the building hangs).

36 While it is clearly an unexpected intrusion into this area, I find it more intriguing than unsightly.

37 I find that it is the "differentness" of the sharply-articulated form of the extension that creates its visual impact, yet the clear intent of New Development Implementation Policy 8.8.7 is that "New work should be readily distinguishable from heritage fabric and the reproduction of heritage details in any new development should be avoided".

38 I find the cantilevered section of the proposed new exhibition hall negotiates this design challenge successfully, albeit that it pushes the boundary in more ways than one.

39 Reference is made in the S42A Report prepared by Ms Odette White to a 'glazed slice' having been proposed between the existing Mountfort Buildings and the redeveloped Centennial Wing. Ms White refers to the Heritage Report of Ms Amanda

Ohs in which (at Paras 54-58) Ms Ohs discusses the effect of this 'glazed slice' on the view of the Museum from Rolleston Avenue, concluding that the effects will be more than minor.

40 I am informed that there is no such 'glazed slice' proposed between the proposed Centennial Wing and the Mountfort Buildings. Rather, there will be a 600mm gap.

41 This gap is barely discernible from Viewpoint 3 of the proposed redevelopment. In my opinion, the visual effect of the gap between the buildings is negligible, which is expressed in the TTatM scale as 'very low'.

42 However, overall, in terms of the TTatM 7 point scale, I rate the effects from this viewpoint as low-moderate, taking into account the above considerations including those in Ms McMullin's assessment. In my opinion therefore, the adverse effects from Viewpoint 3 are minor.

#### **Viewpoint 4**

43 Viewpoint 4 is from the southeast looking towards the Roger Duff Wing and takes in the southwestern corner of the 1872 Mountfort Building

44 I agree with Ms McMullin's lists of Heritage Significance, Exterior Changes that will result from the redevelopment, relevant Policies and Implementation provisions in the CMCP, and relevant items in the Specific Building Policy in the CMCP.

45 With regard to her list of relevant Policies in the Conservation Plan for Hagley Park and Christchurch Botanic Gardens, I agree that this is a valid consideration with regard to the setting for the Museum (and the RMAG) and to the potential effects the proposed Museum redevelopment might have on the area of the Botanic Gardens in the immediate vicinity of the Museum and Art Gallery.

46 However, the Resource Consent application, as I understand it, relates only to the land in the ownership of the Museum Trust (and the works which connect the Museum to the eastern side of the RMAG).

47 The Museum Trust, therefore, has no control over what might happen on the Botanic Garden land. However, it is clear that the Museum Trust does have an interest in the "good neighbour" aspect of the proposed development and I consider the potential effects of the proposed redevelopment on the adjoining park is a valid component of the assessment of landscape effects.

48 I therefore consider that Ms McMullin's listed Policy 4.4 and 4.4.1 of the Conservation Plan for Hagley Park and Christchurch Botanic Gardens are relevant considerations as part of an assessment of the landscape effects of the proposed Museum redevelopment.

- 49 I agree with the comments made by Ms McMullin under the heading of Assessment and I agree in part with her description of relevant considerations to a judgement of the effects of the proposed redevelopment.
- 50 Where I differ from Ms McMullin's opinion is in her finding that "Visual effects in this viewpoint are considered more than minor due to the scale and proximity of the work, the number of viewers and the sensitivity of views from the Gardens".
- 51 Ms McMullin appears to base her opinion on what she sees as the potential of the new work to "overshadow" the Mountfort buildings (which I take to mean the potential to contrast with, upstage or decrease appreciation of the Mountfort buildings).
- 52 It is unclear to me what she means by "proximity of the work" but I have taken this to mean the proximity of the building to passers-by, primarily pedestrian users of the Museum Walk, and perhaps users of the South Walk and the intersection point between other paths, such as the Herbaceous Border Garden Walk and the Museum Walk.
- 53 In my opinion, the proposed new design for the Roger Duff Wing is a considerable improvement on the existing building. That being the case (in my opinion) proximity to the work is more of a positive situation than a negative one.
- 54 Although the proposed building will be taller and attract attention from passers-by due to its scale, materiality and design articulation, on balance, I consider, given the potential positive effects, the adverse effects on the TTatM scale to be in the range of low to low-moderate.
- 55 I therefore conclude that the adverse visual effects of the proposed redevelopment will be minor, when considered alongside the considerable positive effects of the proposed redevelopment of the Roger Duff Wing.
- 56 With regard to Ms McMullin's statement that "There is no effect on contextual significance", I am unsure what she means by this. I have assumed this to mean the proposed development will have no effect on the setting for the building, on the relationship between the proposed redeveloped building and the adjoining park setting, and the way that setting is perceived by users of both the Roger Duff Wing and the Park.
- 57 If my assumed interpretation of the meaning of contextual significance as Ms McMullin sees it is correct, then I disagree with her, only to the extent that I believe the proposed redevelopment will enhance the relationship between the Roger Duff Wing and its setting (particularly with regard to future users of the elevated, glazed restaurant floors).



## Viewpoint 5

- 58 This viewpoint is from the Museum Walk to the south of the southwest corner of the proposed Roger Duff Wing and takes in the western side of the redeveloped RDW, as well as part of the southern side of the RMAG and a glancing view of the southern side of the RDW. It includes part of the existing planting of shrubs and ground covers in the area defined by the RDW, the RMAG and the Museum Walk, as well as the Museum Walk and the lawn and the existing mature English Beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) tree to the south of the Museum. In the distance is the Arts Centre.
- 59 I agree with Ms McMullin's lists of Heritage Significance, Exterior Changes, the Relevant Policies and Implementation in the CMCP, and the Specific Building Policy. I agree generally with her section headed Assessment in which she describes the changes that will result from the proposed redevelopment and considers the visual impacts, both adverse and positive, that will occur as a result of the proposed development.
- 60 As a point of clarification, I take her statement "The introduction of cafe windows may lead to a less private experience in this area of the Gardens, although for pedestrians passing it would be a temporary experience" to mean that the experience will be fleeting or of short duration. In any case, I think the experience would be more positive than adverse for pedestrians - the act of seeing or being seen is generally more pleasurable than unpleasant.
- 61 I particularly agree with Ms McMullin's statement that "Overall, the exterior of the [proposed] new building in this corner is more homogeneous [than] the existing facade, creating less visual distraction from heritage fabric".
- 62 I also agree that the existence of the English Beech tree (*Fagus sylvatica*) to the south of the Museum mirrors the height of the proposed new building and the combination of the tree and the expanse of lawn beneath helps to "ground" the proposed building in its setting.
- 63 As was the case with Viewpoint 4, while I agree with much of her commentary under the heading of Effects, I differ from Ms McMullin in her rating of the effects of the proposed redevelopment from this viewpoint.
- 64 In my opinion, the proposed building is a considerable improvement on the existing building, for all the reasons listed in the Assessment section referred to above. These include: the careful design detailing and materiality of the design, (including the use of recessed planes in the roof and exterior walls, the glazing which increases the sense of lightness of the building, and the fact that the new wall

panels reference existing patterns and materials); the improved views of the RMAG and the Gardens, as well as the views into the Museum from the Gardens.

- 65 On balance therefore, on the TtATM 7 point scale, I rate the adverse effects of the proposed redevelopment as assessed from Viewpoint 5 to be in the range of low to low-moderate.
- 66 I therefore conclude that the adverse visual effects of the proposed redevelopment from this viewpoint will be minor, when considered alongside the considerable positive effects of the proposed redevelopment of the Roger Duff Wing.

### **Viewpoint 6**

- 67 Viewpoint 6 is the view of the Robert McDougall Art Gallery as seen when approaching from the Botanic Gardens to the west of the Gallery. The existing view includes the existing trees, shrubs and ground covers in the plantings to the west of the Gallery, which to a large extent obscures the view of the Gallery.
- 68 The view of the proposed redevelopment shows the proposed RDW above and behind the Gallery, and includes the lower shrubs and ground covers at the base of the Gallery, but not the existing medium sized trees in the foreground which I understand are scheduled by the Botanic Gardens authorities for removal.
- 69 I agree with Ms McMullin's lists of Heritage Significance, Exterior Changes that will arise as a result of implementation of the Redevelopment Plan, the relevant Policies and Implementation in relation to the CMCP, and the relevant Policies and Implementation relating to the Robert McDougall Art Gallery Conservation Plan.
- 70 I also agree with the reference to the Hagley Park Botanic Gardens Master Plan 2007 but point out that decision making regarding the Gardens is not the responsibility of the Museum Trust Board and therefore consideration of this aspect is not part of this Resource Consent application.
- 71 For this reason I have not been asked to provide an opinion on the wisdom or otherwise of removing the existing trees in the foreground as has been proposed, according to Ms McMullin, as part of the Hagley Park Botanical Gardens Master Plan.
- 72 I agree with the points made in Ms McMullin's report under the heading of Assessment. In particular, I support her contention that "The horizontal roofline of the [proposed] new building is more homogeneous [than] the existing Museum roofline, creating less distraction from the heritage fabric. The horizontal plane matches the flat roof of the Gallery. The [proposed] new building is clearly visible, but due to the glazing, [limited] height above, and distance behind the Gallery, it appears to "hover" in the background, [rather than overwhelming] it".
- 73 In my opinion, the proposed RDW is an improvement on the existing building for all of the reasons listed in the section of Ms McMullin's report.

74 I rate the adverse visual effects of the proposed redevelopment as viewed from Viewpoint 6 on the 7 point TtM scale as low. I therefore assess the adverse effects from this viewpoint to be minor.

### **Viewpoint 7**

75 Viewpoint 7 is from the northern side of the Christ's College courtyard and looks south in the direction of the College Chapel and the Museum.

76 The view of the proposed development from Viewpoint 7 reveals a narrow section of the proposed redeveloped Exhibition Hall cantilevered adjacent to the northern boundary of the Museum, and part of the serrated roofline of the Hall protruding slightly above the Chapel roofline.

77 The view is not public as the viewpoint is within the College grounds. The amount of exposed Hall roofline will reduce the closer the viewer moves southwards across the courtyard towards the Chapel.

78 I agree with the lists regarding Heritage Significance, the identified Exterior Changes that will arise from the proposed redevelopment, and the points made in Ms McMullin's report under the heading of Assessment.

79 I agree with Ms McMullin's comments regarding visual effects. I rate the adverse effects that will arise from the proposed redevelopment on the 7 point TtM scale as low. I therefore conclude that the adverse visual effects from Viewpoint 7 will be minor.

### **SUMMARY OF REVIEW OF MS MCMULLIN'S HERITAGE LANDSCAPE REPORT**

80 In summary, I find I am in general agreement with the parts 1, 2 3 and 4 of Ms McMullin's HLA, which provides:

- (a) an Introduction;
- (b) a listing of the relevant Plans and Documents including: the section of the Christchurch District Plan on Heritage Setting, the Heritage Statements of Significance, identifying and describing the Heritage Precinct and the relevant Botanic Gardens Plans of relevance to the Museum Redevelopment Proposals;
- (c) her brief description of the proposed Museum Redevelopment; and
- (d) her setting out of the Legislative Context for her Assessment.

81 The main focus of this review is therefore on the part of Ms McMullin's report that deals with the Landscape and Visual Assessment part of the redevelopment proposal.

82 I am in general agreement with much of the content of Ms McMullin's Assessment, in particular:

- (a) her selection of the appropriate assessment viewpoints; and

(b) her listing of relevant Heritage Significance status, the various Exterior Changes that will arise from the proposed redevelopment, and the relevant Policies of the various Conservation Plans etc. as set out in relation to the various viewpoints she has selected.

83 It is beyond the scope of this review to prepare a complete re-assessment of the Landscape and Visual Effects of the proposed redevelopment, so I have focussed my comments on the aspects of Ms McMullin's report with which I disagree.

84 There are two main areas of disagreement. The first relates to the need for a more consistent approach being taken to the *rating* of the nature and magnitude of adverse landscape and visual effects.

85 The recently-adopted draft NZILA Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines (known as Te Tangi a te Manu, abbreviated to TTatM in this review) provides a means of achieving this, so that is the method that I have used in this review.

86 For ease of reference I have reproduced the TTatM scale again below:

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
less than minor	minor		more than minor		significant	

87 The second significant area of disagreement is in the weight given to change, as distinct from visual effects. In my opinion, change does not equate to effect, and it is important in arriving at an assessment of visual effects to strike a balance between both positive and adverse effects.

88 This slight, but significant, difference in approach has resulted, in some cases, in a different conclusion regarding the assessed adverse visual effects from a number of the selected viewpoints.

89 In summary, in my opinion, the adverse visual effects from the various viewpoints, using the 7 point TTatM scale and the RMA equivalent, are as follows:

	<b>7 point TTatM scale</b>	<b>RMA equivalent</b>
<b>Viewpoint 1</b>	very low	less than minor
<b>Viewpoint 2</b>	very low	less than minor
<b>Viewpoint 3</b>	low-moderate	minor
<b>Viewpoint 4</b>	low to low-moderate	minor
<b>Viewpoint 5</b>	low to low-moderate	minor

<b>Viewpoint 6</b>	low	minor
<b>Viewpoint 7</b>	low	minor

**RESPONSE TO JEREMY HEAD'S PEER REVIEW OF MS MCMULLIN'S HLA**

- 90 Mr Jeremy Head has prepared a peer review of the landscape character and visual amenity aspects covered in the Heritage Landscape assessment (HLA) prepared by Ms McMullin.
- 91 Mr Head has focussed his peer review on the part of Ms McMullin's HLA from Section 5 to the end of the report, that is, the part of the HLA that deals most specifically with Ms McMullin's Visual and Landscape Assessment and the conclusions that she has come to as a result of her assessment.
- 92 Mr Head identifies aspects of the proposed redevelopment where he considers there may be effects on landscape character and visual amenity. I agree with most of these, but, the effects of the removal of blackouts and tints in the 1877 Mountfort Building is outside the scope of my expertise, and the removal of trees and other vegetation is not a matter that forms part of this Resource Consent application.
- 93 I concur with Mr Head regarding the items in Ms McMullin's HLA that he is in agreement with.
- 94 In the opinion of Mr Head "a site visit is critical, for instance, to understand the proposal's juxtaposition with the Botanic Gardens, the Garden's values and the likely extent of the effects of the proposal on these values".
- 95 I agree with this assertion to the extent that I believe that a site visit in order to gain a sense of the setting and context of the Museum in order to provide a fully informed assessment of the effects of the proposed development would be highly desirable.
- 96 I agree with this assertion to the extent that I believe that a site visit in order to gain a sense of the setting and context of the Museum in order to provide a fully informed assessment of the effects of the proposed development would be highly desirable.
- 97 Because of time constraints, I have not had the opportunity to visit the site to experience the setting and spatial context for the proposed redevelopment. In an ideal world, I would have preferred to have recently visited the site to gain an up-to-date impression of the site and its current setting.
- 98 However, in my case at least, I have had the benefit of having visited the Museum and the Heritage Precinct on a number of occasions previously as well as being familiar with the Robert McDougall Art Gallery and that part of the Botanic Gardens in which the Museum is situated.
- 99 I believe the images provided both in Ms McMullin's HLA and in the architect's very comprehensive drawings pertaining to the proposed development have equipped me

sufficiently to form what I consider to be informed opinions in relation to the Landscape and Visual effects associated with the proposal.

- 100 Having said that, I would intend to undertake a visit to the site prior to the scheduled Hearing of this Resource Consent application, and in the event that I feel the need to revise any of my opinions provided in this Brief of Evidence as a result of having revisited the site, I would make those revised opinions known to the Hearing Commissioner.
- 101 Mr Head points out that a landscape concept plan is not included in either the HLA or the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) prepared by the Applicant. I agree that, ideally, the preparation of a Landscape Concept Plan by a suitably qualified person would have been desirable as a companion document to the redevelopment plan, especially given the importance of the Museum and its location.
- 102 However, the Applicant is constrained by the extent of the footprint over which The Museum Trust Board has control, namely, the area which the current Museum occupies. This excludes the RMAG which the CCC owns and administers.
- 103 Further, the architects have had serious regard to the 2017 Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan which is effectively a Master Plan for the Botanic Gardens. Given the building envelope constraints and the consideration given by the building designers and the level of consultation undertaken with Mana Whenua and the wider community I consider the Applicant has struck a reasonable balance between the ideal world and their pragmatic and practical considerations.
- 104 I consider it would be appropriate for the Christchurch City Council, as administrators of the Botanic Gardens to prepare, in consultation with the Museum, a Landscape Concept Plan specific to the Museum site setting, once a Resource Consent has been approved for the proposed redevelopment. I note that some detailed consideration has already been given to the location of some culturally important features to be located at the Rolleston Avenue frontage, and some conceptual planning has allowed for a proposed main entry point to the Botanic Gardens, modification to paths and the removal of some existing trees to provide additional breathing space for the RMAG. Mr Head makes the point the no mention is made in Ms McMullin's HLA regarding the construction phase. While I agree that some consideration of the possible effects of construction on the setting of the Museum might be useful, I do not consider that such an assessment needs to form part of a Landscape and Visual Assessment for the assessment to have validity.
- 105 Mr Head makes the point the no mention is made in Ms McMullin's HLA regarding the construction phase. While I agree that some consideration of the possible effects of construction on the setting of the Museum might be useful, I do not consider that such an assessment needs to form part of a Landscape and Visual Assessment for the assessment to have validity.

- 106 Mr Head notes a lack of consistency in the conclusions reached regarding landscape effects from the various viewpoints to allow easy comparisons to be made. He suggests the use of the 7 point scale as set out in the NZILA Landscape Assessment Guidelines. I agree and have included, in my review of Ms McMullin's HLA, use of the recommended scale in preparing my revised assessment.
- 107 Mr Head points out that Ms McMullin comes to no firm conclusion regarding the Landscape and Visual Effects as assessed from Viewpoint 3. I agree, and have provided my opinion that should respond sufficiently to Mr Head's criticism, particularly given his conclusion that "the changes to the Rolleston Avenue facade will generate 'positive' landscape effects...."
- 108 Regarding Viewpoint 4, Mr Head offers the opinion that Ms McMullin "adopts a conservative approach when she states that: 'Visual effects in this viewpoint are considered more than minor'". He points out that Ms McMullin then discusses how in various ways adverse effects are reduced and offers the opinion that he "considers this part of the proposal to have 'Moderate' *positive* effects [my emphasis] given the current 'back of house' state of this corner of the Museum....". Again I agree, at least with the assertion that insufficient consideration was given to the positive effects of the proposed redevelopment, which I have addressed in my revised assessment. My rating of the landscape and visual effects is different from that of Mr Head (refer above).
- 109 At Viewpoint 5, Mr Head states that he agrees in full with the discussion under the heading of Assessment. However he is concerned at the contradictory statements between the conclusion of 'more than minor' effects and the subsequent listing of adverse effects being reduced, that there will be 'beneficial' effects and that 'contextual significance is not affected'. I agree and have provided a revised assessment that gives what I consider to be a more balanced view of the respective adverse and positive effects.
- 110 At Viewpoint 5 Mr Head comments on the lack of clarity regarding the retention or removal of vegetation in the vicinity of the new Roger Duff Wing and the Gallery. Mr Head also registers his concern at Viewpoint 6 at the proposed removal of a number of trees to the west of the RMAG. As above I point out that decision making regarding the Gardens, including vegetation removal within the Gardens, is not the responsibility of the Museum Trust Board and therefore consideration of this aspect is not part of this Resource Consent application.
- 111 At Viewpoint 7 Mr Head agrees with the conclusion of Ms McMullin in her HLA that the landscape and Visual (adverse) effects will be 'minor'. This finding is similar to mine, although my rating of adverse effects on the NZILA 7 point scale was assessed as low, which led to the same conclusion of the effects being considered minor.
- 112 Mr Head's sections headed Conclusion and Recommendations essentially reiterate the points made earlier in his review and have been responded to already (above).

He makes reference to the positive effects he sees in the proposed gap between the proposed new Centennial Wing and the Mountfort buildings, an opinion I agree with,

#### **RESPONSE TO AMANDA OHS' HERITAGE EVIDENCE**

- 113 I have read the parts of Amanda Ohs' Heritage Evidence (Paras 93 and 94) that pertain to landscape and visual effects, particularly in response to the HLA prepared by Ms McMullin.
- 114 At Para 93 of her evidence, Ms Ohs correctly notes that "The changes proposed to the Roger Duff Wing facade have been assessed by Ms McMullin as having 'more than minor' visual effects".
- 115 She further records that "Ms McMullin notes that (at Para 93) improved connection of the Museum with the Botanic Gardens is desirable and in this respect the glazed corner enhances this connection and 'strengthens the important relationship between the Museum, the Botanic Gardens and the Gallery'.
- 116 Ms Ohs further notes "Ms McMullin also refers to the 'historical association between the Museum and the Gardens.' Ms McMullin considers 'visual effects in this corner are inevitable as a result of necessary redevelopment for the Museum to continue to function".
- 117 To return to Ms Ohs' first point that Ms McMullin has assessed the changes proposed to the RDW facade as having 'more than minor' visual effects, Ms Ohs neglects to mention the lengthy list of positive and mitigating factors listed by Ms McMullin that I took into account in my review of Ms McMullin's evidence (above).
- 118 My reading of Ms McMullin's HLA is that she provides in her assessment from the various viewpoints that take in the RDW (Viewpoints 4, 5 and 6) a considerable amount of commentary that highlights the positive and mitigating effects with respect to the RDW.
- 119 At Viewpoint 4, in her section on effects, Ms McMullin concludes the visual effects are 'more than minor' "due to the scale and proximity of the work, the number of viewers and the sensitivity of views from the garden". She also points to "the potential for the new work to visually overshadow the Mountfort Buildings".
- 120 It is unclear to me exactly what the work is proximate to, but I assume she may be referring to the areas likely to be used or frequented by members of the public visiting or passing through the adjoining areas of the Botanic Gardens.
- 121 However, she qualifies this judgement with a number of other relevant considerations including: "improved visibility to and from the building, bringing the Museum to 'life' in this corner, restoring its status and strengthening the important relationship between the Museum, the Gallery, and the Gardens".
- 122 She earlier noted that "The Roger Duff Wing facade is secondary fabric. Changes are in keeping with CP (Conservation Plan) policies for the new development, although



specific building implementation policies relating to the exterior of this building are not entirely consistent.

123 Matters listed in the section of Ms McMullin's report under Assessment, which I would consider positive or mitigating factors include:

- (a) changes to the balance of the relationship (of the redeveloped RDW) to the 1872 Mountfort building...."The effect of this is lessened by the distance from the gable and the buffer of the glazed atrium";
- (b) "The glazed atrium is in keeping with the Conservation Plan policies for new materials linking to heritage buildings to be 'contemporary and visually lightweight'. The new work is 'readily distinguishable from heritage fabric'";
- (c) "The connection between the Roger Duff Wing and the Gardens is currently very poor";
- (d) "The original design, including the prominent observatory overlooking the gardens, was intended to make a visual statement about the building's significance. The building would face with confidence onto the gardens, in keeping with the Mountfort buildings along the south facade. Without this the SW corner of the Museum lacks status. The exterior looks like a back entrance. It has low visual amenity and little interaction with the Gardens or relationship with the wider setting.";
- (e) "The cafe window spans two levels, overhanging the gardens, and is a prominent feature of the facade. Visitors to the cafe will see and be seen by visitors accessing the Gardens and walkways past this corner. The window also affords view of the Gallery and roof, increasing the connection between the Gardens and the Gallery. Views from the cafe window may extend to the Port Hills and Rolleston Avenue";
- (f) "The pattern of glazed panels on the cafe windows mirrors the existing Roger Duff panels and softens the visual impact of the large expanse of glass. The re-use of wall panels references existing materials.";
- (g) "The new areas of glazing open connections between the Museum and the Gardens in keeping with the policies of the Conservation Plan."; "The building footprint is unchanged." ; and
- (h) "The new work is in keeping with the Conservation Plan for the Botanic Gardens. The building does not intrude into the gardens or introduce inappropriate or incongruous intrusions. The integrity and definition of the Gardens setting is retained. The new work does not erode significant heritage values."

124 It seems to me inconceivable that with such a schedule of positive and/or mitigating factors that the assessment of visual effects would conclude with a 'more than minor'

rating. This observation is consistent with my finding in my peer review of the part of Ms McMullin's HLA.

- 125 While I acknowledge Ms Ohs' duty to accord due respect to the finding of an experienced and respected allied professional, I believe that her reference to the finding of 'more than minor' visual effects unreasonably neglects to acknowledge the many positive and mitigating factors listed above.
- 126 I could carry out the same exercise regarding the findings of Ms McMullin with respect to Viewpoints 5 and 6, but I believe that would be a rather tedious and unnecessary exercise.
- 127 It should be sufficient to comment that in my opinion, there is a disconnect between the matters that Ms McMullin correctly identifies as positive or mitigating effects and the conclusion that she reaches in her assessment of landscape and visual effects. I explain this further in my review of the key points of Ms McMullin's HLA (above).
- 128 The second point that Ms Ohs appears to make at Para 94 of her evidence is that to her knowledge "the relationship between the Museum and the Botanic Gardens is simply one of co-location". She continues "The Museum buildings form an important backdrop to some of the earliest areas of the Botanic Gardens to be developed".
- 129 She goes on the point out that "As is evident in the design of the Mountfort and Hendry buildings there has historically been no attempt to provide visual or accessible connections between the Museum and the Gardens on the south frontage - rather the focus on connecting has been on the Rolleston Avenue facade where the entrances are located".
- 130 Ms Ohs concludes this paragraph of her evidence by opining "Given the sensitivity of this corner of the Museum site, I consider that a reduced amount of change to the Roger Duff Wing facade would have the dual benefit of reducing heritage effects as well as visual effects identified by Ms McMullin.
- 131 The idea that the relationship between the Museum and the Botanic Gardens is simply one of co-location is, in my opinion, fanciful. My opinion is supported (at 2.4.1) of the Conservation Plan for Hagley Park and the Christchurch Botanic Gardens, where it states: "This Conservation Plan identifies the area to the south and west of the Museum and gallery as having high heritage significance". It further states "The Armstrong Lawn, South Walk, Museum Walk, and the portion of the River Walk opposite the old Acclimatisation Society Grounds, the Moorhouse Statue, and the Pine Mound together with the terminus structures of the Museum and the former Curator's House, are considered to form the most significant portion of the Botanic Gardens in terms of the combination of heritage elements and the interrelationship between these elements".
- 132 Under the heading Canterbury Museum and the Robert McDougall Art Gallery the CP states "There is a shared associational, social and cultural relationship between these

two institutions and the Botanic Gardens. This is grounded in past cultural practices and historic planning concepts and continues today by virtue of their spatial relationship, shared history and their more recent cultural precinct identity.

- 133 The CP goes further to state "The coupling of art, science and nature was a common late Victorian-era concept, At that time the value of public gardens, parks and botanical gardens was considered to extend far beyond the opportunities they offered for recreation and communion with nature, They were regarded as 'civilising terrain' or places of betterment, offering educational and improving pursuits for "all levels of society", and museums, art galleries and libraries were frequently situated alongside, or within their grounds".
- 134 In my opinion the locating of the original 1870 Mountfort Building on the corner of the Botanic Garden (the establishment of which pre-dated the establishment of the Museum by seven years) was quite deliberate. The Gardens provided the setting for the Museum - not the other way round.

#### **MATTERS OF DISCRETION FROM CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT PLAN**

- 135 I have considered the relevant provisions of the Christchurch District Plan and identified those matters of discretion that are relevant to my evidence. In doing so, I have considered only the proposed redevelopment of the Roger Duff Wing and the proposed 600mm gap between the proposed new Centennial Wing and the Mountfort Buildings, because, in my opinion, these are the only elements of the proposal where there is some difference of opinion between Council officers and the Applicant.
- 136 With regard to the Open Space Chapter, Clause 18.10.2(b), both (iv) and (v) appear relevant.
- 137 At Clause 18.10.2(b) (iv) the Plan requires assessment of "Whether the activity/facility and/or its scale will have a layout and design that is appropriate to the locality, context, character, and/or natural values of the area".
- 138 In my opinion, the activity and scale of the proposed Roger Duff Wing is entirely appropriate to the locality, context, character and natural values of the area. The relationship between the Museum and the Gardens is already well established and the proposed changes to the RDW will have minimal effect on these values. The much improved appearance of the building will further enhance the effect of the building on these values.
- 139 With regard to the gap between the Centennial Wing and the Mountfort Buildings, in my opinion, this will have negligible effect on context, character and natural values of the area. The gap will be barely visible from the only viewpoints where it might be discernible, so the effects I assess as negligible.
- 140 Clause 18.10.2 (b) (v) of the Plan requires assessment of "Whether the activity/facility and/or its scale will adversely impact on the amenity values of the

adjoining open space and residents, including visual impacts, noise, glare, nuisance and traffic effects".

- 141 In my opinion, the proposed Roger Duff Wing will result in an improved relationship between the Museum and the Botanic Gardens to the south and west of the Museum. The adjoining open space is easily spacious enough to accommodate the increased height of the proposed building. The glazed cafe floors create a better connection with the Gardens area, and the cleaner lines and lightness of materials create an enhanced interface with the gardens. The proposed development fits very well with the aspirations of the Conservation Plan for the Botanic Gardens.
- 142 There will potentially be an increase in the amount of glare or light spill from the RDW cafe on passers-by in the darkest weeks of the year (nominally early June to mid-July) but this might well be considered a positive effect at these times of the year. I understand that currently, both the Museum and the Gardens close at night which should further minimise effects from light spill.
- 143 The effects on residents in terms of visual impacts, noise, nuisance and traffic effects arising from either the RDW improvements or the gap between the Centennial Wing and the Mountfort Buildings I believe will be minimal given the location of the Museum in what is primarily a heritage precinct.
- 144 With regards the Natural and Cultural Heritage Chapter, Clause 9.3.6.1 (d) requires an assessment to be provided with regard to:
- (v) impact on public places; and*
- (vi) within a heritage setting, the relationship between elements such as layout and orientation, form, and materials.*
- 145 With regard to Clause 9.3.6.1 (d) (v) I consider the impact of the proposed development, and in particular, of the proposed RDW and the gap, on public places (in this case the adjoining Botanic Gardens, the Rolleston Avenue frontage, and Christ's College) to be minor.
- 146 The main impact is likely to derive from the visual effects associated with the RDW on the Gardens, and I have already provided an explanation as to why I believe these effects will be minor or less than minor (depending on the viewpoint).
- 147 With regard to Clause 9.3.6.1 (d) (vi), namely the effects of the proposed development on the relationship between elements such as layout and orientation, form and materials, the effects on layout and orientation are negligible since the proposed development does not propose any alteration to the existing building footprint.
- 148 Regarding form and materials, the form of the proposed RDW does involve an increase in height but the existing form is essentially echoed in the proposed design. Where new materials have been used, they have been carefully and deliberately

designed to create a contemporary and visually-lightweight effect, in which the new work is readily distinguishable from the heritage fabric.

**CONCLUSION**

149 Thank you for the opportunity to present my evidence.

Alan David Titchener  
25 May 2021