

# Independent Hearings Panel

## Christchurch Replacement District Plan

*Te paepae motuhake o te mahere whakahou a rohe o Ōtautahi*

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch Replacement District Plan) Order 2014

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Specific Purpose Hospital Proposal

---

### EXPERT CONFERENCING STATEMENT

#### SPECIFIC PURPOSE ZONE PROPOSAL: CHAPTER 21

#### TOPIC – INNER URBAN HOSPITALS & SCHOOLS

23 September 2015

---

#### 1. EXPERT CONFERENCING

Expert conferencing for this topic was held on the 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2015 at the Hearings Venue, 348 Manchester Street, Christchurch. The session was facilitated by Environment Court Commissioner John Mills.

#### 2. PARTICIPANTS

Participant	Company/Organisation	Representing
Josephine F J Schröder	Christchurch City Council	Christchurch City Council
Jonathan Clease	Planz Ltd	Rangi Ruru School, Nurse Maude Hospital
Jane Rennie	Boffa Miskell Ltd	St Georges Hospital
Jessica Staples	Goom Landscapes	St Georges Hospital

### 3. MATTERS TO NOTE

- 3.1 The Christchurch City Council's Stage 2 Specific Purpose Zones Proposal dated 17<sup>th</sup> of September 2015 was used as the basis for conferencing.
- 3.2 There were no differences of opinion between the participants who attended the conferencing and a good level of progress was achieved to further refine the Specific Purpose (Hospital) Zone - Inner Urban Sites provisions package, and in respect to the Specific Purpose (School) Zone.
- 3.3 Submitters the Crown and Canterbury District Health Board did not have representatives at the conferencing in respect to the Specific Purpose (Hospital) Zone provisions.
- 3.4 Ms Rennie provided an updated 'Will Say' statement of the 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2015, outlining two potential areas where she may have a conflict and she restricted her conferencing to Specific Purpose (Hospital) Zone - St Georges Hospital only, as noted below.

*"My expert conferencing does not extend beyond the built form standards applying to the notified SPHZ. Whilst the same or similar built form standards are now proposed for the possible St George's Heaton Street Overlay extension I have chosen not to comment on these due to a potential conflict arising from a statement made in expert conferencing by William Field on Character Area identification on behalf of the Crown (13 August 2015). However, I do acknowledge that both the built form provisions and assessment matters in part reflect character area considerations.*

*In addition, I highlight a further potential conflict arising from the Ministry of Health's submission in relation to Princess Margaret, Burwood and Hillmorton Hospitals'. This includes provision 21.5.2.3.1.1c (exclusion of lift shafts, mechanical plant and other equipment from the maximum height control), RD5 (deletion of the building elevation rule), RD6 (building gross floor area to be 2,000sqm). These changes seek a less restrictive package of rules for these particular Suburban sites, and RD5 and RD6 relate to all Hospital sites, including St George's. Given this, I seek that the conferencing minutes clearly state that I am only commenting on provisions in the context of St Georges Hospital site only."*

## **SPECIFIC PURPOSES (HOSPITAL) ZONE**

### **4. SITE CONTEXT APPROACH**

- 4.1** The participants agreed that the site specific rules package is appropriate as a method to reflect the context of each hospital site and are comfortable that the 'Inner Urban' classification for Nurse Maude and St Georges is appropriate to these sites, including Nurse Maude-Mansfield and St Georges-Heaton Overlay.
- 4.2** The participants discussed and agreed the need to provide clarity within the pRDP of the name and location of each of the hospital sites, particularly in respect to the Nurse Maude sites. This may be by way of notation within the Planning Maps and/or a note within Proposal 21 by way of notation of the address.

### **5. PROVISIONS PACKAGE**

- 5.1** The participants wished to highlight that they have considered the provisions as a package for each site and that it is important that the interrelationship between each of the provisions is recognised.

#### **Inner Urban Hospital Sites Activity Status**

- 5.2** In respect to the Inner Urban Hospital Sites only, as a broad point, the participants agreed that the bulk and location rules as stated within the package are appropriate. The remainder of the sites were not reviewed by the participants with the exception of Ms Schröder.
- 5.3** It was also agreed that the urban design thresholds for the sites were appropriate, including 21.5.2.2.2 RD5, RD6, RD7 and RD8, with RD7 recognised as being more of a bulk and location rule rather than urban design trigger. Ms Staples did not comment on this matter.
- 5.4** In regard to Nurse Maude-Mansfield, Mr Clease was comfortable with RD9, including the zero threshold. It was agreed between Ms Schröder and Mr Clease that the reason for the zero threshold was the size and narrow dimension of the site and the consequent potential for adverse effects on residential neighbours. Mr Clease and Ms Schroder also agreed that the activity status proposed as restricted discretionary, rather than a controlled activity status is appropriate, on a non-notified basis. An amendment to the Proposal is required to ensure that in regard to Nurse Maude the non-notified status is specifically addressed for consistency.

- 5.5** Mr Clease noted that in regard to RD9 Nurse Maude -Mansfield that the preference is, for the purposes of clarity and simplicity of the Plan, that the Matters of Discretion should not cross reference to the Residential Medium Density Zone. Instead the reference should be to 21.5.4 Matters of Discretion - Specific Purpose (Hospital) Zones, including 21.5.4.1-21.5.4.4 (City context and character, Site interfaces, Fencing and screening, Outdoor storage areas). Ms Schröder agreed with this.

#### **Inner Urban Hospital Site Rules - Nurse Maude and St Georges**

- 5.6** It was agreed by the participants that some rewording and restructuring of the rules was required in respect to 21.5.2.3.1.3 and 21.5.2.3.1.4 Inner urban sites (and consequently to the remainder of the hospital site rules). This is to provide clarity to the rules, not to change the measures proposed to apply, including:

- (a) Boundaries to which the rules apply
- (b) The exception for access across the landscape strip
- (c) Tree planting required in relation to the length of the site boundary should be located within the applicable landscape strip
- (d) The ordering of the rules.

Ms Schröder will address these matters in conjunction with the Council's planner.

- 5.7** In respect to the St Georges Hospital main site, Ms Staples, Ms Rennie and Ms Schröder are agreed on all of the rules stated in 21.5.2.3.1.3 in the Proposal of the 17<sup>th</sup> September 2015, including landscaping, fencing, building height and setbacks, and outdoor storage, with the exception of the agreed amendments to these rules noted in this statement below. Ms Staples agreed with the landscaping, fencing and outdoor storage rules within 21.5.2.3.1.4.
- 5.8** In respect to the Nurse Maude main site and Nurse Maude-Mansfield, Mr Clease and Ms Schröder are agreed on all of the rules stated in 21.5.2.3.1.4 in the Proposal of the 17<sup>th</sup> September 2015, including landscaping, fencing, building height and setbacks, and outdoor storage, with agreed amendments to these rules noted in this statement below.
- 5.9** The participants agreed that in respect to 21.5.2.3.1.3 (d) and 21.5.2.3.1.4 (d) tree planting - that only one tree per 15m of boundary length should apply to internal boundaries. Ms Rennie did not comment on this.

**5.10** Mr Clease and Ms Schröder agreed on the following changes to the rules proposed for Nurse Maude-Mansfield as follows in respect to 21.5.2.3.1.4:

- (a) A maximum building height of 11m including lifts and plant.
- (b) A minimum building setback from internal boundaries of 4m.
- (c) A minimum landscape strip excluding kerb of 1m where an accessway is adjacent to an internal boundary. It should be noted that it has also been agreed in respect to this that additional matters of assessment in regard to tree planting in relation to this rule will be incorporated in the Proposal.

**5.11** Mr Clease and Ms Schröder also agreed to a change in height for the Nurse Maude main site in respect to 21.5.2.3.1.4 (c) to provide for a maximum building height of 11m, except where to provide for lift shafts lifts and plant, the maximum height limit shall be 15m.

#### **Alternative Zone Provisions - 21.5.3**

**5.12** Ms Rennie and Ms Schröder agreed that the Residential Medium Density Zone as an alternative to the Specific Purpose (Hospital) Zone is appropriate to St Georges hospital main site, given the scale and location of the site.

**5.13** Ms Rennie and Ms Schröder agreed that the Residential Suburban Zone as an alternative to the Specific Purpose (Hospital) Zone is appropriate to St Georges Heaton Overlay, given the interface with the adjacent and opposite zone, and the depth of the overlay.

**5.14** Mr Clease and Ms Schröder agreed that the Residential Medium Density Zone was more appropriate to the Nurse Maude main site and Nurse Maud-Mansfield site as an alternative to the Specific Purpose (Hospital) Zone than the Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone as denoted in the Proposal, given that the surrounding residential area is proposed as a Residential Medium Density Zone under Proposal 14.

#### **Inner Urban Hospital Sites - Matters of Discretion Nurse Maude and St Georges**

**5.15** Broadly speaking Mr Clease and Ms Rennie stated their support for the length and scope of the assessment matters, and their tone. All the participants recognised that minor tweaking of the assessment matters is required.

**5.16** The participants agreed that 21.5.4.3 Access, parking and servicing, is adequately addressed through Proposal 7 - Transport and through the amendments proposed to 21.5.4.2 and as such 21.5.4.3 can be deleted.

**5.17** The participants agreed that in respect to 21.5.4.4, an additional matter of assessment was required to state (iv) Takes into account the operational, accessibility and security requirements of the hospital.

**5.18** Ms Schröder and Mr Clease agreed that an additional set of assessment matters in regard to landscaping is required.

## **6. SPECIFIC PURPOSE (SCHOOL) ZONE**

**6.1** Mr Clease supports the deletion of 21.6.2.3.3 relating to Rangī Ruru School, from an urban design perspective.

**6.2** In regard to 21.6.2.3.4 (a) internal boundary setback, Mr Clease and Ms Schröder have agreed that between 3m and 6m a controlled activity status could apply, with appropriate matters of control. Ms Schröder has agreed to write these matters of control to circulate and agree with Mr Clease.

We confirm that this Expert Conferencing Statement is a true and accurate record of the conferencing session held on the 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2015 and we have complied with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses.

Signed:

Josephine Schröder



Jane Rennie



Jonathan Clease



Jessica Staples

