

Ryman Karori – Hearing notes on behalf of Responsible Development Karori

Opening statement

Kia ora koutou. Ko Andrew Cooper ahau. I am Chair of Responsible Development Karori, otherwise known as RDK.

RDK was established in response to Ryman's acquisition of the old Teachers College site in Karori to ensure that the development proposed by Ryman will be undertaken in a manner that is responsible and has a positive, rather than detrimental, impact on the surrounding community and environment.

RDK represents 38 members from 25 households in the surrounding community. Many of our members have advised me that they have foregone their opportunities to speak at this hearing, delegating the representation of their concerns to RDK.

RDK is supportive of a retirement village development on the site, but remains extremely concerned by the adverse impacts that the scale of the development will have on the local community and the environment.

RDK's objectives are to ensure that Ryman's development of the Teachers College site is of an appropriate scale, character and amenity that minimises any detrimental impact on Karori and its residents, including future Ryman residents, and that an undue burden is not placed on Karori's already constrained infrastructure.

As a non-complying activity, WCC may only grant approval for the consent if:

- a) the adverse effects of the proposal will be no more than minor, or
- b) the proposal will not be contrary to the objectives and policies of the District Plan – be that operative or proposed.

RDK considers that Ryman's proposed development fails on both of these tests.

RDK also considers that Ryman's proposal is contrary to the Resource Management Act for the following reasons:

- it fails to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on the environment;
- it fails to provide for future generations due to its adverse impact on the environment and the generational investment in a fossil fuel based energy source;
- it fails to comply with the relevant statutory planning policies; and
- it will contribute to environmental degradation due to the imposition on Karori's constrained infrastructure.

As mentioned in opening, RDK is supportive of a retirement village development on the site, however RDK submits that the issues documented in our written submission will have a more than minor effect on the community thus requiring amendment of the proposal and specific conditions to be placed on the development.

Without wanting to repeat RDK's full submission in this korero, and without prejudice to our written submission, I will focus on a small number of the concerns raised.

However before doing so, I would like to comment on the applicant's legal counsel's opening submission that submitters have an "inherent interest in the outcome, whereas an independent expert does not". It is obvious that submitters, in particular affected neighbours, will have an

inherent and vested interest in the outcome as the effects of the proposal have very real impacts on our personal lives. That is not to say that our statements are inaccurate. By contrast, as affected neighbours, we have an inherent knowledge of the effects and the context of the local environment that commissioned experts do not.

District Plan change

Zoning for the suburb of Karori was recently amended in the draft District Plan from outer residential to medium density in response to the NPS-UD.

It is noted that WCC's initial draft district plan retained Karori's zoning as Outer Residential, whilst changing all other suburbs to Medium Density. This was because WCC acknowledges that Karori's infrastructure cannot sustain intensive development until substantial investment in its infrastructure is made, which WCC officers have advised me is over a decade away. It is only the advent of the NPS-UD that the latest iteration of the District Plan has amended Karori's zoning to Medium Density. However there is no magic bullet or imminent investment proposed that will solve the original constraints that retained Karori as Outer Residential in the initial draft plan.

While some intensification can and should be achieved in Karori, including an intensive development of the Teachers College site, we consider that the sheer scale of that being proposed by Ryman is incongruous with the parlous state of Karori's infrastructure and will place an undue, more than minor, burden on the environment and the community.

Under the proposed District Plan, while Ryman's proposed buildings B02-B07 would now comply with the future height limit of 11m, the main village building B01 would still materially exceed the height limit for the zone. Under the proposed Plan, Supported Residential Care is listed as an Enabled Activity, which are permitted where "their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone".

In accordance with the RMA, **amenity values** means those natural or physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes.

It is the view of RDK that the bulk, scale and loss of community facilities and open space that result from the Ryman development will detract from, rather than contribute to, people's appreciation of pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes that previously characterised the site and surrounding areas. In other words, the proposed development is inconsistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone. On this point alone the proposed development is contrary to the Resource Management Act.

Integration with the community

The previous use of the Teachers College site was heavily integrated with the community, with community access to many of the Teachers College facilities, including the Allan Ward Hall for school performances, a gymnasium for a variety of indoor sports, outdoor courts for tennis and netball, cricket nets and a playing field.

These will not exist under the proposed development. Ryman have so far offered nothing in compensation to the community for the loss of these assets nor have looked outside the square to

consider how the provision of community facilities may benefit both the residents and the community.

Point G137 of the new Residential Design Guide states “The scale of larger commercial, residential, or mixed-use developments has a direct bearing on the quality and level of amenity offered by the city’s public environment, and the public’s enjoyment of it. To address this, five factors, collectively referred to as City Outcomes Contribution, will be considered in assessing the quality of larger scale development - provision of public space, sustainability, accessibility, provision of assisted housing, and urban design quality. The aim of this assessment is to incentivise “density done well””.

However in the evidence put forward by the applicant and Council, there is no mention of an assessment against the City Outcomes Contribution, which includes desired outcomes consistent with those that have been put forward by RDK in our submission.

If the proposed development is to be assessed against the proposed District Plan, then it should also be assessed against the accompanying Residential Design Guide, including an assessment undertaken against the City Outcomes Contribution.

RDK urges the Commissioners to seek fulfilment of this Residential Design Guide requirement.

Given the loss in community access, community amenity and community facilities posed by the development, RDK suggests that Ryman could incorporate at least one of the lost community facilities in its future development, whether this is an arts centre, a gymnasium, a netball or tennis court, cricket nets or maybe simply even a playground. Such an asset within the village that is available for community use will benefit not only the community but the residents also, providing much needed stimulation for residents through the opportunity to watch activities and interact with younger community members.

More open space, walking tracks, children’s playgrounds and other opportunities for interaction with the community, stimulation and physical exercise can only be of benefit for residents. However under the current scale of development, Ryman are choosing to forgo such opportunities.

Amenity for residents

The scale of development proposed by Ryman will not only be detrimental for the community and environment, it is the view of RDK that it will also be detrimental to the residents. The most recent development by Ryman in Wellington is the Bob Scott Village in Petone. One would think that as experienced developers and operators of retirement villages it would get the basics right. From direct experience of my parents at Bob Scott, two of the greatest disappointments and indeed frustrations with the Bob Scott Village is the lack of a covered walkway between the independent apartments and the village centre and the lack of a perimeter walking track.

A covered walkway between the apartments and village centre could have easily been accommodated in the original design at Bob Scott but wasn’t. Subsequent attempts by Ryman to retrofit such a walkway have failed. Instead Ryman thought it adequate to offer umbrellas and torches to the apartment residents, many of whom have their hands full with walking sticks and frames. As a consequence my elderly parents felt hostage in their apartment during inclement weather and at night as they were unable to negotiate the uncovered trek between their apartment building and the village centre when the weather was wet and/or windy or at night. RDK urges the Commissioners to ensure that Ryman does not make a similar mistake and fail to provide an all-

weather, well-lit access between all apartment buildings and the village centre for its residents. At present, the proposal does not include such a fundamental amenity.

The lack of perimeter walkway could also easily have been designed in from the outset by Ryman at Bob Scott, particularly as the Bob Scott village has a substantial, well over 10m setback from all boundaries. At present at Bob Scott, there is nowhere for the residents to securely walk for exercise or socialisation with each other or for families to push a wheelchair within the village other than the various short linking walkways between each apartment block and the village centre.

The proposed Karori village is significantly more compressed and intensive than the Bob Scott village. Consequently there is no walking exercise facilities offered for residents. Section 2.1.11 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects states that the pedestrian paths provide a series of loop walks for the residents within the confines of the proposed village. This is either an error or an untruth as there is no indication from the site plans that there is a series of loop walks. On the contrary there are short linking paths between buildings, but certainly not loop walks.

Due to the building coverage in the NE corner and elevation into this area of the site, the best opportunity to provide walking exercise, outdoor stimulation and socialization for the residents is around the perimeter of Buildings B02-B06. This could be easily achieved with a responsible, appropriately scaled development that was set back from the boundary and was less intensive. For the benefit of future residents and their families, a prudent village operator would consider the needs of its residents over its desire to maximise every square inch of land with buildings. With slightly smaller buildings and larger setbacks from the boundaries, Ryman have the opportunity to design a perimeter walkway that will be of immense value to its residents and their families.

The scale of the proposed development also results in extremely sub-optimal shading outcomes for residents. The applicant's urban design assessment states that 59% of apartments and assisted living areas receive less than the recommended minimum levels of sunlight into their living areas, including 20% of the dwellings receiving "little to no sun" at mid-winter.

Included in those dwellings that receive little to no sun, are the dementia wards, located on level 1 of Building B01B. RDK considers that the location of the dementia ward does not adequately meet the guidance issued by the Ministry of Health regarding the importance of direct and accessible sunlight for dementia patients, and specifically that secure dementia care homes are to be designed to maximise natural light and minimise shadowing. It is apparent that the eastern and southern sides of the dementia ward, which includes the lounge areas, will receive virtually no direct sunlight due to the orientation of building B01B and the shading from the height of the adjacent B01A.

We urge the Commissioners to consider the future amenity of residents when considering the merits of this proposed development – from a physical, social and wellbeing perspective and to consider how the amenity of residents could be substantially improved with a more considerably thought out village that valued resident and community wellbeing over density and height.

Sustainability

The applicant at times relies on the Educational Precinct Overlay that remains attached to the site within the operative District Plan to present comparative use of the site, despite the site not being used for educational purposes for nearly a decade. If the operative District Plan is to be the reference plan and Educational Precinct Overlay relied on, Council should then also continue to apply the rules and guidance within the operative District Plan for 'Institutional Precincts' (under

which educational precincts are characterised) to this proposal. In particular I draw attention to Policy 8.2.1.3, i.e. to encourage energy efficiency and the development and use of renewable energy within Institutional Precincts.

Council has, through its Sustainable Development Strategy, made a commitment to encourage energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy. With respect to Institutional Precincts this may be in the form of new development incorporating sustainable and energy efficient building design principles, and the use of renewable energy sources for space and water heating, and electricity generation.

Despite reference to the Educational Precinct Overlay, neither Ryman nor Council reference the objectives and policies for Institutional Precincts contained in the operative District Plan. If Commissioners are accepting of the proposal's assessment under the Educational Precinct Overlay, then we encourage the Commissioners to also consider the proposal against the objectives and policies for Institutional Precincts, in particular in relation energy efficiency.

More generally in relation to energy efficiency and the creation and use of renewable energy, the operative District Plan states: "Changes made to the Resource Management Act in March 2004 mean that energy efficiency and the use and development of renewable energy are matters to which the Council must have particular regard under Section 7 of the Act when making decisions under the Act."

Ryman's application pays lip service to sustainability and energy efficiency. There is no description or commitment to energy efficiency or sustainability standards that will be adhered to and there is no analysis of the energy efficiency or energy use of the proposed development by Ryman. Nor has there been any assessment by Council in this regard. We consider that this is a failing and breach of the Council's obligations under Section 7 of the Act.

RDK have put forward a number of suggestions for Commissioners to consider when setting the conditions of consent on Ryman. At the very least we encourage Commissioners to prohibit Ryman from connecting to the natural gas network and locking in decades of continued fossil fuel use on this site.

The proposed development is a commercial enterprise to be built and operated by a multi-million dollar corporation that will be in existence for decades and will draw on natural resources and emit greenhouse gases for decades unless appropriate obligations and safeguards are prescribed through this consenting process.

Potable and waste water

Having read the evidence of Mr Wilson on behalf of WCC regarding the three waters impact of the development, RDK remains concerned by the following factors raised in our written submission and not addressed by Mr Wilson's review of the Ryman application.

Both Wellington Water and Mr Wilson have simply accepted information supplied by Ryman for potable water use and wastewater. The data informing these volumes is based on a 2008 memo of water surveys at two Ryman villages measured in 2004 and 2007. A 2016 report on a single Christchurch village is also referenced. No comparison is made to the applicability of these other villages to the proposed Karori village, nor do they take into account changed circumstances over

the subsequent 15 years, such as increased hygiene and cleaning requirements on water use and even the potential impact on wastewater as a result of changes in resident diets.

Simply relying on the statement that "...Ryman are experienced operators of comprehensive care retirement villages and have collected historic information on occupancy rates, water demands, and sewer loads for this type of village" places sole reliance on the applicant to provide data.

Significant decisions on resource use and infrastructure impact are being informed by an extremely limited and very outdated set of data, that has been supplied by the applicant without external veracity.

Commissioners should not simply accept the resource use analysis on the basis of numbers provided by Ryman. We ask Commissioners to ensure that the veracity of data informing such decisions is robust and that any decisions on the capacity of the potable water supply and wastewater network are reserved until appropriate peer reviewed data analysis of comparable sites has been undertaken.

A number of points raised in the Wellington Water assessment supported by Mr Wilson's evidence are ambiguous or contradictory and we request that the Commissioners seek clarity on the following matters:

1. Point 39 of Mr Wilson's evidence states that "The model indicates that the local network has at least 2.7 l/s spare capacity". However page 6 of Wellington Water's November 2020 report states that the "Karori WWTP model indicates that the local network has 1 l/s spare capacity". As the peak dry weather flow from Ryman is predicted to be 2.0 l/s, this discrepancy needs explanation. If the original advice from 2020 is correct then both the trunk and local networks will be materially exceeded by Ryman's development unless mitigation is implemented, such as wastewater detention.
2. Point 40 of the evidence states that "A review of development within the local network catchment since the model was generated in 2017 showed there have been only 17 new connections". Whilst there may have been only 17 new connections completed at the time of writing his evidence, assuming Mr Wilson is referring to 210 Karori Rd and 2 Cook St, he fails to include in his evidence, the 40 townhouses consented and under construction in the local area plus the 40 apartments proposed by WCC itself on the corner of Campbell St and Karori Rd.
 - 210 Karori Road: 7 new houses, approved 2019, wastewater detention required by Wellington Water – built
 - 2 Cook Street: 10 new houses, approved 2020 – built
 - 74-76 Chamberlain Road: 17 new house, approved 2021 – under construction
 - 430 Karori Road: 11 new houses, approved 2021 – under construction
 - 50 Friend St: 12 new townhouses, approved 2022 – under construction
 - Cnr Campbell St and Karori Rd: 40 apartments – design stage

To only consider the effects of the recently completed 17 new connections and not take into account in the calculations the 40 that are under construction appears to be a flawed methodology and should be clarified.

3. Point 41 notes that the "trunk network mains are already over their design capacity during a 1-year LTS design event, with overflows of over 50m³ and 500m³ occurring into the Karori Stream at engineered overflows." However according to Mr Wilson, "Wellington Water's current policy is that on-site wastewater detention is only required where there are capacity

constraints within the local network. Trunk network capacity constraints are addressed at a whole of catchment scale.” Therefore as “there is sufficient capacity within the local wastewater network for the proposed development on-site wastewater detention will not be required”. We note though that the evidence is silent on the impact of the increased wastewater loading from the Ryman’s development on the frequency, duration and faecal coliform contaminant loading of engineered discharges of raw sewerage into the Karori Stream due to the trunk network being over its design capacity. As there is no imminent investment planned to upgrade Karori’s trunk network, the frequency and duration of contaminant discharges to the Karori stream will only increase if this development is approved without any wastewater mitigation in place. We request that the Commissioners seek clarification from Wellington Water on these matters in the interests of public health and the ecological health of the Karori Stream.

4. It seems incongruous that a local development approved in 2019 by Wellington Water at 210 Kaori Road (comprising 7 new townhouses) required wastewater detention whereas the considerably larger Ryman’s development does not require wastewater detention. This is extremely unfair to other developers who are also looking to provide housing in Karori as the Ryman’s development will take a disproportionate share of any spare local capacity.
5. We understand that around 180 apartments, 68 Living Suites and 60 care beds are proposed on site. This is the equivalent of over 250 new dwellings putting their wastewater into a public network that already cannot cope in a 1 year rain event. The Ryman’s development will be occupied full time 24/7 (plus support staff and carers) and loading of the wastewater network will significantly increase contributions to the diurnal peak wastewater flows. Comparison is made by Ryman to the demand of the old Teachers College. However the proposed village is a very different demand to the old Teachers College usage of perhaps only 8 hours per day with significant periods of holiday interspersed through the year, which as stated elsewhere was at peak demand over a decade ago.

RDK also remains concerned at the caveat in the Wellington Water report that is not addressed by Mr Wilson. That is, that the Wellington Water assessment “does not take into account the impact on the spare design capacity of other developments that have occurred since then, are currently underway, or possible future developments. Non-hydraulic parameters like pipe age, conditions and likelihood of their failure have not been assessed. Flow monitoring may be required to verify these results. This development may impact on the spare design capacity available for possible future developments along the downstream network.”

Flow monitoring after the development has been built would appear to RDK to be too late as, if it is wrong, the result is an impact on the environment, the community and up to the City to rectify. We therefore urge Commissioners to reserve their decision until modelling is undertaken by Wellington Water on the effects of the trunk network, taking into account additional loadings since the model was prepared and the non-hydraulic parameters like pipe age, conditions and likelihood of failure in future.

Clarifications sought

RDK raised a number of additional concerns in our written submission regarding a number of the assessments undertaken by Ryman’s experts. We have not yet seen anything to alleviate these concerns.

RDK requests that the Commissioners seek further explanation from the applicant regarding the following matters:

Traffic flows – Ryman’s Transportation Assessment Report assumes that 90% of trips entering and exiting the site will come from / go towards the east consistent with the suburb’s current general flows. However, with the majority of traffic movements for the elderly generally for essential travel to shops and medical facilities, it is difficult to understand how this assumption has been derived. The local supermarkets, green-grocer, pharmacy, main medical centre and dentist rooms are all to the west of the site. The majority of independent apartments are also to the west of the site and therefore residents who drive will most likely exit onto Campbell St to the west.

The Traffic Assessment Report makes comparisons between the peak traffic generated by the site under its former purpose of the Teachers’ College. This comparison is irrelevant as the Teachers’ College was officially closed six years ago and was in decline for some years prior to that. It is a decade since the site was at peak occupancy. Since that time Karori’s population and traffic volumes have grown. The impact on Karori’s traffic should be assessed against the current baseline from the site, which is zero.

RDK’s concern is that the Transport Report has made very broad assumptions on traffic flows, making comparisons against an irrelevant baseline and failing to take into account the reasons for village residents’ travel and the lack of on-site parking for visitors. The Transport Report also assumes a level of public transport use, however fails to recognise the lack of frequency outside peak times, the difficulty in accessing Karori by public transport from other Western Suburbs and points further afield and the inherent unreliability of bus services in Wellington, particularly outside peak times.

Flawed assumptions leads to inaccurate outcomes and impacts.

We do not believe that the Traffic Assessment Report can be relied upon and urge Commissioners to request a new Traffic Assessment Report that uses more up to date and relevant assumptions.

We would also like to reiterate that concern raised in our written submission that the scale of the proposed development will result in 4-5 years of continuous traffic comprising large construction trucks and other vehicles on narrow residential streets, passing by the front gates of a primary school, a public swimming pool and early childhood centres.

Parking – According to Ryman’s application, of the 229 carparks on site, 190 are allocated to residents in the secure undercroft garaging. Of the remaining 39 ‘at grade’ carparks, 5 are set aside for accessible parking and the village’s vans and 25 are allocated for staff use. This leaves 9 carparks available for visitors.

Whilst RDK is supportive of reduced car use, it is unlikely that driving habits of Wellingtonians are going to change quickly and therefore we consider 9 visitor carparks for a 400 resident village to be completely inadequate.

Rather than risk trying to find a spare carpark out of 9 available, visitors are most likely to park in the adjacent Council carpark designated for the public swimming pool, making it harder for the local community to use this excellent community facility. Once the swimming pool carpark is full, visitors will be forced to park in the adjacent streets. While everyone is free to park in the local streets, this outcome is inconsistent with Ryman’s claims that there will be little spillover parking outside the village.

At the pre-hearing meeting, Ryman advised that the carparking numbers are fluid and will be adjusted once they know how many residents will take up the secure carparking options. RDK considers this to be too vague, representing an unknown effect, particularly the effect on the community's access to the local swimming pool.

We request that the Commissioners require Ryman to designate more on-site carparks to visitors in the conditions of consent so that an appropriate minimum is locked in from the outset.

Shading effects – There is no peer review of the shading diagrams put forward by Ryman. There are peer review reports of other aspects of Ryman's application, but none for shading. RDK has no way of verifying that the shading effects are an accurate representation of the future shading on the community. We also note that the shading diagrams only demonstrate the dynamic shading effect of the proposed development and does not overlay the dynamic effects of shadow from objects that are outside the site, leading to flawed conclusions of effects on neighbouring properties. Given the very real impact that loss of sun on properties has and the current conclusions that all instances of shading on neighbouring properties is no more than minor, which are based solely on Ryman's commissioned imagery of shading generated by the site only, Commissioners should not accept the recommendations on shading effects without an independent verification of these effects.

Landscaping – The initially proposed selection of large tree species, Pohutukawa, Rimu, Silver Fern and Puriri, along the southern boundary to mitigate the dominating effects of Buildings B02-06 was inappropriate and out of scale with the residential character of the surrounding properties.

At the pre-hearing meeting, Ryman acknowledged that these tree species are inappropriate and that they would amend the landscaping plan. In the revised landscaping plan the Pohutukawa, Rimu and Puriri have been replaced, but with tree species that are still 10-15m tall and proportionately wide at maturity. The Detailed Schedule to the landscaping plan only shows tree heights at 10 years growth. Does Ryman not expect their village to exist beyond 10 years? Or is it that they think the current residents will no longer be living alongside in 10 years time and that the effects on future neighbours beyond 10 years is not a matter for consideration?

Other than for the purpose of obfuscating the actual heights and effects of these trees at maturity, that is a very odd way to present information. Trees that are planted adjacent to or within 4 metres of the boundary that grow to 10-15m tall are going to create enormous shading effects for those neighbours resident along the southern boundary in years to come. And I point out that Ryman still intend to plant silver ferns in this space. In Ryman's own description within the landscaping plan it describes the height of the species as 10m and fronds to be 4m long. That essentially creates a 10m tall tree with a frond canopy of 8m in diameter. The silver fern is a fantastic representation on our national sporting jerseys and is lovely in our rain forests, but within a 4-5m wide garden in a residential setting, they are completely inappropriate.

RDK urges the Commissioners to request Ryman produce a landscaping plan that is more appropriate for the scale and context of the neighbouring houses and clearly shows the heights and widths of the proposed trees at maturity, not simply a disingenuous height representation at 10 years.

RDK remains of the view that a larger setback and greater stagger of the apartment buildings B02-06 will provide a substantially more effective softening of the obtrusive nature of these buildings than the planting of large, dominating trees. This is particularly so in the 50m long section impacted by stormwater infrastructure where no substantial planting can be undertaken to minimise the overbearing effects of the buildings.

Lighting impact on 40 Campbell St – subsequent to the closing of submissions, new residents have moved into 40 Campbell St. These residents have joined RDK and have raised concerns that the undercroft carpark exit on Campbell Street is directly opposite their house. They are extremely concerned by the effects of the headlights of cars exiting the undercroft carpark at night shining directly into their bedroom impacting their sleep. There appears to be no assessment of the effects of car headlights exiting the village either on Campbell St or Donald St in Ryman’s application, noting that the two vehicular exits are directly opposite residential homes.

RDK requests that the Commissioners seek an assessment from Ryman on the effects from car headlights on the dwellings opposite the two vehicular exits.

Precedents

At the pre-hearing meeting between Ryman and RDK members, when asked for examples of Ryman developments in the middle of similar urban communities, Ryman officers listed their Auckland developments in Lynfield, Devonport and Kohimarama as comparable sites. An example of a recent development locally is the Bob Scott development in Petone.

Please refer to the RDK handout.

It is clear that the Karori site is materially different in its suburban context than all of these other Ryman examples. While each of these other examples have substantially fewer immediate neighbours, particularly on the southern boundaries, Ryman have, either by choice or requirement, provided materially larger set-backs from its neighbours than is proposed in Karori or have staggered building heights and scale to more appropriately integrate with the neighbouring community.

Kohimarama – substantial set-backs from neighbours on southern boundary together with substantial natural amenity for village residents.

Murray Halberg Village, Lynfield – substantial reserve along southern boundary and large set-backs or established vegetation in other areas of the site.

William Sanders Village, Devonport – reserve along entire southern boundary and roads providing buffer around rest of site, with substantial set-backs along Ngataranga Road.

Bob Scott Village, Petone – parkland on three boundaries and large set-backs to the small number of neighbouring residential properties and staggered building heights.

While the Karori site currently features a sportsfield and other previous community facilities, Ryman propose to build over these spaces, removing any potential for natural buffer that Ryman’s other examples all enjoy. While all of the other examples enjoy some degree of natural buffer zone between the villages and neighbours, Ryman have also chosen, or been required to, include large set-backs and/or staggered building heights in all of their other recent development examples.

RDK considers that these treatments should be considered precedents in what can be achieved by Ryman to more appropriately integrate large retirement villages into the local communities.

Draft consent conditions

Ryman submitted proposed consent conditions for the proposed Karori village development on the 5th of August. These proposed conditions were discussed at the pre-hearing meeting between Ryman and RDK on 9th of August.

At the meeting RDK expressed its disappointment that the proposed consent conditions represented the bare minimum that would be expected of any development and did not address any of RDK's substantive concerns with the proposed development.

Ryman stated that it had no intention to address the issues raised by RDK in relation to the bulk, scale and design of the proposed village nor any of the environmental concerns raised by RDK.

However, Ryman did invite RDK to submit any additional consent conditions in relation to other matters.

In response to this invitation, RDK submitted its proposed updates and additions to Ryman's proposed consent conditions on 15th of August. We understand RDK's proposed updates were circulated to Ryman, other submitters and the Commissioners. We have not received feedback from any party on RDK's proposed non-exhaustive conditions.

RDK request that the Commissioners include RDK's proposed updates in their final direction, together with any changes to the development itself and any other conditions considered necessary by the Commissioners.

Closing statement

The obligations on the community to stand up for its rights against a multi-million dollar corporate reinforces the inequities and biases of the resource consent process. Ryman reported underlying profit for the 2022 financial year of \$693 million dollars, up 64% on the prior year. That is profit, not turnover – nearly \$700 million in profit in FY22.

Ryman have substantial resources and experience to commit to the resource consent process in order to push through their vast developments at the expense of the environment and communities in which they are built to continue to earn such extraordinary profits.

In contrast, the community, who are inexperienced in this process, who hold down day jobs and are reliant on their own volunteer time to digest and understand the effects of the proposed developments on their families and communities, are given just 20 days to make submissions to contest against the often inaccurate depiction of the effects of the proposed development on their own circumstances.

Despite this imbalance, we trust that the substantial effort made by the local community to highlight the impacts of Ryman's proposal on the community and the environment will be sufficient for the Commissioners to acknowledge the failings in many of the assessment made and the overall inappropriateness of the scale of development proposed and require Ryman to return both to the drawing board and to consult with the community in a way that they have failed to do so to date.

At the very least we consider increasing the setback of new buildings from all boundaries to 10m, providing greater staggers of building heights and reducing the height of B01 by at least one level will potentially, subject to an assessment of the revised effects, mitigate much of the overbearing, loss of privacy and shading effects on the neighbours. These measures are small in the scheme of the

development and could be achieved by Ryman with the loss of only a small number of the 179 apartments and/or reconfiguration of larger apartments into smaller apartments.

A village sized appropriately to the context of the site, that is integrated with the local community, will still deliver the much needed retirement housing for the area, will still release many family homes into the general housing pool, will still deliver the economic boost from construction and future operating jobs, but will also deliver improved amenity for both residents and the community and will deliver improved environmental outcomes. It will even still deliver a profit to Ryman's shareholders – it just may not be one that they are generally used to. But with net profit after tax of almost \$700 million last year we consider that there is some room from Ryman to do the right thing in Karori.

Ngā mihi nui.