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

SUMMARY EVIDENCE OF TREVOR WATT OF ATHFIELD ARCHITECTS LIMITED ON BEHALF OF THE CANTERBURY MUSEUM TRUST BOARD

Dated 9th June 2021

Presented for filing by:
Adderley Head
Chris Fowler
PO Box 1751, Christchurch 8140
T 021 311 784
E chris.fowler@adderleyhead.co.nz

BACKGROUND

These speaking notes has been prepared following the direction of Mr David Caldwell, Independent Hearing Commissioner in Minute 1 dated 18 May 2021 which reads at paragraph 6:

I direct that all experts prepare a summary of their evidence to be read at the hearing. To be of benefit, the summary should focus on the key assumptions, methodology conclusions and the reasons for those conclusions. It would be particularly helpful if areas of disagreement with the Reporting Officers can be identified.

The following speaking notes are provided to satisfy this direction and assist the Commissioner in his consideration of the proposed redevelopment of the Canterbury Museum and Robert McDougall Gallery – RMA/2020/2852. These notes are not intended as a verbatim transcript of my oral evidence but an outline summary.

INTRODUCTION

1 My full name is Trevor William Watt. I am a graduate of the Victoria University Faculty of Architecture 1992 and a member of the New Zealand Institute of Architects. I hold the qualifications of B.Arch (Hons) / B.BSc.

2 I have been a Director of Athfield Architects since 2008. Athfield Architects is an architectural firm dealing with urban design, architecture, landscape, industrial design and interior design and numbers 40 personnel in Wellington, 8 personnel in Auckland and 16 in Christchurch. Athfield Architects established a practice in Christchurch in 1994 and has a continuing commitment across New Zealand.

3 I have practised as an architect in Christchurch since 1996 and have been involved in the design and construction of numerous projects over this time, many relate to the nature of the Canterbury Museum Redevelopment project as they involve heritage, alterations to existing buildings, basement construction and/or are large-scale public and civic buildings.

4 My role on the Canterbury Museum Redevelopment is Project Director and Lead Design Architect. I have been involved as an Architect on Canterbury Museum over 21 years, including the previous Revitalisation Project (2000-2006), Project Brief development (2009 & 2019), Museum seismic resilience feasibility studies (2012-2018), tenant representative on the CCC lead RMG seismic strengthening options review (2013-2014), Conservation Plan Reviewer (2018-2019) and Redevelopment Concept Design which is the basis of this application (2020-current).

5 For time efficiency and to avoid repetition with other evidence, my presentation will only lightly cover the following areas:

- Consultation and the Design Process;
- The History of Evolution of the Canterbury Museum buildings;
- Context and the Neighbourhood;
- Understanding the Existing Buildings;
- Deficiencies of the Existing Buildings;
- Foundation Documents / Brief of Requirements;
- Cultural Narrative Integration; and
- Key Design Aspects of the Application

Whilst not covering these areas in detail, it is nevertheless important to highlight and understand that all this background information informed the proposed concept design.

6 In this presentation I will concentrate on the following areas where there have been concerns raised in submissions and where there are areas of disagreement with the CCC Heritage evidence. These are:

- Protection of Collections (basement storage);
- Alterations to the Roger Duff Wing Façade; and
- Junction between the 1958 & 1877 Buildings.

Consultation and the Design Process

7 Prior to commencement of the concept design, considerable consultation occurred with a wide range of interested parties and stakeholders, including heritage groups, heritage architects, neighbours, local community groups, and members of the general public. This commenced with a series of hui with Ngāi Tūāhuriri as mana whenua and extended to other local rūnanga.

8 Drawing upon some lessons learnt from previous projects, the concept design process was set up with a series of three key workshop stages being:

- Stage 1 Workshop - A Need for Change (outlining reasons for the need for change and the background works completed to date with the foundation documents);
- Stage 2 Workshop - First thoughts (initial ideas and key concept drivers, sketched options); and

- Stage 3 Workshop - Preferred Option (developed concept, incorporating feedback, final review).

9 These workshops were a minimum of 1.5 - 2 hours at a time, and there were multiple workshops at each stage to keep groups down to numbers where people felt comfortable to provide input and feedback (approx. 6-12 people at each).

THE EXISTING BUILDINGS

History

10 The existing Canterbury Museum & Robert McDougall Gallery overall building plan has evolved over the last 150 years and consists of a series of building footprints developed in relationship to each other, to form the current configuration.

Understanding the Existing Context & Existing Buildings

11 Canterbury Museum and Robert McDougall buildings form part of one of the Central City's most recognised and valued neighbourhoods, the Cultural Precinct of Christchurch city. Together with Christ's College and the Arts Centre they present an important and attractive streetscape of heritage buildings, complemented by the open space and landscaping of the Botanic Gardens, Christ's College, Hagley Park, the hospital grounds and the Avon River. These all rest on pre-European sites important to Māori; Puāri Pa, Ōtākaro Waiwhetū & Waipara springs.

12 The Museum and Robert McDougall Gallery is a complex which is made up of numerous building additions and alterations over 150 years. Prior to commencing a project of this nature, it is imperative that there is a good understanding and record of the existing buildings and how the complex has been altered over time.

13 Athfield Architects has recorded the Museum and Robert McDougall buildings over 20 years. This included a detailed on-site measuring of the buildings, conversion of these onto measured drawings, to the study of all available original and alteration consenting and construction documentation.

14 This detailed understanding informed the design as it progressed – especially highlighting areas where opportunities existed to expose original heritage fabric and form.

Limitations & Deficiencies of the Existing Buildings

15 The last improvements of any significance at the Museum occurred in the mid 1990's. This work concentrated on the structural strengthening of the Mountfort buildings and the construction of a new building for additional space to infill the last remaining open space on the Museum site – the Garden courtyard.

16 The numerous deficiencies to the existing building can be grouped into the following categories:

- Building Code Compliance
- Building Enclosure and the Condition of the Existing Building Envelope / Fabric
- Protection of Collections
- Additional Space of Exhibitions & Collections
- Circulation & Accessibility
- Visitor Facilities

This has been discussed in more detail in Mr Wright's presentation.

Understanding the Heritage Values

17 Whilst the key driver for the redevelopment project is to protect the Museum collections and buildings, there has been a strong desire by the design team from the beginning to unveil and provide public access to original heritage form and fabric of significance, wherever practical.

Cultural Narrative

18 In 2019 a Cultural Narrative for Canterbury Museum was adopted by the Canterbury Museum Trust Board.

19 The Cultural Narrative has informed the design by:

- Providing an insight into the local history and cultural mindset;
- Highlighting opportunities for rebalancing the history of Canterbury;
- Encouraging the opportunity for the Museum to consider how it might best think about its connection and engagement with the whenua, the people and their stories and the pre-European history of this place; and
- Providing several threads for the Museum to weave into the new Museum development project to recognise a shared history and an authentic bi-cultural approach based on the kawa and tikanga of mana whenua.

20 A foundation of the redevelopment is addressing an imbalance in the bi-cultural partnership within the current Museum buildings and exhibitions. Fundamentally the project allows for mana whenua to be represented and tell their stories from their perspective in both the building design and exhibitions.

21 Araiteuru refers to 'Pathway' the name of the bi-cultural exhibition space and embodies the wider integration of the cultural narrative as a pathway from the external gathering space, through a welcoming gateway (Ngutu), across a

threshold involving pounamu, water and first stories, under the Blue Whale skeleton (with connection to Ngai Porou / Paikea) to an ātea space and wider bi-cultural exhibitions.

KEY DESIGN ASPECT OF THE PROPOSAL

Protection of Collections

22 Fundamentally at the heart of this redevelopment project is about protection of Canterbury taonga; both collections and associated heritage buildings. Protection of collections is required from various aspects including seismic events, water protection, temperature, humidity, fire, pests, and security.

23 The following information also addresses concerns expressed in the submissions from the Civic Trust and Mr Tim Seay.

Seismic Resilience - Base Isolation

24 The international standard for providing increased seismic resilience to buildings and collections and people within these buildings is base isolation. This has been peer reviewed and supported by many structural engineers during the earlier feasibility stages of the project.

25 Base isolation reduces accelerations during seismic events into the building by isolating the building from the ground as much as practically possible.

26 This requires an undercroft or basement of some nature to the buildings in order to locate the isolators and maintain access to them.

27 There is a significant cost premium of retrofitting isolators to existing buildings, particularly around construction of basements / undercrofts under. Taking into consideration the large number of deficiencies with the majority of the 20 century buildings on the Museum site, overlaid with this additional cost for base isolation to existing buildings and opportunities to unveil heritage of high significance - this all informed the extent of removal of the existing Museum buildings.

Basement Collection Storage

28 A basement across the site of some nature results from the introduction of base isolation. There is then a proportionally small cost up-lift of providing a useful and functional basement.

29 There is a massive space efficiency advantage of housing all collections within larger spaces – rather than the multiple small rooms which currently exist.

30 The use of the basement for collection storage and same plantroom space provided an opportunity to provide for the increased space demand the Museum needs, as

well as opportunity to have some larger exhibition space over to house the larger taonga, especially the Blue Whale skeleton and the Whare Whakairo.

31 Most basements constructed in Christchurch are largely for car parking use. The Museum basement is to be constructed to a much higher standard, with increased protection measures in place. There is an international standard for basement construction, and this will inform the design going forward.

32 The design of the basement will also be a 'box within a box' concept – with built in redundancy in the system. There will be primary protective walls and floor, as well as secondary walls and floors which are raised and separated from the primary elements. The space between would have additional protection from water ingress with pumps connected to uninterrupted power supply.

33 Structurally the primary walls are also designed to the highest level of seismic resilience. In a seismic event, if there was a crack, the likely result would be moisture seepage and the secondary protective enclosure would still remain dry.

34 The risk of flooding and sea-level change has been investigated. Christchurch City Council undertake flood modelling, especially looking at 1 in 50 year and 1 in 200 year events. The Christchurch District Plan reflects this modelling by highlighting Flood Management Areas (FMA), where there are minimum floor levels for new buildings. Canterbury Museum is well outside of the closest FMA, which extends to the south from the Avon across the Christchurch Hospital land.

35 Whilst the Museum and RMG is not within a FMA so that the flooding risk is lower even with climate change modelling included, the detailing of the construction will take overland and surface water protection into consideration.

Environmental Control

36 Currently there is no space within the Museum that meets the appropriate level of temperature and humidity control. A significant part of the project is to address this within all spaces of the redeveloped Museum. This will necessitate a large increase in space required for services.

37 Environment sustainable design is part of the project and all options are to be explored to practically include as many aspects as possible of this into the design going forward. It is intended that this will include a higher thermal building envelope resulting in less need for mechanical solutions.

Unveiling & Celebration of Heritage – a key architectural concept of the project

38 Whilst the main driver of the project is to protect the Museum collections and improve the visitor experience, the design team have taken this opportunity to unveil and celebrate as much currently hidden Museum heritage of highest significance as practically possible.

39 A summary of highly significant heritage elements which are currently hidden but proposed to be unveiled to public view in this application include:

- Northern stone wall of the 1872 Mountfort building;
- Northern stone wall of 1882 Mountfort building (removal of solid plaster);
- Northern stone of the 1877 Mountfort building (combination of removal of adjacent building structural concrete wall and removal of solid plaster and infill of existing openings);
- Gabled form of the northern wall of the 1870 Mountfort building;
- Gabled form of the western wall of the 1872 Mountfort building;
- Western stone wall of the 1870 Mountfort building, including original stone chimney;
- Whole perimeter of the Mountfort era buildings will be readily legible;
- Reconstructed flèche (spire) to the roof of the 1877 Mountfort building;
- Reconstructed chimneys to the gablets of the east and south wings of the 1877 Mountfort building;
- Removal of section of 1990's structural concrete diaphragm within 1882 to open up space to reflect original volume;
- Expose of 1882 Mountfort timber trusses within public lecture and exhibit space;
- Removal of current exhibitions, walls and removing blackened windows to Rolleston Avenue and reinstatement of original wall positions to 1877 east Mountfort building allows greater appreciation of original volume with natural light and outlook;
- The new atrium roof extending fully over the 1870 gable allows this roof form to be fully expressed and potentially the original corrugated roofing iron to be exposed to view internally;
- The Gothic roof forms of all the Mountfort buildings will be able to be viewed collectively from an internal public space (currently this view is only accessible from access to the current roof). This new vista provides the best understanding of the evolution of the Mountfort buildings from 1870 to 1882;

- The removal of eastern additions to the Robert McDougall Gallery allows the original gallery building form and brickwork walls to be exposed to public view;
- Seismic strengthening of the RMG will allow all exhibition spaces to be opened to the public – all of which have been closed for over a decade;
- Removal of unsightly services and pipework, new glazing to skylights and new membrane to the RMG roof will put back this heritage fifth elevation to an appropriate condition and views of the RMG roof will be possible from the redeveloped Museum; and
- The Whare Whakairo Hau-Te-Ananui-O-Tangaroa (which was the third heritage building constructed on the Museum site) will be reconstructed as part of this project.

RESPONSE TO CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL REPORT

Response to Evidence of CCC Senior Heritage Advisor – Amanda Ohs

40 In this next section I will focus on the areas of disagreement and where further clarifications are required. These are:

- The heritage impact of the proposed design to the 1977 Roger Duff Wing façade; and
- The heritage impact of the separation between the 1958 Centennial Wing and 1877 Mountfort Building.

Roger Duff Wing Alterations

41 The areas which I will concentrate on in this presentation are:

- Design considerations that informed the final design solution to the Roger Duff Wing façade; and
- Impact of these alterations to the façade and the whole Canterbury Museum complex.

Design Considerations

42 There are several reasons that alterations are required to the Roger Duff Wing façade within this comprehensive redevelopment of Canterbury Museum. These include:

- An upper floor extension - up to the District Plan height plane to maximise space growth within the District Plan envelope;
- Inclusion of a necessary seismic separation to the 1872 Mountfort Wing and improved legibility between the 1872 and 1977 buildings;

- Improve the visual connectivity between the Museum and Botanic Gardens from an urban design and internal functionality perspective;
- Address building fabric condition and provide enhanced long-term weather-tightness; and
- Ensure that the overall appearance of this important corner of the Museum is aesthetically appropriate as a long-term solution.

The Proposed Design Solution

43 The current façades of the 1977 building have undertaken change over time and they are visually busy. The design challenge we had was how do you appropriately incorporate all these additional requirements and have a design outcome which is aesthetically resolved for the many decades to come. There was the important balance of retaining the heritage significance of the Roger Duff façade, but still providing a great long term functional and aesthetic outcome.

44 It became evident during design options testing of the southwest corner that with the introduction of any addition on the current 1977 roof, as well as the addition of the seismic joint to the 1872 connection and the desire to provide greater connectivity between inside and outside meant that the redevelopment would be adding more elements to an already visually busy façade.

45 The Museum experience for visitors is largely an interior experience, and most often the exhibition spaces are 'black box' spaces with little or no daylight or external vistas. A condition commonly known as 'Museum fatigue' relates to physical and mental tiredness and reduced level of attentiveness of visitors if visiting Museum and Art Galleries over an extended period. Ideally the Museum arrangement would allow spaces where visitors can rest, relax, eat, drink and recharge - therefore improving the visitor experience and keeping them at the Museum for longer to experience more.

46 The central atrium space does allow access to natural light from above, however the south-west corner is the only feasible place for visitors to have some relief from the Museum experience to rest and refresh, as well as get access to natural light and external views – in this case enhanced with the green views of the Botanic Gardens. The location of the café in this corner is readily accessible and well-placed mid-point of a typical visitor journey for resting and recharging.

47 As it is the only feasible location for locating a resting area with great external views, the increased glazing to the Roger Duff façade is viewed as being very important in the overall Museum concept at this location.

48 I also acknowledge the support for this increased openness within the evidence from the CCC Senior Urban Designer and the evidence of the WSP Landscape Architect.

49 The integration of the new roof level addition with the current façade had a major bearing on the degree of retention of the existing façade elements. The current façade is visually busy so adding the new form above (with potentially new cladding materials, new form and new fenestration), along with the additional glazing at level 2 & 2.5 to the cafe, and the new seismic joint to the east, added a number of additional visual elements.

50 Of all the options investigated the most well resolved option was the integration of the new upper floor addition utilising relocated existing panels, a glazed separation incorporating the seismic joint to the 1872 building, and double height glazing to the café. Whilst options were explored for the retention of the two existing eastern windows, architecturally the composition of the façade is significantly better with these removed and replaced with either relocated existing panels or glazing. The overall elevational composition aligns with the modernist language and greater simplicity of the original Henry façade and importantly retains the contextual material linkage to the neo gothic Mountfort buildings.

51 It is important that the overall façade is well composed and resolved architecturally. Hence when options were explored for the degree of alteration to the current façade and the integration of new elements, the removal of the current windows to the south façade (especially the eastern windows) produced a more resolved overall elevational composition, which was still in keeping with the original Modernist style. The design also retains the key heritage aspects that make up the heritage listing and establishes a clearer legibility to the highly significant 1872 Mountfort building.

52 I do note that during the design consultation workshops and subsequent resource consent application the design proposal for the south west corner was reviewed with many interested parties, including: the general public, architects, heritage architects, community groups and heritage groups. Within this wide range of interested parties there has been overwhelming universal support for the design solution proposed for the southwest corner of Canterbury Museum. The only contrary view we have received has been from the evidence of the CCC Senior Heritage Advisor, and associated peer heritage review. My concern with making any of the amendments to this façade, as suggested by Ms Ohs, that the universal support from the many other interested parties that we have consulted on in this process may be altered.

53 Much of this support stems from desire for the Museum complex of buildings to be more open, active and increasing the legibility of the Mountfort buildings. As the majority of the Museum public facades being highly significant Mountfort buildings, the Roger Duff Wing is really the only opportunity for this increased openness and external connectivity, and the requirement for a seismic joint to the 1872 Wing provides the opportunity for increased legibility.

Building Conservation Plan Guidance in the Design Process

54 The Canterbury Museum Building Conservation Plan Policy 8.10.6 strategy 3 was particularly relevant when reviewing the design options in relation to the junction with the 1872 Wing. As well as the seismic joint integration, the additional glazing to the stairwell allows the opportunity for greater legibility of the form of the 1872 Wing . This additional glazing is also important in completion of the legibility of the Mountfort era edge.

1958 Centennial Wing

55 The only area of disagreement regarding proposed changes to this building relate to the so-called 'slice' to the listed 1958 stone veneer façade to provide a separation to the 1877 Wing.

56 The disagreement is not that the separation is required, as there is general agreement that a minimum of 200mm is required to meet seismic requirements, but just the impact of the difference of separation between 200mm and 600mm, the nature of this separation and resulting impact on the wider contextual setting. The following are the most relevant paragraphs in Ms Ohs evidence which covers these issues.

57 Clause 54 '*it is not clear what options were considered for the seismic gap…*'

58 Clause 55 '*The heritage advice in the Application states "even in the absence of a structural / seismic rationale for this intervention we still consider it to be appropriate and desirable…" (p.3, 15 February 2021 Responses to CCC Queries). I disagree that the 600mm slice is appropriate on heritage grounds alone. I consider that making a feature of any seismic gap would disrupt the continuity of the Rolleston Avenue façade, which makes a key contribution to the unique character of the precinct. In my opinion a more subtle approach of introducing a seismic gap would better align with conservation principles and CDP and Conservation Plan policies. It would result in less removal of heritage fabric and better maintain the continuity of the Rolleston Avenue façade as it has stood for over 60 years. This would also better maintain the contribution of the Museum to the wider precinct of continuous stone facades in variations of the Gothic style.'*

59 Clause 61 '*The Applicant states that retention of the wing results in continued difficulties in resolving the juncture of the three buildings (1958,1877 and 1882) and ensuring weather tightness – however it does not say it is impossible…*'

60 Clause 164 '*In my opinion the benefits of the external exposure of the north wall of the 1877 wing do not outweigh the removal of part of the Centennial Wing Façade, and the disruption of the continuous façade presented to Rolleston Avenue. This change inserts a bold 21st century conservation solution for additions, which visually and physically interrupts the continuity of the principal stone Gothic façade*

of the complex. This change will reduce the integrity of the heritage item and also the Museum complex as a whole...'

61 Clause 163 '*I consider the adverse effects of the proposal on the Centennial Wing façade to be more than minor.'* (my emphasis)

62 In summary the key aspects of these statements I will specifically respond to and provide additional information on are:

- Options for providing a seismic joint between these two buildings;
- Clarifying the extent of removal of 1958 façade fabric;
- Impact of this extent of removal on the 1958 façade when assessed in isolation;
- Impact of this extent of removal on the total Museum Rolleston Avenue façade;
- Impact of this extent of removal on the wider Neo-Gothic cultural precinct;
- What are the heritage benefits to the 1877 Wing; and
- Weighting the removal of the amount of heritage fabric of secondary significance against the benefits from greater visibility and unveiling of heritage fabric and form of higher and principal significance.

Seismic Joint Options

63 As noted in the Applicant's 15 February 2021 Responses to CCC Queries, the proposed separation between the 1877 and 1958 Wings is not only being provided to meet the minimum required seismic requirements, but also to increase the unveiling of heritage of higher significance and to provide more robust water-proofing solutions.

64 In detailing this junction, several methodology options were assessed against the aforementioned requirements, including:

a. Installation of proprietary seismic joint systems.

b. Seismic joint installation with a glazed connection to the 1877 Wing.

c. The minimum intervention between both building, i.e complete separation.

Refer images on page 88 for sketches of these methodology options at both roof and wall junctions. It is clear which detail has the least intervention to heritage fabric and provides the best legibility between heritage items of differing periods. The image on page 88 show options for proprietary seismic joint systems.

65 The option with the minimum invention is what is being proposed in the Application. The benefits of this approach are:

- The proposed separation avoids clumsy or complex solid seismic joints;

- To make this junction weather-tight, would require a recess to be carved into the original stone façade for the insertion of a frame, resulting in the loss of heritage fabric. As the surface of the stonework varies in depth this frame could end up being quite bulky; and
- The clear separation also avoids complex junctions between building elements which increases water-tightness risk, directly impacts original heritage fabric and reduces the ability to reveal original heritage fabric. Image on page 92 shows a photo of a key area of the 1877 facade which is complex to reconcile.

66 A new structural and glazed wall is constructed 1.2m back from the 1877 Mountfort wall which provides the new enclosure envelope to the building. A simple single storey glazed link is provided at ground floor to connect the 1877 Wing to the 1958 building and this provides the absolute minimum connection possible to the 1877 Mountfort building.

67 I note that one of the proposed resource consent conditions is '*Seismic Joints – this documentation shall demonstrate that where these connect to heritage fabric, that there is the least intrusion and impact upon heritage fabric practicable.*'

68 The proposed separation detail with no infill is absolutely the least intrusion and impact on the heritage fabric of the highly significant 1877 façade and allows the total highly significant façade to be revealed in full. This is achieved with the minimal removal of heritage fabric of secondary significance.

69 This 600mm wall and roof separation is completely open (Athfield Architects Concept Design Report, pages 143 to 145 are useful drawings which highlight the nature of this junction, including extent of unveiling of the 1877 north wall, extent of 1958 building removal and the line of the new glazed wall). I note there are numerous references in the evidence of Ms Lutz and the CCC Senior Planner report that this is a glazed separation, but this is not correct. In my opinion, an assessment of a glazed separation would be different to an assessment of a completely open separation.

70 As there is acceptance of a seismic joint in the order of 200mm, the only area of difference in agreement is to the additional loss of 400mm of 1958 concrete and stone wall material fabric as the 1958 roof element is outside of the item of listed significance in the CDP (although it is acknowledged the eastern roof fabric is recommended to be retained in Policy 8.10.5 of the Building Conservation Plan).

71 The actual loss of the 1958 heritage fabric is very small. The amount of 1958 façade stone veneer & concrete wall façade material removed with the 600mm separation is 2.6% of the total façade area and if a 200mm separation is accepted as required, then the additional stone veneer fabric loss of the additional 400mm is only 1.65% of the façade.

72 Images show the minor extent of 1958 façade removal against the whole 1958 listed façade.

Impact on Setting & Wider Context

73 Images show the extent of the removal of 1958 façade fabric against the 1958 façade as an isolated element, whole Museum Rolleston Avenue front as the total façade and against how it would be experienced in the wider street and cultural precinct complex. As evidenced in these views the proposed separation is negligible in scale when viewed against all these aspects and indiscernible in most viewpoints.

74 The proposed 600mm separation is extremely minor in the wider context and makes up 0.6m of what is a 320 metre combined precinct façade from along Worcester to the Christs College entrance which is a mix of articulated building forms with a wider variety of forms and recesses, opening, trees, lanes and roads.

75 The continuity of the neo-gothic facades within the cultural precinct of the Arts Centre, Canterbury Museum and Christs College has been a key consideration in the proposed design from the beginning of the design process.

76 I note that whilst it is only the façade of the 1958 building which is listed in the District Plan for the 1958 building, no design options were considered with just keeping the listed façade as an isolated object. I viewed that the best response in maintaining the desired continuity of neo-gothic façades of the wider precinct also benefited with the retention of the eastern roof plane and the north gabled form of the 1958 building.

77 Paragraph 164 refers to the separation as being '*a bold 21st century conservation solution for additions which visually and physically interrupts the continuity of the principal stone Gothic façade of the complex'*. Paragraph 55 notes *'a more subtle approach of introducing a seismic gap would better align with conservation principles…*' As evidenced by the many views of the eastern façade contained within the Concept Design Report this separation is not in my opinion a 'bold' intervention and is in fact very subtle. I also disagree that the proposed separation negatively interrupts the continuity of the street facade.

Heritage & Architectural Benefits

78 The design intent of the separation was not purely to provide a seismic separation but improves the heritage legibility between the principal highly significant and secondary significant facades as well as enhances the architectural quality of the additional entrance.

79 There is a major heritage benefit viewing, albeit obliquely, the detailing of the northern stone wall of the highly significant 1877 Mountfort building in its entirety

without interruption of any seismic joint or even any glazing. Images on page 91 show what is possible to unveil and the plan on image 96 shows the major benefit to the heritage appreciation of the Mountfort era of the Museum building complex. Providing an open separation at the 1877 Wing edge and a glazed separation at the 1872 Wing edge is critical to achieving this appreciation in full.

80 The open separation has a significance benefit to the appreciation of both the total Mountfort Wing, the edge of the Mountfort Buildings as a complex and the detailing the original stone facade itself. It also allows natural light to graze and highlight the stone surface, which along with water reflections at the base really celebrates this important heritage edge of the highly significant Mountfort era in the Museum redevelopment. Images (pages 93-94) show examples of the increased appreciation of heritage stone walls and legibility of the overall heritage building form, when there is the ability to view both the interior and external facades together.

Conclusion

81 The design intent and rationale with the proposed separation between the 1877 & 1958 buildings is:

- Provides the greatest opportunity to reveal the fabric and form of the highly significant north wall of the 1877 Wing (refer BCP Policy 8.10.3);
- Re-establishes and provides greater clarity to the public the original proportions of Mountfort's 1877 eastern façade and provides greater clarity that the 1958 Wing is from a different time period (refer BCP Policy 8.10.3). Even with the small elevational setback and lowered ridge line, there tends to be a lack of understanding from the public that the total Rolleston Avenue façade is not all 19th century Mountfort;
- Allows the Mountfort building edge to be celebrated more as part of the additional entrance experience in the Museum;
- Provides a necessary seismic joint; and
- Resolves a complex weather-tightness junction and avoids complex connection in original Mountfort heritage fabric.

82 The introduction of the 600mm <u>open</u> separation between the 1877 and 1958 is viewed as being a subtle gesture to meet the above requirements and design intent with minimal visual or physical impact on heritage fabric, values or setting.

83 In my opinion, the major heritage and architectural benefits with introducing a separation between the 1877 & 1958 buildings which far outweigh the small loss of 1958 external wall fabric.

84 The proposed design with the removal of a very small section of the listed 1958 façade, in my opinion, has little to no visual impact on the remaining 1958 façade, the eastern Museum façade viewed in whole or the continuity of the overall cultural precinct façade and certainly not 'more than minor' as concluded by Ms Ohs (paragraph 163). It is a subtle gesture with a small loss of less significant heritage fabric but achieves major heritage and architectural benefits.

Response to Overall Conclusion by CCC Heritage Advisor

85 Ms Ohs concludes in paragraph 169 '*Balancing the heritage impacts of the works with the effects on overall heritage significance of the complex as a whole, in my opinion the impact on the complex of scheduled museum buildings and their setting is more than minor'.*

86 Paragraph 39 of this summary of evidence is an extensive list all the heritage gains to the areas of highest significance with the Museum and RMG buildings that have been created from this complex redevelopment project. Compare these major gains in areas of high significance against the minor areas of disagreement in areas of secondary significance, and it is difficult to understand how one could come to this 'more than minor' conclusion when viewing the Application holistically.

CONCLUSION

87 The Canterbury Museum Redevelopment project is the first extensive redevelopment of the Museum in 25 years and is looking to future proof the complex for at least the next 50 – 100 years.

88 The proposal seeks to resolve a multitude of current building issues and deficiencies, but fundamentally it seeks to protect Canterbury taonga, which includes the heritage buildings on the site.

89 Canterbury Museum has evolved over the past 150 years and this proposal is part of this evolution. It seeks to achieve a balance between resolving the existing complex deficiency issues, providing practical and functional spaces for the Museum's continual operation on this site, improving the urban design and connectivity of the Museum within the wider city context - whilst respecting the significant heritage values of the Canterbury Museum and Robert McDougall buildings and their setting.

90 Thank you for the opportunity to present my evidence.

Trevor Watt
Director, Athfield Architects Limited
9th June 2021