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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCBZ</td>
<td>Central City Business Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCDU</td>
<td>Christchurch Central Development Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCMUZ</td>
<td>Central City Mixed Use Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRP</td>
<td>Christchurch Central Recovery Plan, Te Mahere ‘Maraka Ītautahi’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRZ</td>
<td>Central City Residential Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERA</td>
<td>Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LURP</td>
<td>Land Use Recovery Plan, Te Mahere Whakahaumanu Tāone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Plan</td>
<td>Christchurch Replacement District Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMDZ</td>
<td>Residential Medium Density Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Directions decision</td>
<td>The hearings panel's decision on Strategic Directions and Strategic Outcomes (and Relevant Definitions) dated 26 February 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 My name is Timothy Carr Walsh. I am a resource management planner employed by Novo Group.

1.2 I hold a Bachelor of Science (Honours) degree and a Master of Science degree from the University of Canterbury. I am also an Associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.

1.3 I have been employed by Novo Group as a Senior Planner for one month. Prior to my current role I was employed as a Senior Advisor in the Christchurch Central Development Unit (‘CCDU’) at the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (‘CERA’) for approximately 2 years. A summary of my qualifications and past experience is in Appendix TCW1.

1.4 Relevant to this matter, I have experience in processing resource consent applications including preparing Section 42A reports and attending resource consent hearings on behalf of Queenstown-Lakes District Council. As a consultant planner I have experience in evaluating development projects, preparing resource consent applications and presenting evidence at Council resource consent and plan change hearings and the Environment Court.

1.5 While employed at CERA I led the development of the *A Liveable City* residential chapter of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan, Te Mahere ‘Maraka Ōtautahi’ (‘CCRPO’). I was responsible for instructing and coordinating a team of experts (including planners) to develop a draft CCRP residential chapter and associated advice for the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery’s (‘Minister’) consideration.

1.6 I have been engaged by the Crown (through CERA) to provide evidence in relation to integration of suburban residential zones with the Central City and implications for the Christchurch Replacement District Plan (‘Replacement Plan’).

1.7 While I was employed at CERA I provided advice on a pre-notification draft of Proposal 14 (Residential) (‘Proposal 14’) to assist in informing the Ministers’ comments. In providing that advice I focused mainly on the effectiveness of the draft provisions in terms of enabling the Land Use Recovery Plan, Te Mahere Whakahaumanu Tāone (‘LURP’) housing supply targets to be achieved.
2. **CODE OF CONDUCT**

2.1 I confirm that I have read the code of conduct for expert witnesses as contained in the Environment Court’s Practice Note 2014. I have complied with the practice note when preparing my written statement of evidence, and will do so when I give oral evidence before the hearings panel.

2.2 The data, information, facts and assumptions I have considered in forming my opinions are set out in my evidence to follow. The reasons for the opinions expressed are also set out in the evidence to follow.

2.3 Unless I state otherwise, this evidence is within the area of my expertise and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

3. **SCOPE**

3.1 I have been asked to provide evidence in relation to the integration of objectives, policies and rules for the suburban residential zones in the Residential Proposal with the relevant provisions in the CCRP and implications of integration for the Replacement Plan.

3.2 The structure of my evidence is set out as follows:

(a) Central City\(^1\) residential context.

(b) CCRP residential objectives.

(c) Implementing the CCRP residential objectives.

(d) Residential intensification priorities.

(e) Integration with the Central City.

(f) Non-residential activities in the CCRP and Proposal 14.

3.3 Key documents I have used in preparing my evidence include:

(a) Proposal 14 (Residential) of the Replacement Plan (notified version and 9 March 2015 revision);

(b) the section 32 report;

\(^1\) For the purposes of my evidence, the Central City is defined as the area bounded by Bealey, Fitzgerald, Moorhouse, Deans and Harper Avenues.
(c) the Crown’s submission, particularly Part A and Proposal 14 in Part C;

(d) the CCRP (including several documents that informed its development);

(e) the LURP;

(f) the Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch Replacement District Plan) Order 2014, particularly Schedule 4 – Statement of Expectations;

(g) the Preliminary Usability Assessment of the Replacement Plan prepared by Mr Mark Chrisp;\(^2\) and

(h) the hearings panel’s decision on Strategic Directions and Strategic Outcomes (and Relevant Definitions) dated 26 February 2015 (the ‘Strategic Directions decision’).

3.4 I have read and agree with the evidence of Don Miskell for the Strategic Directions hearing.\(^3\) My evidence elaborates on the aspects of Mr Miskell’s evidence that concern residential activity. Further, I have read and relied on the evidence of Ms McIntyre, Ms Barker, Mr Rouse, Ms McLeod, Mr Schellekens, Mr Mitchell, and Mr Teesdale (both on behalf of the Crown and jointly on behalf of the Crown and Council).

4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4.1 The Central City resident population was severely affected by the Canterbury earthquakes. Over the coming years Central City residents will play a critical role in facilitating the recovery of the commercial centre. The CCRP acknowledges this and targets a Central City resident population of between 12,000 and 24,000 people - which represents an increase of 7,000 to 19,000 people over the resident population at the March 2013 census. In light of significant challenges facing residential development in the Central City, the CCRP contains several initiatives designed to stimulate development and establishes appropriately enabling District Plan provisions.

\(^2\) Available for download at [http://www.chchplan.lhp.govt.nz/Hearings/Hearing1/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.chchplan.lhp.govt.nz/Hearings/Hearing1/Pages/default.aspx) under the heading “Report and Advice Sought By the Panel”.

\(^3\) Available for download at [http://www.chchplan.lhp.govt.nz/Hearings/Hearing1/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.chchplan.lhp.govt.nz/Hearings/Hearing1/Pages/default.aspx) under the heading “Submitter Evidence and Written Statements”.
4.2 For the recovery of the Central City, it would be preferable for residential intensification to be prioritised in the Central City before other areas. However, it is my view that this cannot be practically achieved using planning mechanisms. In my opinion, other non-planning methods must be relied on in conjunction with the District Plan to promote Central City residential intensification.

4.3 In my view, the Residential Proposal does not undermine the CCRP objectives but could be integrated and better aligned with the Central City planning provisions introduced through the CCRP. I consider that those provisions are simple and appropriately enabling and ought to be used as a model for the Residential Proposal, which as drafted, is overly complex and contains unnecessarily prescriptive regulations. While improvements have been made in the 9 March 2015 revision, I consider that further improvements could be made.

4.4 In terms of non-residential activities in the residential zones, I consider that the Residential Proposal takes an overly restrictive approach and does not appropriately provide for Community and Emergency Facilities (although improvements have been made through the 9 March revision). While this approach is similar to that taken in the Central City, contextual differences mean that a different response is required for the wider residential areas of Christchurch.

5. CENTRAL CITY RESIDENTIAL CONTEXT

5.1 According to the 2006 Census, there were 7,653 residents in the Central City (3,580 households). Prior to the earthquakes in 2011, estimates suggest that the Central City was home to approximately 8,300 residents or just over 2% of the Christchurch City population.\(^4\)

5.2 The Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy recognised the importance of inner-city living to the successful revitalisation of central Christchurch, with aspirations to have over 20,000 people living in the Central City. Pre-earthquakes, Christchurch City Council (Council) demonstrated its commitment to reinvigorating the heart of the city with the development of the Central City Revitalisation Strategy. One of the strategy’s goals was to increase the Central City’s residential population to 30,000 by 2026.

\(^4\) Data from Statistics New Zealand.
5.3 Despite the best efforts of Council, those aspirations were far from being realised prior to the earthquakes - although momentum appeared to be building. Intensified residential development was becoming somewhat more common. In 2007, the year prior to the global financial crisis, approximately 130 new units were consented in the Central City. On average, approximately 60 units were consented in the Central City per year in the decade prior to the first significant earthquake in 2010.

5.4 However, the medium-density market in the Central City was still in its infancy when the earthquakes destroyed or damaged large swathes of Central City housing. Since the earthquakes many residents have left the Central City, largely as a result of the destruction of a large proportion of the apartment buildings, mostly in the core of the Central City. The results of the March 2013 Census indicate that more than 3,000 residents have relocated from the city centre which represents a 40% population loss – reducing the population to approximately 4,900.

6. CCRP RESIDENTIAL OBJECTIVES

6.1 The CCRP, which was released at the end of July 2012, provides for the recovery of central Christchurch following the earthquakes with the vision that it will become the heart of an international city.

6.2 As a result of the destruction caused by the earthquakes, there are significant brownfield development opportunities in the Central City that could be used to replace and materially increase housing supply. To make sure this opportunity can be acted on, the CCRP attempts to create favourable conditions to allow the private sector to innovate, act quickly, and develop with certainty.

6.3 The recently Gazetted A Liveable City residential chapter of the CCRP recognises the important role inner-city residents have in contributing to implementing the wider objectives of the CCRP such as the creation of a vibrant city both during the day and night. In this respect, the successful recovery of the Central City needs to be underpinned by a substantial increase in the inner-city resident population. Without that increase, the Central City is unlikely to achieve the level of commercial, retail, recreational and cultural activity envisioned by the CCRP.

5 The A Liveable City residential chapter was gazetted on 29 January 2015.
Attracting residents to live in the Central City early in the recovery is an effective way of achieving the benefits that residents can deliver for the city and the recovery and rebuild. In my opinion, a progressive increase in the inner-city resident population will:

(a) help to underpin the economic recovery of the Central City by providing workers and customers for businesses, and re-establish the Central City as the primary node of commerce;

(b) help to attract and retain highly productive and creative workers who seek out urban living;

(c) increase the agglomeration and productivity advantages of the Central City by helping to build and retain human capital;

(d) leverage the public sector investment in anchor projects to cater to a new resident population and provide high-quality facilities and amenity relatively early in the rebuild process;

(e) utilise existing and rebuilt infrastructure in a manner that provides for an efficient urban form; and

(f) create new networks and neighbourhoods that will cater to people who prefer an inner-city urban lifestyle.

A Liveable City advises that a city the size of Christchurch requires 3-6% of the total metropolitan population to live in the central city to support a prosperous commercial, hospitality and entertainment hub. In Christchurch this equates to a population between 12,000 and 24,000 people. For this reason, the CCRP contains a flexible population target reflecting this range.

The importance of revitalising the Central City is also recognised in Objective 3.3.8 of the Strategic Directions decision.

IMPLEMENTING THE CCRP RESIDENTIAL OBJECTIVES

Growing the Central City resident population to between 3 and 6% of the total Christchurch population represents a significant challenge. For example, to achieve a Central City resident population target of 20,000 by 2041, 400 plus housing units need to be constructed per year⁶. This represents a significant increase on the number of housing units constructed per year in the decade prior to the earthquakes.

⁶ CBRE, 2013, Delivering Central City Living in Christchurch
7.2 A combination of factors is currently preventing substantial market-led residential development occurring in the Central City, particularly within the Central City Business and Mixed Use zones where the price of land is higher.

7.3 Higher density housing is a relatively untested product in Christchurch. This creates a higher level of development risk, which in turn demands higher returns, and can ultimately lead to a mismatch between the feasible sale price and the price that potential purchasers are willing to pay.

7.4 In recognition of the challenge of growing the Central City residential population, the CCRP aims to create favourable conditions for residential development by:

(a) establishing an appropriately enabling regulatory framework, and

(b) stimulating private sector investment with public sector initiatives.

7.5 *A Liveable City* established a new District Plan Central City Residential Zone (‘CCRZ’) which complements the Central City Business Zone (‘CCBZ’) and Central City Mixed Use Zone (‘CCMUZ’) introduced when the CCRP was Gazetted in July 2012, and the Central City (South Frame) Mixed Use Zone Gazetted in December 2014. For the sake of simplicity, I will refer to the Central City Mixed Use and Central City (South Frame) Mixed Use zone as one and the same.

7.6 The CCRZ, CCBZ and CCMUZ occupy the majority of the Central City and all permit residential activity. In combination, the three zones provide for a wide variety of housing types to accommodate the growth of diverse central city communities.

7.7 The anchor projects and the several other public sector initiatives outlined in the CCRP are intended to cumulatively stimulate residential development. The key initiatives in this respect include:

(a) the East Frame\(^7\);

(b) Te Papa Ōtākaro/Avon River Precinct\(^8\);

(c) the *An Accessible City* transport improvements\(^9\);

\(^7\) CCRP page 35 / *A Liveable City* residential chapter pages 12 and 13
\(^8\) CCRP page 53 and 54
\(^9\) CCRP *An Accessible City* transport chapter page 20
(d) the Residential Demonstration Project\textsuperscript{10};

(e) the Central City development contributions rebate\textsuperscript{11};

(f) a development utilising a mixed-tenure development model at 399 Manchester Street\textsuperscript{12}; and

(g) a medium density development in the CCMUZ at 36 Welles Street\textsuperscript{13}.

7.8 While the committed initiatives and new CCRZ will help stimulate and facilitate residential development, it may not be a panacea. Further intervention may be required to achieve the aspirations of the CCRP.

8. RESIDENTIAL INTENSIFICATION PRIORITIES

8.1 Consistent with the LURP, Objective 3.3.4(a) of the Strategic Directions decision provides that for the period 2012 to 2028, an additional 23,700 dwellings be enabled through a combination of residential intensification, brownfield and greenfield development.

8.2 In order to enable the additional dwellings, a significant amount of land will need to be zoned to allow higher density residential development. Failing to accommodate additional residential capacity through intensification development would likely result in unnecessary pressure on greenfield areas and ultimately further urban sprawl. Further sprawl may act to undermine the CCRP objectives and is unlikely to accommodate the future needs of the city’s aging population\textsuperscript{14} which, as Mr Mitchell and Mr Teesdale explain, is likely to develop a preference for higher density living.

8.3 The Crown and Council have agreed on criteria for determining the appropriate extent and locations to provide for sufficient housing intensification capacity. I agree with this position which is explained in the joint statement of evidence of Mr Teesdale.

8.4 When applying this criteria however, the modelling which has informed Mr Schellekens’ evidence suggests a high likelihood that the current Proposal 14 does not provide adequate capacity to enable the\textsuperscript{15}.

\textsuperscript{10} CCRP pages 81 and 82 / A Liveable City residential chapter page 14

\textsuperscript{11} CCRP A Liveable City residential chapter page 8

\textsuperscript{12} CCRP A Liveable City residential chapter page 14

\textsuperscript{13} CCRP A Liveable City residential chapter page 14

\textsuperscript{14} The aging population is also discussed in the demographic evidence of Professor Jackson dated 25 November 2014 for the Strategic Directions proposal, which is available for download at http://www.chchplan.lhp.govt.nz/Hearings/Hearing1/Pages/default.aspx under the heading “Submitter Evidence and Written Statements”.

\textsuperscript{15}
implementation of an appropriate intensification target under the LURP and Objective 3.3.4(a). This position is further strengthened when commercial factors are considered. I agree with the evidence of Mr Schellekens because it is based on an appropriate target for intensification within the Christchurch urban area, and it appropriately considers development feasibility factors associated with residential intensification.

8.5 In regards to the capacity of infrastructure to accommodate extra intensification areas required, I rely on the evidence of Mr Rouse. Mr Rouse's evidence considers that residential intensification supports efficient use of existing infrastructure, and that network capacity issues resulting from intensification can be managed in a number of ways.

8.6 While from the perspective of the CCRP, it would be preferable to sequence delivery of residential intensification to prioritise the Central City, it is clear that intensification is needed in both the Central City and wider Christchurch within the life of the Replacement Plan. Further, I cannot conceive of any sensible or practical planning mechanisms to achieve this. Even if intensification in the Central City could be prioritised, that itself would unduly restrict housing choice and therefore undermine Objective 3.3.4(b) of the Strategic Directions decision, and consequently Objective 3.3.4(a).

8.7 In my view, other methods must be relied on to promote inner-city living, such as the committed CCRP initiatives (as discussed at paragraph 7.7 above) and any further initiatives that may be necessary to achieve the CCRP objectives.

9. INTEGRATION WITH THE CENTRAL CITY

9.1 Part B of the Crown's submission focuses on integration with the Central City. It expresses a concern that the "geographically compartmentalized approach to creating the notified Proposals is not desirable for a number of reasons, including a risk that the role of the Central City as the key focus for employment, business and retail activity in Christchurch could be undermined".

9.2 Because Proposal 14 does not include Central City residential provisions, I have reviewed Proposal 14 alongside the relevant Operative City Plan provisions introduced through the CCRP. As section 23 of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 requires authorities not to make a decision that is inconsistent with the CCRP, I have assumed that the provisions of
the Central City Proposal when notified will be consistent with, and similar to, the CCRP provisions.

9.3 In my view, Proposal 14 does not undermine the objectives of the CCRP. In particular, it does not propose provisions that favour medium density residential development outside the Central City. The CCRZ provides a slightly more generous building 'envelope' within which to accommodate residential development compared to the proposed Residential Medium Density Zone ('RMDZ') in the Residential Proposal. Nevertheless, it is my view that Proposal 14 could integrate and align more effectively with the City Plan provisions introduced through the CCRP.

9.4 Preferably, provisions within a district plan will be of a consistent nature throughout – acknowledging that provisions will often differ from zone to zone to address particular circumstances. However, given the current approach in Proposal 14, the Replacement Plan could end up containing incongruous differences between its Central City provisions and those relating to the wider city. Having objectives, policies and rules that seek to achieve similar outcomes, but do so in different ways, has the potential to create confusion for landowners, developers and resource management professionals. In particular, given the similar purpose of the CCRZ and RMDZ, there would be a logical expectation that the provisions for both zones would be very similar. This is not the case however. An example of this is the different approach to assessing building height infringements in the CCRZ and RMDZ. The assessment matters for building height infringements in the CCRZ are standalone, whereas in the RMDZ they are bundled together with matters assessing setback and recession plane infringements.

9.5 In order to improve ease of use, clarity and efficiency, I consider that a consistent approach should be taken in respect of provisions inside and out of the Central City. In this regard, I consider the CCRZ ought to act as something like a template for the provisions of Proposal 14. Specific provisions would of course differ from zone to zone to suit the particular context and address the relevant issues.

9.6 In my opinion, the CCRP provisions are simple, appropriately enabling, and easy to navigate and comprehend. In contrast, the provisions of the Residential Proposal are unnecessarily prescriptive and complex - not least because of how they are structured.
9.7 In instructing the planners responsible for producing a draft CCRZ, I asked them to start afresh (albeit with the benefit of the Council’s Central City Living Zones review), to develop clear and concise objectives and associated policies, and to develop minimum standards necessary to implement the objectives and policies. Every standard developed was robustly tested and informed by research\textsuperscript{15} which included engagement with developers, investors, financial institutions and residents.

9.8 In my view, the resulting CCRZ addresses the main District Plan barriers identified by the development community. It enables a range of housing, at various price points, that people want and that developers are interested in delivering.

9.9 The CCRZ strikes a balance between the need for flexibility in the design of a range of housing types and the need to ensure sufficient certainty of outcome, particularly in terms of amenity, to ensure that potential residents feel confident moving into the Central City. It contains two objectives, five policies, 11 development standards and nine critical standards.

9.10 Compared to the previous Living 4a, 4b and 4c zones in the operative City Plan, I consider the CCRZ better implements the CCRP objectives through a reduction in regulatory burden, increased certainty, appropriately enabling provisions, and the facilitation of increased housing supply. The number and extent of prescriptive development controls and design standards in Proposal 14 as notified does not encourage innovation or foster investor certainty.

9.11 In my opinion, aligning and integrating Proposal 14 with the CCRP provisions would make it consistent with Objectives 3.3.1(a) and (b) and 3.3.4(a). A more enabling planning framework for residential development is likely to expedite the recovery of the housing market to provide for the community’s immediate and longer term needs and facilitate the provision of 23,700 additional dwellings by 2028. Such a planning framework would also go a significant way in addressing the barriers to development, which would foster investment certainty and economic prosperity consistent with Objective 3.3.1(b) and Objective 3.3.4.

\textsuperscript{15} IPSOS and Christchurch City Council, 2013 Developing the Central City as a place to live
Opus Research, 2013, Testing Successful Central City Living in Christchurch
Research First, 2013, Central City Residential Redevelopment
CBRE, 2013, Delivering Central City Living in Christchurch
9.12 While the revisions made to Proposal 14 improve integration with the CCRP provisions compared to the notified version, I consider further improvements could be made, particularly in relation to the assessment matters. In this regard, I support the amendments suggested in the evidence of Ms McIntyre and Ms Barker - given this has been informed by the approach taken in developing the CCRZ.

9.13 In addition to the above, I consider that the general usability of the Replacement Plan could be significantly improved. Mr Chrisp’s evidence identified several shortcomings of the Replacement Plan in terms of usability. In reviewing Proposal 14, I have experienced similar difficulties in terms of navigation and comprehension to those explained in Mr Chrisp’s evidence and consider that administering the Replacement Plan as currently drafted would prove a challenging task.

9.14 I generally agree with the recommendations of Mr Chrisp’s Preliminary Usability Assessment report and consider that these would improve navigation and comprehension of the Replacement Plan.

10. APPROACH TO NON-RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITIES

10.1 The City Plan provisions as introduced through the CCRP clearly delineate the primary function of each zone. The CCBZ is the most permissive zone in the Central City enabling the widest range of activities. By way of contrast, and to protect the primacy of the CCBZ, the CCMUZ provides for a reduced range of activities specifically restricting office and retail development.

10.2 Consistent with this approach, non-residential activities are restricted in the CCRZ to a scale which does not compromise the primacy of the adjacent commercial zones and to protect residential activities within the zone.

10.3 In general, non-residential activities are restricted, by way of a non-complying status rule, to occupying a maximum area of 40m\(^2\) in the CCRZ and only the residents of the dwelling can be employed in the activity. Further, sites containing non-residential activities are only permitted to be open to clients, visitors and deliveries between 7am and 9pm on weekdays, and between 8am and 7pm on the weekend.

---

\(^{16}\) Evidence of Mark Chrisp on the Strategic Directions proposal dated 24 November 2014, which is available for download at [http://www.chchplan.ihp.govt.nz/Hearings/Hearing1/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.chchplan.ihp.govt.nz/Hearings/Hearing1/Pages/default.aspx) under the heading "Report and Advice Sought By the Panel".
10.4 An exception to the above is made for activities that provide a benefit to the local community (including residential-scale education, spiritual, pre-school and health facility activities) or would benefit from and are consistent with the residential amenity in the area (including residential scale traveller’s accommodation). These exceptions generally permit these activities if they front Bealey and Fitzgerald Avenue, and define them as discretionary activities if between 41m² and 200m². These residential-scaled non-residential activities are to be considered on their merits.

10.5 While the CCRZ reduces the opportunity for non-residential activity compared with the former Living 4a, 4b and 4c Zone provisions in the operative City Plan, this was considered appropriate given the objectives of the CCRP and the volume and location of commercially zoned land in the Central City.

10.6 The notified version of Proposal 14 adopts a similarly restrictive approach to non-residential activities in areas outside the Central City. I generally agree with this approach but consider that it is overly restrictive in respect of Community and Emergency Service Facilities. These types of facilities are commonly located in residential areas in order to best serve community needs, and unlike the Central City, there may be limited opportunities to locate these facilities in commercial zones.

10.7 The relevant provisions of the notified version (Objective 14.1.7, Policy 14.1.7.2, and Permitted Activity Standard 14.2.2.1) are drafted such that Community and Emergency Facilities are inappropriately constrained. In my opinion, the provisions do not appropriately reflect Objectives 3.3.11 and 3.3.13 which provides for the recovery and provision for community facilities and emergency services throughout the city. While the revisions made to Proposal 14 represent an improvement, I agree with the evidence of Ms Barker and Ms McLeod that further amendments are necessary to remedy the constraints.

Tim Walsh

20 March 2015
APPENDIX TCW1 – QUALIFICATIONS AND RELEVANT PAST EXPERIENCE

Qualifications

- 2011, Master of Science in Geography, University of Canterbury
- 2005, Bachelor of Science with Honours in Geography, University of Canterbury

Affiliations

- Associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute

Relevant Experience

- Strategic advice, site evaluations and risk mitigation for developments
- Project management and coordination of technical experts
- Preparation of resource consent applications and assessments of environmental effects
- Involvement in district plan changes
- Preparation of expert evidence (Council & Environment Court)

Selected Employment Summary

- 2015 – present, Senior Planner, Novo Group, Christchurch
- 2013 – 2015, Senior Advisor, CERA (Christchurch Central Development Unit), Christchurch
- 2012 – 2013, Acting Principal Planning Advisor, New Zealand Transport Agency, Christchurch
- 2011 – 2013, Senior Planning Advisor, New Zealand Transport Agency, Christchurch