

**BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH REPLACEMENT
DISTRICT PLAN HEARINGS PANEL**

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 Residential
Proposal

**[UPDATED] STATEMENT OF ISSUES RELATING TO THE
RESIDENTIAL PROPOSAL**

23 FEBRUARY 2015

 **Simpson Grierson**
Barristers & Solicitors

Simpson Grierson
J G A Winchester / S J Scott
Telephone: +64-3-968 4018
Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023
Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com
PO Box 874
SOLICITORS
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

MAY IT PLEASE THE PANEL:

1. The purpose of this memorandum is to set out the issues arising from submissions that have been made on the Residential Proposal of the Christchurch City Council (**Council**) proposed Replacement District Plan (**pRDP**). At "A" of the Pre-Hearing Report and Directions of the Residential Proposal issued on 18 February 2015, the Council is directed to provide an issues statement.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

2. Intensification

Issue 1 Is there sufficient land zoned/identified to meet intensification targets?
Is there a shortfall in supply?

Issue 2 What model is appropriate to test the suitability of areas for residential intensification and what are the relevant assumptions and criteria that need to be included in the model?

Issue 3 Are the locations identified suitable and will they be attractive to the market?

Issue 4 Do the activity status and the built form standards provide the flexibility within which to enable residential intensification?

Issue 5 Which communities have raised concerns with respect to potential intensification locations? Are those concerns valid and can they be addressed?

2.1 Submissions have been received opposing the proposed residential intensification provisions applying to the following areas:

- (a) Riccarton - the large majority of submissions;
- (b) Papanui / Northlands;
- (c) Bishopdale;
- (d) St Albans;
- (e) Shirley / The Palms;
- (f) Aranui;

- (g) Barrington; and
- (h) Merivale.

2.2 Submissions have been received supporting the proposed residential intensification provisions applying to their area, or seeking that their land be included in intensification areas:

- (a) Riccarton;
- (b) Hornby;
- (c) Papanui / Northlands;
- (d) Merivale; and
- (e) Beckenham.

2.3 Intensification within the airport noise contour is also a sub-topic.

3. New Neighbourhood Zone Provisions

Issue 6 Can the differentiation between the comprehensive land use and subdivision resource consent path and the “subdivide first” resource consent pathway be made clearer?

Issue 7 Can submissions seeking rezoning of land to residential, that is “greyed” out on the Stage 1 maps, be heard in Stage 1, or should those provisions be considered in Stage 2 of the Replacement District Plan when the zoning of that land is notified?

3.1 This issue was addressed at Paragraphs [6] – [8] of the Pre-Hearing Report and Directions Residential Proposal issued on 18 February 2015, where the Panel made the following direction:

- (a) *If the zone proposed by the Council for your property was notified in the first stage proposal (for example, residential, industrial or commercial) then you should attend hearings on both proposals and put forward your case as to which is the most appropriate zoning for your site.*
- (b) *If your property was in an area identified in the notified planning maps as part of Stage 2 proposals then you can*

only attend hearings when the appropriate zoning of your property is able to be discussed as part of Stage 2 proposals. You will need to lodge a submission on the Stage 2 proposals when they are notified.

4. Retirement Village and Elderly Homes provisions

Issue 8 Is the comprehensive design of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity more appropriate than the alternatives sought by Retirement Village providers, such as overlays with bespoke built form standards or outline development plans?

Issue 9 Should the Elderly Person Housing Unit provisions in the operative City Plan be continued in the proposed Replacement District Plan (pRDP)?

4.1 This issue is raised by submitters who seek the "roll over" of the Elderly Persons Housing Unit provisions currently in the operative city plan. The Council has provided for elderly persons housing in the pRDP through the Retirement Village, minor dwelling unit, social housing unit provisions in the Residential Suburban Zone and Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone, and the multi-unit development in the Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone.

5. Sustainability Standards / Life Star

Issue 10 Are Life stage inclusive and adaptive design and energy and water efficiency standards necessary and appropriate in a Resource Management Act planning document and can they be justified in regard to Section 32 of the Act?

5.1 Submissions have been made in support of and in opposition to the standards.

6. Non-Residential Activities

Issue 11 Is the permitted activity status appropriate, and are the built form standards for non-residential activities appropriate? For example,

activities include pre-school, veterinary care and health care facilities, places of assembly, and providing for boarding/residential accommodation ancillary to education activities.

Issue 12 Has sufficient provision been made for non-residential activities in the residential zones? For example, community based facilities such as emergency service facilities, travellers accommodation, churches, and schools.

7. Infrastructure / Corridor Protection

Issue 13 The appropriateness of standards relating to Memorial Avenue as an important and high amenity entrance to the central city, and Standards relating to Rail, Road, and Airport noise protection / reverse sensitivity provisions.

8. Enhanced Development Mechanism and Community Housing Redevelopment Mechanism

Issue 14 Are the provisions of the Enhanced Development Mechanism (EDM) in 14.7 and the Community Housing Redevelopment Mechanism (CHRM) 14.8 an accurate reflection of the changes to the Operative City Plan made on 13 December 2013?

9. Residential Suburban Zone

Issue 15 The appropriateness of provisions in the Residential Suburban Zone for boarding houses, tertiary student accommodation, ancillary buildings and sleep outs.

10. Submissions on the remainder of the objectives / policies and rules and definitions not included in topics above

Issue 16 Are the built form standards necessary or set at the right measurable standard?

11. Definitions

11.1 A list of core definitions is set out in **Attachment A**.

12. Deferral until Stage 2

12.1 At the pre-hearing meeting on Monday 16 February, issues arose as to the scope of relief sought in some submissions, who are seeking that their land be rezoned to residential (through Stage 1) when their land is "greyed out" on the Stage 1 planning maps. This matter is wider than the New Neighbourhood Zone Issue 7, set out above. The University of Canterbury [797] and the Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology [756] have provided a memorandum explaining that the University and the CPIT are seeking to rezone land that relies on proposals that will be notified in Stage 2 (**Attachment B**), and requesting that hearing of these submission be deferred from the Stage 1 hearing process.

12.1 As identified in paragraph 3.1 above, this issue has already been addressed by the Hearings Panel, at Paragraphs [6] – [8] of the Pre-Hearing Report and Directions Residential Proposal issued on 18 February 2015, where the Panel made the following direction:

- (a) *If the zone proposed by the Council for your property was notified in the first stage proposal (for example, residential, industrial or commercial) then you should attend hearings on both proposals and put forward your case as to which is the most appropriate zoning for your site.*

- (b) *If your property was in an area identified in the notified planning maps as part of Stage 2 proposals then you can only attend hearings when the appropriate zoning of your property is able to be discussed as part of Stage 2 proposals. You will need to lodge a submission on the Stage 2 proposals when they are notified.*

DATED this 23rd day of February 2015



S J Scott / A O J Sinclair
Counsel for Christchurch City Council


Attachment A

Core definitions

Access	External sound insulation level Dtr, 2m, nTw
Access lot	Filling
Access strip	Floor level and fill management area
Accessory building	Frontage
Allotment	FTE
Archaeological site	Garage
Arterial road	Gross floor area
Balcony	Ground floor area
Boundary	Ground level
Building	Habitable space
CHRM	Health care facility
Collector roads	Heavy vehicle
Commercial services	Height
Community housing unit	Home occupation
Convenience activities	Installed
Council	Insulation R value
Cycle way	Key activity centre
Detailed design statement	Landscaping
Development	Living area
District Plan	Living space
EDM core public transport route	Local road
EDM qualifying supermarket	Major arterial road
EDM walking distance	Multi-unit residential complex
Education activity	Net floor area
Elderly person's housing unit	Net site area
Electrical switch	No complaints covenant

Outdoor living space	Road boundary
Outdoor storage area	Sensitive activities
Parking area	Service station
Place of assembly	Setback
Pre-school	Site
Primary living level	Site boundary
Public floor area	Sleep-out
Rear site	Social housing
Relocation of a building	Tertiary education and research activity
Residential activity	Veterinary care facility
Residential thoroughfare	Visibility splay
Residential unit	Waste management area
Residential activity	Water body
Retailing	WELS
Retirement village	Window
Right turn offset	Window control
Road	

Attachment B



Resource and Environmental Management Consultants

17 February 2015

To: James Winchester
Partner
Simpson Grierson
Level 24, 195 Lambton Quay
P O Box 2402
Wellington

By email: James.Winchester@simpsongrierson.com

Under: The Resource Management Act 1991 and the
Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch Replacement
District Plan) Order 2014

In the Matter of: Submissions by the University of Canterbury and the
Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology on
Chapter 14 of the proposed Christchurch
Replacement District Plan - Phase 1

1. This memorandum is provided on behalf of the University of Canterbury (the University) (submitter 797) and the Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology (CPIT) (submitter 756).
2. At the Residential prehearing meeting held on Monday 16 February 2015, issues arose as to the scope of relief sought in some submissions and whether the relief should be considered as part of the phase 1 hearings or deferred until phase 2. The purpose of this memorandum is to seek further clarification on that issue within the context of the information provided below.

Resource Management Group Ltd

Phone (03) 943 4112

Level 4, 69 Cambridge Terrace
PO Box 908, Christchurch Box Lobby, Christchurch 8140

3. The University and the CPIT sought land rezoning within their submissions. The background to these submissions is as follows:

3.1 University of Canterbury:

- The University campus is zoned Cultural 4 in the operative City Plan. The land currently zoned Cultural 4 will be addressed as part of phase 2 of the Replacement Plan process. Within this context, the University campus is “greyed out” on the Replacement Plan planning maps.
- Preliminary consultation with Christchurch City Council planning staff indicate that the phase 2 zoning for the campus will be referred to as the “*Special Purpose (Tertiary Education) Zone*”, although the exact notation is not critical to this discussion.
- There are a number of sites containing existing University activities and buildings that sit outside of the current Cultural 4 zone. These sites are zoned Living 1 and 2 in the operative City Plan and are proposed to be zoned Residential Suburban and Residential Suburban Density Transition zone in the Replacement District Plan.
- The University’s submission sought that the sites be rezoned to reflect the zoning that would ultimately cover the campus; i.e. the “*Special Purpose (Tertiary Education) Zone*”. This would, therefore, provide a consistent planning mechanism across the University campus.

3.2 Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology:

- The CPIT owns the “Seven Oaks” site in Hassals Lane. Historically this site has been used by the CPIT for the delivery of viticulture and horticulture training programmes. In more recent times it has been used by another education provider. Ultimately, however, the CPIT has proposals to return to the site.
- The Seven Oaks site is zoned Living 2 in the operative City Plan and is proposed to be zoned Residential Suburban Density Transition zone in the Replacement District Plan.
- The CPIT’s submission sought that the Seven Oaks site be rezoned to reflect the zoning that would ultimately cover all other tertiary education providers; i.e. the “*Special Purpose (Tertiary Education) Zone*”.

4. In both cases the University and the CPIT are seeking to rezone land that relies on proposals that will be included in phase 2. This raises issues concerning the extent of useful evidence that can be presented at this stage of the Plan process, given the uncertainty surrounding the exact nature of the tertiary education zone proposal and the supporting policy and rule framework. Accordingly, the University and the CPIT request that hearing of these submissions be deferred from the phase 1 hearing process and be included with the phase 2 hearings.

Resource Management Group Limited

On behalf of the University of Canterbury and the Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology



Darryl Millar

Director

(03) 962 1740

darryl@rmgroup.co.nz