

**BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH REPLACEMENT  
DISTRICT PLAN INDEPENDENT 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 Christchurch  
Replacement District  
Plan

---

**FURTHER INFORMATION REGARDING APPLICATION TO SET ASIDE LAND  
FROM STAGE 1 PROPOSALS, WHERE THE LAND HAS BEEN RE-NOTIFIED IN  
STAGE 2 PROPOSALS**

**7 July 2015**

---

 **Simpson Grierson**  
Barristers & Solicitors

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. We refer to the Christchurch City Council's (**Council**) application dated 17 June 2015 to set aside land from Stage 1 Proposals where that land has been re-notified in Stage 2 Proposals. The application was made because there was either a change in the zoning approach between the stages or there were errors in the land zoning during Stage 1 of the review which were not identified until after Stage 2 was notified. The Hearings Panel has made the orders that were sought in respect of that application, and has also sought an explanation from the Council as to how the change and errors in the various land zonings have occurred.
2. In addition to the detail set out in the original application<sup>1</sup>, the Council has advised that the issues are a result of human error, and are attributed to a combination of:
  - (a) the staged approach;
  - (b) the intensive timing requirements of the district plan review under the Order in Council; and
  - (c) resource constraints, in particular in the GIS mapping department.
3. The staged approach has meant that where there has been resource pressure and time constraints, tasks have needed to be prioritised. In the lead up to Stage 1 there were tasks that would have ideally been completed before the notification of Stage 1. However, because those tasks related to Stage 2 proposals, it was considered that they were less of a priority than those tasks that directly impacted Stage 1 Proposals. For example, the identification of Schools and Tertiary sites, Cemetery sites, and Open Space Zones were not ground truthed or checked through GIS means during the preparation of Stage 1, as these were all part of Stage 2 Proposals and it was considered that scarce time and resources would be more appropriately directed to tasks that directly impacted Stage 1 Proposals.

---

<sup>1</sup> Application dated 17 June 2015, paragraph 3 of the Transport section, paragraphs 7 to 9 of the Open Space section, paragraph 13 of the Schools and Tertiary Education section, and paragraph 17 of the Cemetery section.

## ***Transport***

4. Given timing constraints between the release of the Order in Council and the date required for notification of the first Proposals, the Council carried over the existing mapping approach in the operative City Plan (that is that roads were shown as part of the adjoining zone, with the intention that they would be deemed to be part of the Special Purpose (Road) Zone).
5. After Stage 1 submissions had closed, but before Stage 2, the Council reconsidered this approach (particularly in light of matter (i) in the Statement of Expectations). It considered that in terms of usability, it was much clearer to zone the transport network as a "Transport Zone", thereby enabling specific objectives, policies and rules to apply to those areas.
6. This approach avoids the confusion of plan users assuming the transport network is zoned residential or some other zone, only to find through further investigation that it has an 'underlying' transport zone (under the City Plan, this was the Special Purpose (Road) Zone). It was also at that time (ie after Stage 1 submissions had closed, but before Stage 2 was notified) that the Council had the time and resources available to update the maps so that the roads were shown separately on the maps (rather than assuming the adjoining zoning).

## ***Open Space***

7. A more thorough explanation of the errors relating to Open Space zoning is provided in the original application.<sup>2</sup> However, in summary:
  - (a) during Stage 1 the areas of land that were not the subject of Stage 1 zonings were "greyed out" on the planning maps;
  - (b) categorisation of sites (ie whether they were zoned in Stage 1 or shaded grey for future stages) was made based on a combination of:
    - (i) planners' visual assessment of maps;
    - (ii) Outline Development Plans;

---

<sup>2</sup> Application, paragraphs 7 to 9.

- (iii) the section 32 assessment available for Stage 1 notification; and
  - (iv) planners' general knowledge of the area.
- (c) with Open Space zones this method was not 100% accurate;
- (d) however this was not identified until during the preparation of Stage 2 when a more thorough GIS-based assessment was undertaken;
- (e) this assessment also accounted for land ownership data and the Greenspace Unit staff input which was not factored in during the Stage 1 "screening" exercise; and
- (f) waterways and their margins were not mapped in the operative City Plan, therefore they assumed their adjacent zoning. It was not until Stage 2 preparation when decisions had been made to include Open Space Water and Margin Zones that a corresponding decision was made to map Open Space Water and Margin Zones accordingly.

### ***School and Tertiary Zones***

8. Due to timing and resource constraints, and because School and Tertiary Zones are part of Stage 2, detailed checking of school and tertiary zoning boundaries did not begin until after Stage 1 was notified.

### ***Cemeteries***

9. Again, due to timing and resource constraints, and because the Cemetery zone is part of Stage 2, detailed checking of cemetery boundaries did not begin until after Stage 1 was notified.

**DATED** 7<sup>th</sup> day of July 2015



---

J G A Winchester / S J Scott  
Counsel for Christchurch City Council