9 August 2017

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT RELATING TO AUGUST 2017 DESIGN REVISIONS
PROPOSED MORAY PLACE DUNEDIN HOTEL

This assessment statement addresses the change in environmental outcomes that might be realistically anticipated if the revised design by Thom Craig Architects was to be implemented as an alternative to the design proposed in the application documents.

This assessment statement relates to the matters in which Paterson Pitts Group has previously provided expert evidence, i.e.-

- Anticipated Views Assessment
- Shading Assessment
- Subdivision
- Infrastructure Demand

1 General

The principle elements of modifications contained within the August 2017 design, for the purposes of this assessment statement, are-

1. The maximum height of the Hotel is no higher on the alternative plans as is has been previously shown to be on the application plan set.

2. The top of the Hotel wing that faces Smith Street is: 171.900 (17 level). This is the same height as the level of this wing as presented in the application plans (171.900).

3. The top of the wing that faces the Cathedral is: 168.380 (16 level). This is 3.520m lower than the level of this wing as presented in the application plans (171.900).

4. The top of the Hotel wing that faces Filleul Street is 164.860 (15 level). This is 7.040m lower than the level of this wing as presented in the application plans (171.900).

For the sake of completeness, I note that this assessment understands that there are no proposed modifications to the external width or form of the Hotel structure, excepting for i) where described above, and ii) where the reception and vehicle entranceways into the hotel have been revised. Fundamentally, the Hotel has not been widened to accommodate space that might have been lost as a consequence of the reduction in height of two of the wing structures.

2 Anticipated Views Assessment

The changes resulting to the anticipated views of the Hotel structure, if the alternative structure was to be built instead of the application structure, can best be described as a fairly modest (to perhaps moderate) reduction of the space that the Hotel would occupy within the field-of-view frames from each of the Anticipated Views assessment positions.

The impact that the modified structure will have on the anticipated views will depend on the distance between the Hotel and the observing position, as well as the angle of orientation between the viewing position and the Hotel (as the three wings shown on the alternative design occur at differing levels).

For instance, an observer looking at the Hotel from one of the viewing positions that are located further away from the Hotel would most likely be able to discern the changes between the application design and the alternative design (the storey levels can be identified in the montage images), however the difference in the overall impression of the Hotel is relatively minor. I consider Anticipated View positions 1, 17, 18 and 19 in this regard.

Where montage view positions are at a middle distance and are located directly to the north-west of the Hotel, particularly Anticipated View position 20, I also consider the difference to the overall impression of the Hotel to be relatively minor. This is because the wing of the Hotel that faces in that direction occupies the majority of the structure's visible width at the top of the form, and this wing remains at the same height as originally proposed.

Other view positions will receive various levels of reduction of space within which the Hotel occupies the field-of-view. In some instances, such as Anticipated View position 5 (looking between the Cathedral and the Town Hall) the difference to the overall impression of the Hotel might rate somewhere between modest and moderate, on the grounds that the two wings which are visible from this positon have both been reduced in height by the alternative design.

Due to the timeframes involved, new montage images showing the alternative Hotel design have not been able to be constructed. It is hoped that the Panel, and other users of the montage images, will be able to interpret the differences between the application design and the alternative design by understanding that the wing of the structure which faces towards the Cathedral will be reduced in height by effectively one storey and the wing that faces towards Filleul Street will reduced in height by effectively two storeys. The building levels can be observed in the majority of the montage images, so visualising the differences proposed by the alternative design is possible.

To be quite clear, the alternative Hotel design will not take up any greater visual space in any of the anticipated view positions than the Hotel design which was proposed by the application.

3 Shading Diagrams

The changes resulting to the shading diagrams for the Hotel structure, if the alternative structure was to be built instead of the application structure, are expected to vary depending on the receiving location.

During the summer months, while the sun is at relatively high elevations (through the central parts of the day) the reduction in shading which will result from the reduced heights of the Filleul Street and Cathedral facing wings is expected to be fairly modest. However, early in the morning, and later on in the evening, where shadows are longer due to the sun's low elevation, a reduction of one or two storeys on parts of the structure, as proposed by the alternative design, will have a larger impact of the extent of the shading effect.

Because the Smith Street wing has been retained at its original height, the reduction in shading will be less prominent in the mornings, when the Smith Street wing is located at the back of the sun's line, and more prominent in the afternoons, when the Smith Street wing is located at the front the sun's line.

During the equinox period, the differences in shading between the application design and the alternative design will be more pronounced, due to the sun having a lower elevation throughout the day. Similarly, during the winter months, these differences will be further pronounced again, for the same reason.

Having described the differences that will be experienced between the two Hotel designs above, it is reasonable to state that while the reduction in height of two wings of the Hotel will reduce the resulting shading, the overall result is not considered to be particularly considerable during many of the situations assessed.

For instance, there will be a relatively small change in the effect generated on the nearby Kingsgate Hotel as the reduced shadow is still expected to pass over the top of the Kingsgate during most of the winter month. Some reduction in shading of the face of the Kingsgate building will occur at the equinox period.

Shading in the Octagon is expected to be reduced by a greater margin than at the Kingsgate. This is due to the two reduced height wings both facing towards the Octagon. I have considered in particular the shading that will occur at 2:25pm on the Winter Solstice, and I have calculated the approximate reduction in shadow ground coverage within the Octagon, as a consequence of the alternative design, to be approximately 350m². This represents a reduction of approximately 15-20% of the additional shading that would be generated by the application design at the same date and time. I consider that this level of difference is more than modest.

As with the montage images, due to the timeframes involved, new shading diagrams showing the alternative Hotel design have not been able to be constructed.

To be quite clear, the alternative Hotel design will not generate any greater level of shading than the Hotel design which was proposed by the application.

4 Subdivision

The form of the unit title subdivision will change as a result of the alternative design presented by Thom Craig Architects, however these changes will only be technical in nature.

Several of the penthouse and apartment units will be adjusted in shape and size, and the revised entranceway into the Hotel will require modifications to adjust the boundary between Unit 1 and the Common Property.

Many of the levels of the units will also be modified.

However, the purpose and general form of the unit title subdivision will remain materially unchanged. Ultimately, the unit title subdivision will still enable the penthouse and apartment units to be owned independently of the Hotel property (although they may be operated in a cooperative arrangement), which is consistent with the original subdivision objective.

Overall, I consider that the revisions to the subdivision form, as a consequence of the alternative design, are in all meaningful ways negligible.

5 Infrastructure Demand

The effect that the alternative design will have on the form and function of infrastructure supplies is negligible. This consideration relates to-

- Foul sewerage drainage, including trade waste.
- Water supply (domestic).
- Stormwater drainage, including retention facilities.

While the shape and sized of the units are slightly revised within the alternative design presented, there is not likely to be any difference in the level of foul sewerage generated by the Hotel nor any difference in the level of water supply required.

Overall, I consider that the impact on infrastructure demand, as a consequence of the alternative design, are in all meaningful ways negligible.

Assessment report prepared by:

Kurt Bowen
Registered Professional Surveyor
Paterson Pitts Group