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Strategic Framework

The Council’s Vision – Christchurch is a city of opportunity for all.
Open to new ideas, new people and new ways of doing things – a city where anything is possible.

Whiria ngā whenu o ngā papa Honoa ki te maurua tāukiuki
Bind together the strands of each mat And join together with the seams of respect and reciprocity.

The partnership with Papatipu Rūnanga reflects mutual understanding and respect, and a goal of improving the economic, cultural, environmental and social wellbeing for all.

Overarching Principle
Partnership - Our people are our taonga – to be treasured and encouraged. By working together we can create a city that uses their skill and talent, where we can all participate, and be valued.

Supporting Principles
Accountability
Affordability
Agility
Equity
Innovation

Collaboration
Prudent Financial Management
Stewardship
Wellbeing and resilience
Trust

Community Outcomes
What we want to achieve together as our city evolves

Strong communities
Strong sense of community
Active participation in civic life
Safe and healthy communities
Celebration of our identity through arts, culture, heritage and sport
Valuing the voices of children and young people

Liveable city
Vibrant and thriving central city, suburban and rural centres
A well connected and accessible city
Sufficient supply of, and access to, a range of housing
21st century garden city we are proud to live in

Healthy environment
Healthy waterways
High quality drinking water
Unique landscapes and indigenous biodiversity are valued
Sustainable use of resources

Prosperous economy
Great place for people, business and investment
An inclusive, equitable economy with broad-based prosperity for all
A productive, adaptive and resilient economic base
Modern and robust city infrastructure and community facilities

Strategic Priorities
Our focus for improvement over the next three years and beyond

Enabling active citizenship and connected communities
Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable 21st century city

Climate change leadership
Informed and proactive approaches to natural hazard risks
Increasing active, public and shared transport opportunities and use
Safe and sustainable water supply and improved waterways
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1. **Apologies**
   
   At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant and to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

3. **Public Participation**
   
   3.1 **Public Forum**
   
   A period of up to 30 minutes is available for people to speak for up to five minutes on any issue that is not the subject of a separate hearings process.

   3.2 **Deputations by Appointment**
   
   Deputations may be heard on a matter or matters covered by a report on this agenda and approved by the Chairperson.

   There were no deputations by appointment at the time the agenda was prepared

4. **Presentation of Petitions**
   
   There were no Presentation of Petitions at the time the agenda was prepared.
5. Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board Report to Council

Reference: 19/709357
Presenter(s): Ali Jones, Chairperson

1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations

That the Council:


3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation

The Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board held meetings on 14 and 28 June 2019. Decisions made under delegation were:

- Approved the landscape plan for the play space renewal at Paddington Playground and will look at funding options in the next financial year to include a drum play item in the play area. The Board also requested that staff investigate traffic calming measures on Paddington Street.

- Approved the replacement of the existing Give Way control currently against Westminster Street at its intersection with Hills Road with a Stop Control.

- Approved the installation of a Stop Control against Nyoli Street at its intersection with Sawyers Arms Road and that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Nyoli Street commencing at its intersection with Sawyers Arms Road and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of 23 metres.

- Requested a report from the Road Landscapes Team for the repair of the palm tree planter box located in the roundabout at the intersection of Laguna Gardens and Palm Drive in the Clearbrook Palms subdivision which must include options for remediation, renewal or removal, together with quotes for the costs applicable to each option (i.e. resource consent, traffic management plans, etc.) finances available and timelines.

- Approval of the following grants:
  - $500 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to St Albans Tennis Club Incorporated towards the purchase of a portable heat pump.
  - $290 from its 2018-19 Positive Youth Development Fund and $160 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund (PYD Fund now used up hence the added amount from the DR Fund to make up the total grant of $450) to Olivia Brett towards the costs of representing New Zealand at the World Junior Canoe Racing Championships to be held in Romania, August 2019.
  - $450 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to Jessica Nisbet towards the costs of representing New Zealand at the World Junior Canoe Racing Championships to be held in Romania, August 2019.
  - $2,000 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to the St Albans Community Preschool towards a contribution for a heat pump.
Item 5

4. **Part A Recommendations to Council**

There were no Part A recommendations.

5. **Significant Council Projects in the Board Area**

**Community Facilities**

5.1 **St Albans Skate Park Upgrade**

This is in the design stage after engagement with the local school and skate park users. It is planned to present a draft to the Board later this year to be followed by public consultation.

5.2 **St Albans Park – Children’s Playground**

At its meeting on 14 June 2019 the Board passed a resolution requesting that the relevant staff provide a report on reinstating the fence around the children's playground on the Edward Avenue side of St Albans Park as it was prior to the 2011 earthquake.

5.3 **Paddington Playground Landscape Plan**

The Board approved the landscape plan for the play space renewal at Paddington Playground. They will look at funding options in the next financial year to include a drum play item in the play area. The Board also requested that staff investigate traffic calming measures on Paddington Street.

5.4 **Papanui Library – Introduction of NZ Postal Services**

The Papanui Service Centre is to become a one-stop shop where you can post letters and pay bills. We are glad this important service has been retained for the community by incorporating it into the CCC Service Centre in the Papanui Library.

Governance and Customer Services staff have been relocated temporarily while the contractor is on site for five weeks undertaking the alterations to the customer services area at the front of the library.

**Infrastructure Projects**

5.5 **Sissons Park Footpath**

Following an approach from a member of the public in 2018, the Board requested that staff report on the progress with the repairs to the footpath through Sisson Park which had sunk post-earthquake and therefore regularly flooded in wet weather.

The repairs were completed this year in time for the wet winter months.
6. Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area

Events Report Back

6.1 Papanui Bush – Bridgestone Reserve

On a cold, frosty Arbour Day (5 June 2019) approximately 40 volunteers from Papanui Rotary, Papanui Heritage Group, Papanui High School, and the wider community came together to grub, weed and plant at Papanui Bush.

Good inroads were made with ring weeding around the existing plants and the hot drinks and sausage sizzle were much needed and appreciated. The plant plaques organised by Papanui Rotary and funded by Papanui Heritage were placed in the ground.
6.2 **Matariki in the Zone**

Matariki in the (Red) Zone celebrated the beginning of the Māori New Year, with Matariki marking the reappearance of the seven Matariki stars. The event was a collaboration by Avebury House, Richmond Community Garden and the Avon–Otākaro Network and supported by the Papanui-Innes Community Board.

Held at Avebury House and the Richmond Community Gardens, a large feast including a traditionally prepared hangi was served to 500 people and was accompanied by live music and entertainment. Loads of activities including – classes in wood carving, flax weaving, lantern and kite making as well as seed bombs and cultural and environmental projects. It took two days for organisers to set up the fairy lights in Avebury Park and the surrounding gardens.

7. **Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan**

7.1 The Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board Plan can be found at the following link: [Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board Plan](#)

7.2 The Board’s ongoing decisions are being included as measures against the Outcomes and Priorities contained in the 2017–2019 Community Board Plan.

8. **Community Board Matters of Interest**

8.1 Nil to report.
### Attachments
There are no attachments to this report.

### Signatories

| Authors                  | Elizabeth Hovell - Community Board Advisor  
|                         | Lyssa Aves - Governance Support Officer    |
|                         | **Approved By**                           |
|                         | Christine Lane - Manager Community Governance, Papanui-Innes |
|                         | Matthew Pratt - Manager Community Governance, Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton |
|                         | Matthew McLintock - Manager Community Governance Team |
6. Waihoro/Spreydon-Cashmere Community Board Report to Council

Reference: 19/680582
Presenter(s): Karolin Potter, Chairperson
Melanie Coker, Deputy Chairperson

1. Purpose of Report
The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations
That the Council:

3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation
The Waihoro/Spreydon-Cashmere Community Board held meetings on 4 and 21 June 2019.

Decisions made under delegation were:
- Approving a grant of $5,000 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Addington Community House / Manuka Cottage towards the Addington Times and Addington Out of School Care and Recreation projects.
- Approving a grant of $2,956 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Rotary Club of Cashmere Inc. (on behalf of Cashmere Residents’ Emergency Response Team (CREST)) towards the purchase of a generator for emergencies.
- Approving a grant of $8,810 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Ngaio Marsh House and Heritage Trust towards the Removal of Trees project.
- Approving a grant of $500 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Spreydon Youth Community Trust towards the LJ and Friends project.
- Approving a grant of $3,500 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Spreydon Youth Community Trust towards the LJ and Friends project.
- Approving a grant of $3,022 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Suburbs Rugby Football Club towards the Junior Rugby Scrum Development project.
- Approving a grant of $500 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Suburbs Rugby Football Club towards the Junior Rugby Scrum Development project.
- Approving a grant of $295 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Zabiullah Miyakhel towards participation in the Football Fusion England Tour in the United Kingdom from 28 September to 11 October 2019.
• Approving a grant of $350 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Connor Nicholas Charles Stanley towards participation in the Under 15 Softball Friendship Series in Brisbane.

4. Part A Recommendations to Council
There were no Part A recommendations from the Board to the Council in June 2019.

5. Significant Council Projects in the Board Area

5.1 Urban Narratives - Addington
A Council Community Partnership project has been created following recent Council-sponsored research undertaken in the Addington area. The Heritage led initiative has explored and produced a heritage-based interactive on-line application for use by residents and visitors to the area. A working party of Heritage, Community Development, and Libraries staff alongside representatives from four local community groups will work together to enable and pilot local use, build content of the prototype, and organise ongoing operating and supporting mechanisms. Planning the timetable of work, including a community launch is underway.

5.2 Barrington Mall Entry
The proposed safety improvements to the Barrington Mall entrance/exit on Barrington Street were scheduled to get underway at the beginning of May. Due to delays with changes to the resource consent for Barrington Mall necessary before the work can commence the work has unfortunately been delayed. As some of the planned changes will be on mall land they are subject to the conditions of the Mall’s resource consent and cannot proceed until changes to the consent conditions have been approved.

Temporary solutions that can be carried out on council owned land only and would improve safety in the interim are currently being investigated by Staff.

6. Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area

6.1 54 Colombo Street.
For some time the Board has been enquiring on behalf of community members about the possible availability of an area of Council land at 54 Colombo Street (pump site) adjacent to the South Library for community use. The latest advice provided by staff is that part of the site is currently being used as a storage area for gravel while road repair work on Colombo Street was being undertaken. That work is expected to be completed by mid-July after which the road repair material stored at the site will be cleared. The site has solid concrete beams approximately 500mm high running across it with the space between these beams filled with gravel to create a level surface. This surface will remain after the removal of the roading material.

Civil Defence is also based on the site accessing its area by via the driveway to the west of the site currently occupied by Roading. Use of the land by the public is likely to necessitate the driveway and boundary between the two areas being fenced. The eastern side currently in grass will also need to be fenced to keep people away from the well heads. There is no funding in the Annual Plan for either the fencing of this area or for providing a hard surface over the area that will be left in gravel.

6.2 Once the site is cleared staff will undertake an investigation into the costs of fencing and possible re-surfacing of the area necessary for use by community so that a funding application can be made to the Long Term Plan.
6.3 Christchurch Squash and Racket Club

Christchurch Squash and Racket Club was recently granted a $200,000 community loan towards the building costs of the Club’s new facility at the Cashmere Club, Colombo Street. The facility is due to open early July 2019.

Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan 6.4 Community Board Plan monitoring report

The latest monitoring report on the Community Board Plan is currently being prepared for consideration by the Board and will be reported through to the Council prior to the end of the term.
6.5 Men’s Shed - St Martins

The Spreydon-Cashmere Community Board Plan measure for Strong Communities include investigating the feasibility of a new Men’s Shed. On 27 May 2019, a public meeting was held at the St Martins Presbyterian Church to determine interest in the establishment of a Men’s Shed and drew an audience of 35 people. At the meeting a working party was formed to develop the project involving the use of an old Sunday school building on the church site. The Community Board and local Community Development staff have provided advice and support liaison.

6.6 Spreydon Cashmere Age Friendly Action Plan

The Community Board Plan recognises that the development of an Age Friendly Spreydon-Cashmere Action Plan would contribute to a strong community one of the outcomes identified in the Plan.

An Age-friendly Spreydon-Cashmere Steering Group was formed on 21 August 2018 and tasked with development of a Spreydon Cashmere Age Friendly Action Plan. The Group meets regularly and recently provided an update of its progress to the Board and sought an informal meeting. A workshop involving Board members and representatives of the Steering Group was held on 24 May 2019 where the proposed format and content of the plan was looked at and arrangements for ongoing engagement on the plan were discussed and agreed.
7. Community Board Matters of Interest

7.1 Youth Achievement and Development Scheme

The Board continues to receive applications for grants from its Youth Achievement and Development Scheme for an extensive and diverse range of academic, sporting, cultural and recreational pursuits. The latest grants made were for: participation in The Pacific Project UN Youth Australia National Conference; participation in the Football Fusion England Tour in the United Kingdom; participation in the Under 17 Fencing Championships 2019 in Sydney; participation in the National 2019 Climbing New Caledonian Championships; and participation in the Under 15 Softball Friendship Series in Brisbane.

The Board is always delighted to hear from grant recipients about their trips and their achievements.

Attachments

There are no attachments to this report.
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<th>Author</th>
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</thead>
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<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Christopher Turner-Bullock - Manager Community Governance, Spreydon-Cashmere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Pratt - Manager Community Governance, Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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</table>
7. Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū/Banks Peninsula Community Board Report to Council

Reference: 19/663795
Presenter(s): Pam Richardson, Chairperson
Penelope Goldstone, Community Governance Manager

1. Purpose of Report
The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations
That the Council:

3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation
The Banks Peninsula Community Board held meetings on 10 June and 24 June 2019. Decisions made under delegation were:

   - Little River Coronation Library
     The Board considered a report regarding the results of an Expression of Interest process for the Little River Coronation Library and its future use. Staff presenting the report highlighted an historic issue of flooding in and around the building. They recommended that the Board include a request for staff to investigate raising the building as part of its resolution on this matter.
     The Board resolved to:
     - Approve the future use of the Coronation Library as a base for a range of community activities facilitated by the Little River Wairewa Community Trust Board;
     - Approve the Trust Board as the preferred applicant to be based at the Coronation Library subject to the successful negotiation of a Community Partnership Agreement with the Council;
     - Approve the commencement of public consultation to change the classification of approximately 2500 square metres around Coronation Library from Recreation Reserve to Local Purpose (Community Buildings) Reserve;
     - Request that staff investigate lifting the building above the one metre flood level before any earthquake repairs are carried out.

   - Community Funding
     - The Board approved a grant of $2,500 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to the Okains Bay School Board of Trustees towards costs for community use of the swimming pool.
     - The Board approved a grant of $1,704 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to the Okains Bay School Board of Trustees towards a community barbecue and furniture.
• **Akaroa Issues Working Party**

The Board endorsed the following Working Party recommendations:

- Recommend to the Board that it ask staff to review the signage on L’Aube Hill, that steps be taken to ensure that the gate on the road is kept locked and that enforcement and monitoring takes place under the Freedom Camping Bylaw.

- Recommend to the Board that it request staff to update the rubbish bins in Akaroa in terms of appearance and functionality, before the next summer season.

- Request that the Board prioritise replacement of the toilets at the Akaroa Recreation Ground and include it in its Long Term Plan submissions.

4. **Part A Recommendations to Council**

The following reports presenting Part A recommendations from the Board are included in this agenda for Council consideration:

4.1 **Banks Peninsula Speed Limit Review – Akaroa Harbour, Bays and Little River Areas**

The Board’s consideration and recommendation of the above report will be considered by the Council at its meeting on 11 July 2019.

5. **Significant Council Projects in the Board Area**

**Strength, Balance and a Good Yarn**

5.1 The Community Governance Team established a key partnership with Sport Canterbury, which has led to a new class kicking off this term. Strength, Balance and a Good Yarn had a turnout of 21 people in the first few weeks, which was a fantastic result.

5.2 ACC, who support the initiative, ensure that the class incorporates exercises that reduce falls and meet a set of nine assessment criteria. The class focuses on improving lower body and core strength and balance, which will lead to gains in movement confidence.

5.3 The aim is to have a class run by people in the community for people in the community. Staff are working on this next stage.

6. **Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area**

**Community Resilience**

6.1 Over the last few months a key theme for several communities in Banks Peninsula was to make a decision whether to become/remain a formally trained Civil Defence Centre Volunteer Team or act in a community capacity during emergencies and adverse events.

6.2 The Little River and wider Wairewa community has made the decision to act in a community capacity and focus on community response and resilience planning.

6.3 Akaroa previously had a trained Civil Defence Volunteer team. Given increased training standards and professionalization for Civil Defence Volunteers, the group has made the decision to become the “Akaroa and Bays Community Resilience Group” and will develop a local community plan based on their extensive experience as community responders.

6.4 There remains a trained Civil Defence Volunteer Team in the Lyttelton Harbour Basin. Many members are driving community response and resilience planning in their respective communities, including Diamond Harbour and Governors Bay.
6.5 The Lyttelton community has had a strong focus on community-driven emergency response planning for several years. The community is considering whether the emergency response plan established in 2015 is still the appropriate format and how it can best be updated to meet the community’s needs and reflect changes in Civil Defence.

6.6 The Cass Bay Residents Association has indicated their interest to increase their community preparedness and make a local plan for Cass Bay.

6.7 Community-driven response and resilience planning will be supported by the Council’s Community Resilience Coordinator, and over time extend to more communities in Banks Peninsula.

7. Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan

7.1 The Community Board Plan is available [here](#).

7.2 The next update will be compiled as at 30 June 2019 and presented to the Board the following month.

8. Community Board Matters of Interest

Future Use of Godley House Site

8.1 The Board received a letter and deputation from the Diamond Harbour Community Association regarding the future use of the Godley House site. The Community Association advised that the community would like the Council to:

- Undertake consultation on what the community would like to use the Godley House site for;
- Commit to funding or co-development of the site to enable these uses to be achieved;
- Determine the appropriate classification of this land to meet these needs.

8.2 The Board:

- Acknowledged that staff had revised the consultation process for the site to firstly determine how the community wishes to use the site in future;
- Requested that staff work with the Community Association and the Board on the consultation process and documents;
- Requested that staff report to the Board at its next meeting on the matters raised in the correspondence, specifically including the proposed timeframe for the consultation to ensure that outcomes coincide with preparation of the draft Annual Plan.

8.3 Staff have since sought feedback from the Community Association and the Board on the consultation document and provided an update on the consultation process and timeframe, which aligns with the preparation of the Annual Plan.

Attachments

There are no attachments to this report.
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8. Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board Report to Council

Reference: 19/661463
Presenter(s): Kim Money, Chairperson

1. Purpose of Report
The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations
That the Council:

3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation
The Coastal-Burwood Community Board held meetings on 4 and 17 June. Decisions made under delegation were, the Board:

   • Approved the granting of a right of way easement over Lot 3000 DP 486184 (adjacent 408 Prestons Road) in favour of Lot 3 DP 13469 subject to:
     a. The consent of the Minister of Conservation or her delegate.
     b. All necessary statutory consents under but not limited to the Resource Management Act 1991 and Local Government Act 1974 being obtained.

   • Allocated funds from the 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to two local recipients.

   • Allocated grants from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to:
     • Renew Brighton
     • Guardians of Rāwhiti
     • North Beach Playcentre
     • Pūkeko Centre

4. Part A Recommendations to Council
No reports presenting Part A recommendations from the Board are included in this agenda.

5. Significant Council Projects in the Board Area
5.1 Bexley Park Development
The approved Development plan of Bexley Park includes a car park, playground, paths, landscaping, pump tracks and a dog park. The main objective is for increased recreation opportunities and activity in the park to meet community needs and improve safety in the park. The main construction period is in September 2019 for the new dog park, car park and final drive reseal. The repairs to the main drive pot holes are underway and due for completion by mid-July 2019.
5.2  **QEII Park Masterplan Project Update**

The Board received an update from staff to discuss the next steps for the QEII Park Master Plan following the Council’s approval of the plan on 9 May 2019.

Staff advised that a property brief has been prepared for the investigation into potential commercial activity on the south west corner.

6.  **Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area**

6.1  **Coastal-Burwood Community Service Awards**

The Board hosted the 2019 Community Service Awards function on Tuesday 2 July 2019 at the Waitikiri Golf Club. The Board provided 14 awards in total, giving recognition to people who make the Coastal-Burwood community a better place to live.

7.  **Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan**

7.1  The Board approved the Coastal-Burwood Community Board Plan for 2017-19 on 16 October 2017. The Plan can be found at the following link: https://www.ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/The-Council/Community-Boards/Coastal-Burwood-Community-Board-Plan-2017-19.pdf

7.2  The Board’s ongoing decisions are being included as measures against the Outcomes and Priorities contained in the 2017 – 2019 Community Board Plan. In late July staff will be reporting to the Board on Board Plan Achievements.

8.  **Community Board Matters of Interest**

8.1  **South Brighton Holiday Park**

The Board received a deputation from the Lessee of the South Brighton Holiday Park on the recent rain flooding issues within the Holiday Park. The Board attended a site visit at the Holiday Park with the Lessee and staff on 28 June 2019 to discuss this issue and also the Estuary Edge outfall drain issue in this area.

8.2  **Bower/Travis Roads - Planned Works**

A local business person spoke to the Board regarding the Travis Road Roundabout and his suggestion that the median strip on the approach from the west is not removed. The Board received a petition from him that requested retention of the median strip.

The Board has received an update from staff on this matter and requested a site visit be arranged with the Community Board, staff from the Transport team and the concerned business person to discuss the layout of the planned works.

8.3  **Policy Revision - Pedestrian Accessway Closure, Road Stopping and Structures on Roads**

A seminar was presented on this topic, outlining proposed changes to three policies which would be presented to the Regulatory Performance Committee for a recommendation to Council. The Board does not have any concerns on the proposal.

8.4  **Southshore and South New Brighton Regeneration Strategy Update**

The Board received an update on the Regeneration Strategy for Southshore and South New Brighton. Staff have been providing regular updates on this topic to ensure that the Board is informed.
8.5 **South New Brighton Reserves Management and Development Plans**

The Board has indicated an interest in revisiting the South New Brighton Reserves Management and Development Plans to ensure these plans do not pre-determine a position while the options are being investigated for the earthquake repairs and erosion of the edge of the Reserve.

Advice was received from staff that if the outcome of the Earthquake Legacy Project and Adaptation Strategy requires a change to the management plan, review of the management plan would then take place.

8.6 **Freedom Camping Bylaw - Coastal Car Parks**

At the Board’s request, staff undertook to seek more information on whether the carparks at North Beach could be designated in the same fashion as the carpark at the Waimairi Beach Carpark in terms of freedom camping requirements/restrictions.

Staff provided information on the difference between areas covered by the Freedom Camping Act and those covered by the Parks and Reserves Bylaw and its “no camping” clause.

The Board would like to see coastal car parks having consistent freedom camping restrictions /designations, and staff will look at that request in the review of the Freedom Camping Bylaw next year.

Staff provided information regarding the Government is currently looking at the responsible camping regime, which may result in some changes to make bylaws more workable, and for greater consistency across the country.

8.7 **Bottle Lake Forest Park Trail Signage**

The Board received a briefing from staff regarding concerns the Board raised about the adequacy of trail signage within the Bottle Lake Forest Park.

The briefing included an overview of the Walking Track Map available on the Council website - a tool that can be used for navigating the tracks in the forest.

The map can be accessed at this link: [https://www.ccc.govt.nz/parks-and-gardens/explore-parks/walking-track-map/](https://www.ccc.govt.nz/parks-and-gardens/explore-parks/walking-track-map/)

In addition, information about the current signage in the forest was shared with the Board including the coloured track markers shown below.

*Three additional map boards are going to be installed by staff in the centre of the forest for improved navigation.*
8.8 Toi Ōtautahi/Christchurch Arts - Draft Strategy

A seminar was presented to the Board to provide information that assisted and informed the Board with their subsequent submission on the draft strategy.

Attachments
There are no attachments to this report.
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1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations

That the Council:


3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation

3.1 The Waimāero/Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board held meetings on 4 June and 17 June 2019. Decisions made under delegation were:

- **Broughs Road Extension Project - Resolution of Traffic Controls and Additional No Stopping Restrictions**: The Board resolved to approve traffic controls and No Stopping restrictions which have been installed by the New Zealand Transport Agency.

- **Stableford Green and Memorial Avenue Intersection – Proposed No Stopping Restrictions**: The Board resolved that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Stableford Green commencing at its intersection with Memorial Avenue and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of 87 metres, the south east side of Stableford Green commencing at its intersection with Memorial Avenue and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of 80 metres, and the north east side of Memorial Avenue commencing at its intersection with Stableford Green and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 70 metres.

- **Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Youth Development Fund Applications**: The Board approved funding totalling $2,850 towards 8 young people attending various events including the World Under 19 Rowing Championships in Tokyo, the Australian International Oireachtas Irish Dance Competition on the Gold Coast, the World Scholars Cup in Sydney, the Junior Canoe World Championships in Romania and the International Korfball Federation World Cup in South Africa.

- **Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Discretionary Response Fund Applications**: The Board approved funding totalling $12,155 to the Burnside Bowls Club towards the installation of four sunshades and the Yaldhurst Tennis Club towards tennis court improvements.

4. Part A Recommendations to Council

There are no Part A Board recommendations in this agenda for the Council's consideration.
5. **Council Projects in the Board Area**

5.1 **Harewood Road/Breens Road/Gardiners Road Intersection**

Feedback on the proposed options for the Harewood Road/Breens Road/Gardiners Road intersection closed on Monday, 10 June 2019.

1,085 submissions were received.

The Board will hold an Extraordinary Meeting on Saturday 17 August 2019 to hear deputations from the community and consider the staff report. The Board will then make a recommendation to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee which in turn will make a recommendation to the Council.

5.2 **Kapuatohe Dwelling and Kapuatohe Cottage**

The original structural design is under review for completeness prior to procurement and consenting. This will be complete in July 2019.

Tender will be awarded for both jobs in September 2019.

Site handover to the Builder is expected in October 2019 with the completion of works on both buildings is expected late May 2020.

Staff will be updating the Board at a seminar on 29 July 2019.

5.3 **Jellie Park Sport and Recreation Centre Earthquake Repair Project**

Works to upgrade the reception foyer/café/change rooms and toilets, including new flooring, painting, toilets, showers, seating, ceiling tiles, partitioning and electromechanical items are progressing well and it is expected that this will be opened to the public by the end of June 2019.
6. Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area

6.1 Network of the Ilam Stream (NOTIS)

At the Board meeting on 17 June 2019, Bill Carroll and Bill Swallow addressed the Board on behalf of Network of the Ilam Stream (NOTIS) regarding initiatives for the Ilam Stream.

They updated the Board on ongoing concerns including intermittent water flows from the water race and presented a discussion paper which outlines options for maintaining a consistent base flow to the Ilam Stream.

The Board have requested that the discussion paper be referred to staff to assess the options presented, and to provide the Board with advice on the ability to work with the Selwyn District Council and Ecan on the impacting water races for the overall improvement of the Ilam Stream.

Local Community Governance Team staff are also working with NOTIS and local Girl Guide groups to plan a stream planting and clean-up event.

7. Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan

7.1 At the Board meeting on 1 July 2019, the Board received the latest update against Outcomes of the Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board Plan. Staff have also prepared a Highlights and Achievements from the Board Plan (refer Attachment A).

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2017-19 Community Board Plan Highlights and Achievements</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ilam Stream flows from Avonhead Park until it joins the Avon River in the University grounds.
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Community Outcome: Strong Communities

What we said we would do:

Strengthen community connectedness by supporting and promoting activities and programmes provided by local community organisations.

Achievements:

- 49 local community organisation received annual funding towards their service delivery through the Board’s Strengthening Communities Fund.
- A further 69 community projects received funding support through the Board’s Discretionary Response Fund.
- 160 young people have been supported to participate in various events and activities through the Board’s Youth Development Fund.

51% of Community Board funding was allocated to projects specifically targeting young people.

(Board target - 40%)

Support a range of services that support at-risk young people and their families, particularly in the Bryndwr community.

Achievements:

- The Board has provided three year funding to St Aidan’s Church in Bryndwr to deliver a range of services to young people in the Bryndwr community. This funding includes the employment of youth workers to work alongside local youth to provide mentoring and support, along with developing local young leaders. The funding also includes the employment of 24/7 Youth Workers at Cobham Intermediate School.
- The Board also provided funding from their Discretionary Response Fund to Te Ora Hou Otautahi towards a project targeting at risk young people and their whanau in the Burnside/Bryndwr areas.

Board member, Aaron Campbell, with members of Christchurch North Community Patrol
Community Outcome: Strong Communities

What we said we would do:

Utilisation of the Mona Vale Gatehouse for the purpose of an Artist in Residence programme.

Achievements:

- In January 2018, Field Theory, the production company for the ‘Kiri and Lou’ television series, entered into a residential tenancy of the Mona Vale Gate House.
- Council staff continue to explore opportunities for new artists to utilise the space once the current tenancy ends.

“It’s been a fantastic place to work from. The setting is so serene and quite inspiring. We really appreciate the Board providing this opportunity.”

Current artist in residence

Community Outcome: Liveable City

What we said we would do:

Work alongside Council traffic engineers to develop solutions to assist with the reduction in traffic congestion.

Achievements:

- During the period of the Community Board Plan, the Board has made decisions on 34 staff reports relating to traffic issues within the Board area.
- The Board also heard 11 deputations from members of the community regarding traffic issues.
- The Board continues to work alongside local residents, businesses and the wider community to address traffic congestion and safety issues.

Installation of traffic lights at the Harewood/Breens Road intersection.

Achievements:

- The Board included the request for traffic lights at this intersection in its submission to the Council’s 2018-28 Long Term Plan and again in their submission to the 2019-20 Annual Plan.
- In September 2018, the Board made a recommendation to Council for safety improvements at this intersection to go out for community consultation. One of the two options put forward for consultation was the installation of traffic lights.
- Community consultation opened on 6 May 2019 and closed on 10 June 2019. Over 1,000 submissions were received and the Board is awaiting the staff report to consider the results of the consultation.
Community Outcome: Liveable City

What we said we would do:

Installation of exercise equipment in local parks.

Achievements:

◊ In partnership with a local business and the local Rotary Club, the installation of exercise equipment at Burnside Park is now completed.

◊ The equipment is part of a four stage Fitness Trail and includes a sit-up bench, push up bars, stairs, vertical ladder, chin-up bar, shoulder wheel, cross trainer and more.

This project would not have been possible without the generous financial contributions from the Commodore Hotel and the Rotary Clubs of Avonhead, Bishopdale-Burnside and Riccarton.

Work in partnership with the local community to undertake projects and initiatives to support the quality and enhancement of local waterways, including clean-up of Otukaikino Stream (Clearwater).

Achievements:

◊ The Board advocated on behalf of the Kids Fishing Charitable Trust to request that Council undertake weed removal from the Groynes fishing lakes and the Otukaikino Stream. This work was carried out in August 2018 which allowed the Take a Kid Fishing event to go ahead.

◊ Community Board members and Council staff have worked alongside members of the Network of the Ilam Stream (NOTIS) to address issues with the stream, particularly a leak in the stream bed between Colina Street and the University.

◊ Local staff are currently working with NOTIS and local Girl Guide groups to plan a stream planting and clean-up event.
Community Outcome: Prosperous Economy

What we said we would do:

Work in partnership with Council, Development Christchurch Ltd and local businesses to undertake regeneration activities at Bishopdale Mall.

Achievements:

- In January 2018, the Board requested permission from the Chief Executive to allow Council staff and Development Christchurch Limited (DCL) to work on the regeneration of the mall area.
- The Council’s Urban Regeneration Team and DCL began working with the Bishopdale Centre Association and other key stakeholders. Local Community Governance staff supported DCL to gather community feedback from mall users. Focus groups were held with local community organisations.
- A Bishopdale Design By Enquiry workshop was held in October 2018.
- The Board held a seminar with Council staff and DCL staff to be updated on the project. This included:
  - the findings from the enquiry-by-design workshop held with key community and business stakeholders.
  - a draft spatial plan developed in response to findings from both the enquiry-by-design workshop and background investigation of issues.
  - exploring and discussing options and tools for achieving revitalisation in the area through a framework for regeneration of support, enable, and transform; with short, medium and long term actions required.
- At their meeting on 26 November 2018, the Board tagged $10,000 from their Discretionary Response Fund towards regeneration activities including the development of the old library and community centre site.
- A small community project team (Enliven Bishopdale) has come together to progress the beautification of the Bishopdale Village Mall. The Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Development Adviser is working alongside the group and coordinating the project.

Group plans to tidy up Bishopdale mall

By Jess Gibson

A SMALL community group is working on a plan to get the beautification of Bishopdale Village Mall under way.

“Enliven Bishopdale” is a group made up of five members, with representatives from the Bishopdale Mensheds, Bishopdale Community Trust, and the Bishopdale Business Association, among others.

The group has come up with three ideas to liven the retail area at a low cost – by repainting the seats, developing the green space at the old library site into a village green and a new mural.

But community activator Bill Greenwood said the group are waiting to have details checked off by the community and shop owners before work can officially begin.

The Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board pledged $10,000 in December to help upgrade the mall. However, none of the $10,000 has been spent yet.

Mr Greenwood said the group are trying to get most of the material and labour work completed for “mates rates” so the budget can go further.

The group has had help preparing for the project so that everything is ready when they get confirmation to move forward.

Some of the broken seating was repaired at the Men’s Shed in preparation for painting, in conjunction with City Care and with support from the city council’s streets maintenance team.

Enliven Bishopdale has met with the city council’s parks staff to discuss the staging of the village green project, beginning with a path and a few trees as stage one and consulting with the community to finish off the design of the space as stage two.
10. Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Report to Council

Reference: 19/637683
Presenter(s): Mike Mora, Chairperson
Marie Byrne, Acting Community Governance Manager

1. Purpose of Report
The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations
That the Council:


3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation
The Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board held ordinary meetings on 11 June and 26 June 2019. Decisions made under delegation were:

- The approval to mark an existing bus stop at 5 Kirk Road outside the Templeton Medical Centre.
- The approval of a trial to extend the Halswell Swimming Pool operating hours for the 2019-20 summer season and to fund this from the Board’s 2018-19 and 2019-20 Discretionary Response Fund up to amount of $50,000.
- Allocations were made to two local organisations from the Board’s 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund.
- Allocations were made to seven local recipients from the Board’s 2018-19 Youth Development Fund.

The Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board also held an Extraordinary Meeting on Wednesday 5 June 2019 to approve its submission under delegated authority on the resource consent application by Fulton Hogan Limited for the Proposed Roydon Quarry in Templeton.

4. Part A Recommendations to Council
There are no Part A Board recommendations in this agenda for the Council to consider.
5. Significant Council Projects in the Board Area

5.1 Strengthening Community Fund Projects

5.1.1 The Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board will consider and make decisions on the applications received to its 2019-20 Strengthening Communities Fund on 13 August 2019.

Of the 55 applications received, the Board has already approved multi-year funded grants to six organisations from 2017-18 to 2019-20.

A Board Workshop was held on 9 July 2019 to assist the Board in its initial deliberations ahead of its decision-making meeting on 13 August 2019.

5.1.2 Community Service and Youth Service Awards

The Board-hosted Community Service and Youth Service Awards 2019 function was successfully held on Monday 8 July 2019 at the Tea House, Riccarton Park.

5.2 Community Facilities

5.2.1 Yaldhurst War Memorial Hall - Update

Work to repair the southern end of the damaged roof to stop further deterioration was completed in early June 2019. No further work on the Hall is planned at this stage.

6. Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area

6.1 St John of God

6.1.1 The team at St John of God in Halswell and The Granada Centre hosted a series of events in the 2018 summer featuring a giant 70 metre water slide. Along with providing a fun activity for residents, volunteers and caregivers, the activity stems from the resident-focussed Model of Care, aimed at supporting people living with disability to live and experience life.

6.1.2 The team wish to expose residents to variable levels of risk to achieve important goals and experiences in life. For people living in residential care, risk is often something understandably eliminated in the interests of health and safety management.

6.1.3 A video of the slide and the experiences can be seen on https://youtu.be/iyPN_B2ffJ0.

6.1.4 The Council provided a small amount of funding to assist with the construction of the slide.
6.2 **Riccarton Community Pantry and Fridge**

The Riccarton Community Pantry and Fridge was officially opened on Saturday 8 June 2019 at the Riccarton West Community Garden in Peverel Street.

The pantry is open on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays from 11am to 1pm. The donated fridge/freezer enables safe storage of food.

The Riccarton West Community Garden recently won first place and the President’s Trophy in the Christchurch Beautifying Association’s summer street and garden awards. They also took a prize for the biggest pumpkin with an estimated weight in the vicinity of 50 kilograms.

---

7. **Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan**

7.1 Updates are being presented quarterly to the Board throughout 2019 on its Community Plan 2017-2019 to measure progress against the Board’s approved outcomes and priorities. The next update is in September 2019.
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11. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Report to Council

Reference: 19/692705
Presenter(s): Sally Buck, Chairperson
            Arohanui Grace, Community Governance Manager

1. Purpose of Report
   The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of Part A matters requiring a Council decision and of initiatives and issues considered by the Community Board.

2. Community Board Recommendations
   That the Council:

3. Community Board Decisions Under Delegation
   The Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board held meetings on 4 June and 19 June 2019. Decisions made under delegation were:
   - Rolleston Avenue and Cambridge Terrace – Changes to Mobility Parking.
   - The approval of contributory funding from the Board’s 2018/19 Youth Development Fund for youth to attend:
     - World Snooker Championships in China.
     - Australian International Oireachtas on the Gold Coast.
     - Dance competition ‘Body Rock’ in San Diego and a week training in Los Angeles.
     - Summer Air – Shanghai Youth Summer Music Camp 2019.
     - Little League Asia-Pacific Qualifier in Indonesia.
     - Senior Korfball World Cup in South Africa.
     - U15 and U17 Netball in New Zealand Competition.
     - New Zealand National Youth Futsal Championships.
   - The approval of contributory funding from the Board’s 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund for:
     - Ōtautahi Sports Association – Bower Park Carpark Project.
     - Richmond Community Garden Trust – Matariki in the Zone Event.
     - Greening the East Project.
     - Richmond Community Garden Trust – Expansion of Community Development hours.
   - Approved the future use of the Barbadoes Street Cemetery Sextons’s House as a residential dwelling or for community use to be leased out once restored to residential tenancy standards.
   - Approved the Lower Heathcote Dredging Stage 2 Landscape Plan and seven Tree Removals.
   - Approved the formation of the Board’s Ōpāwaho to Ihutai (Lower Heathcote Catchment Project) Working Party.
4. **Part A Recommendations to Council**  
There are no Part A Board recommendations in this agenda for the Council's consideration.

5. **Significant Council Projects in the Board Area**  
   5.1 **Strengthening Community Fund Projects**  
      5.1.1 The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board will consider applications to the 2019-20 Strengthening Communities Fund on 5 August 2019.  
      Of the 62 applications received, the Board has already approved multi-year funded grants to three organisations from 2017-18 to 2019-20.  
      A Board Workshop is scheduled for 22 July 2019 to assist the Board in its initial deliberations ahead of its decision-making meeting.

6. **Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area**  
   **Public Forum**  
   6.1 Mr Dominic McKeown presented to the Board his concerns on the Worcester Street section of the Rapanui/Shag Rock Major Cycleway Route. Mr McKeown presented photos of examples of inappropriate car parking, placement of rubbish bins on the cycleway and lack of street cleaning. Mr McKeown advised that he had lodged Customer Service Requests and also talked to Council staff on the matters he has raised.

7. **Progress Report Against the Community Board Plan**  
   7.1 The Board approved the Coastal-Burwood Community Board Plan for 2017-19 on 16 October 2017. The Plan can be found at the following link:  
   7.2 The Board’s ongoing decisions are being included as measures against the Outcomes and Priorities contained in the 2017 – 2019 Community Board Plan. In early August staff will be reporting to the Board on Board Plan Achievements.

8. **Community Board Matters of Interest**  
   8.1 **Meeting with NZ Police Metro Superintendent** – the Board held a meeting with the NZ Police Metro Superintendent to discuss the transitional plans for the return of “business as usual” post 15 March attacks.

**Attachments**  
There are no attachments to this report.
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12. Banks Peninsula Speed Limit Review- Akaroa Harbour, Bays & Little River Areas

Reference: 19/710113
Presenter(s): Andrew Hensley, Traffic Engineer

1. Banks Peninsula Community Board Consideration

At the meeting Jan Cook, a resident of French Farm, made a deputation to the Board regarding the report. Ms Cook supported the proposed speed limit changes but requested that a lower limit be applied to Wainui Main Road in the French Farm bluff and Aquatic Club area. She also expressed a hope that there would be a good review of all road signage as part of this project.

The Board noted that a number of additional issues had been raised as part of the consultation on the speed limit review and wanted to draw some of those issues to the attention of staff.

The Board thanked staff for the background work which had been carried out in the preparation of this report.

2. Banks Peninsula Community Board Decisions Under Delegation

Part C

That the Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū/Banks Peninsula Community Board:

1. Request that staff look at the following additional items raised as part of the speed limit review process:
   a. Signage, particularly permanent warning signs (school bus, children, stock, etcetera).
   b. Consider the speed limits on out of scope roads in a future review.
   c. Consider a single speed limit for the majority of the urban areas of the Akaroa and Lyttelton townships in a future review.
   d. Consider changing Onawe Flat Road to a one-way road.
   e. Communicate the rationale for the changes, including feedback from the New Zealand Transport Agency, to all submitters and the public.
   f. Note the comments made regarding the poor condition of the roads.
3. Banks Peninsula Community Board Recommendation to Council

[Original staff recommendation accepted without change]

Part A

That the Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū/Council:

1. Approve, pursuant to Part 4 Section 27 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 and the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017, that the speed limits on the following roads be revoked and set as listed below in clauses a- llll, and shown in Attachments A- H of the agenda.

**Le Bons Bay Map – Attachment A**

a. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour on Le Bons Bay Road commencing at a point 20 metres north west of its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in an easterly direction to a point 715 metres east of its intersection with Le Bons Bay Valley Road.

b. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Le Bons Bay Road commencing at a point 20 metres north west of its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in an easterly direction to a point 715 metres east of its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

c. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Le Bons Valley Road commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Bay Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end

d. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Le Bons Valley Road commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Bay Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

e. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on The Branch Road commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end.

f. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on The Branch Road commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

g. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Leonardo Lane commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its end.

h. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Leonardo Lane commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

**Little River Map – Attachment B**

i. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Church Road commencing at its intersection with Western Valley Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75).

j. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Church Road commencing at its intersection with Western Valley Road and extending in a south easterly direction...
to its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

k. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Cemetery Road commencing at its intersection with Church Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its end.

l. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Cemetery Road commencing at its intersection with Church Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

m. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Western Valley Road commencing at a point 30 metres south west of its intersection with Church Road and extending in a northerly direction to a point 470 metres north of its intersection with Church Road.

n. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Western Valley Road commencing at a point 30 metres south west of its intersection with Church Road and extending in a northerly direction to a point 470 metres north of its intersection with Church Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

**Little Akaloa Map – Attachment C**

o. **Revoke** the existing permanent 100 kilometres per hour speed limit on Chorlton Road commencing at a point 131 metres south of its intersection with Little Akaloa Road and extending in an easterly direction to a point 75 metres east of its intersection with Lukes Road.

p. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Chorlton Road commencing at a point 131 metres south of its intersection with Little Akaloa Road and extending in an easterly direction to a point 75 metres east of its intersection with Lukes Road be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

q. **Revoke** the existing permanent 100 km/h speed limit on Lukes Road commencing at its intersection with Chorlton Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end.

r. **Approve** that the existing permanent speed limit on Lukes Road commencing at its intersection with Chorlton Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

s. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Little Akaloa Road commencing at a point 397 metres south west of its intersection with Chorlton Road and extending in a south westerly direction for a distance of 300 metres.

t. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Little Akaloa Road commencing at a point 397 metres south west of its intersection with Chorlton and extending in a south westerly direction for a distance of 300 metres be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

**Duvauchelle – Barrys Bay Map – Attachment D**

u. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour on Onawe Flat Road commencing at a point 38 metres south east of its western intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a south easterly direction for a distance of 582 metres.
v. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour on Onawe Flat Road commencing at a point 50 metres south west of its eastern intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 569 metres.

w. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 30 kilometres per hour (SL-41) on Onawe Flat Road commencing at a point 620 metres south east of its western intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a south easterly direction then a northerly direction to a point 619 metres south of its eastern intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75).

x. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Onawe Flat Road commencing at a point 38 metres south east of its western intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a south easterly direction then a northerly direction to a point 50 metres south west of its eastern intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) be set at 30 kilometres per hour.

Okains Bay Map – Attachment E

y. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Okains Bay Road commencing at a point 450 metres south west of its intersection with Chorlton Road and extending in a north easterly direction to its end at Okains Bay Camping Ground.

z. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Okains Bay Road commencing at a point 450 metres south west of its intersection with Chorlton Road and extending to a point 35 metres north east of its intersection with Big Hill Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

aa. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Okains Bay Road commencing at a point 35 metres east of its intersection with Big Hill Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

bb. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Knapps Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end.

c. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Knapps Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

dd. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on School House Road commencing at its intersection with Okains River Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end.

ee. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on School House Road commencing at its intersection with Okains River Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

ff. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Back Road commencing at its eastern intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a southerly direction to its end.

gg. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Back Road commencing at its eastern intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a southerly direction to its end be set at 50 kilometres per hour.
hh. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Okains River Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a north easterly direction to its intersection with Chorlton Road.

ii. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Okains River Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a north easterly direction to its intersection with Chorlton Road be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

jj. **Revoke** any existing permanent speed limit within the Okains Bay Camping Ground commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending throughout the Campground.

kk. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit within Okains Bay Camping Ground commencing at its intersection and extending throughout the Camping Ground be set at 10 kilometres per hour.

ll. **Revoke** the existing permanent 100 kilometre per hour speed limit on Chorlton Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a northerly direction to a point 30 metres north of its intersection with Okains River Road.

mm. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Chorlton Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a northerly direction to a point 30 metres north of its intersection with Okains River Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

Onuku and Akaroa Maps – Attachments F and G

nn. **Revoke** the existing permanent 50 kilometres per hour speed limit on Beach Road commencing at a point 40 metres south west of its intersection with Bruce Terrace and extending in a south westerly direction to its end.

oo. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Beach Road commencing at a point 40 metres south west of its intersection with Bruce Terrace and extending in a south westerly direction to its end be set at 30 kilometres per hour.

pp. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Grehan Valley Road commencing at a point 926 metres south east of Rue Lavaud and extending in a south easterly direction to its end.

qq. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Grehan Valley Road commencing at a point 926 metres south east of Rue Lavaud and extending in a south easterly direction to its end be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

rr. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Lighthouse Road commencing at a point 154 metres south of its intersection with Onuku Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 146 metres.

ss. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Lighthouse Road be set at 50 kilometres per hour commencing at a point 154 metres south of its intersection with Onuku Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 146 metres be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

tt. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Morgans Road commencing at its intersection with Long Bay Road and extending in a westerly direction to a point 209 metres east of its intersection with Old Coach Road.
uu. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Morgans Road commencing at its intersection with Long Bay Road and extending in a westerly direction to a point 209 metres east of its intersection with Old Coach Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

vv. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Old Coach Road commencing at its intersection with Long Bay Road and extending in a southerly direction to a point 31 metres north of its intersection with Morgans Road.

ww. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Old Coach Road commencing at its intersection with Long Bay Road and extending in a southerly direction to a point 31 metres north of its intersection with Morgans Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

xx. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Rue Balguerie commencing at a point 213 metres south east of its intersection with Rue Cachalot and extending in south easterly direction to its intersection with Stony Bay Road.

yy. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Stony Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Purple Peak Road and extending in south easterly direction for a distance of 40 metres.

zz. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Rue Balguerie commencing at a point 213 metres south east of its intersection with Rue Cachalot and extending in a south east direction to its intersection with Purple Peak Road be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

aaa. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Stony Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Purple Peak Road and extending in a south east direction for a distance of 40 metres be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

bbb. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Purple Peak Road commencing at its intersection with Rue Balguerie and extending in a northerly then easterly direction to its end.

ccc. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Purple Peak Road commencing at its intersection with Rue Balguerie and extending in a northerly then easterly direction to its end be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

ddd. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour on Rue Jolie (North) commencing at its intersection with Woodills Road and extending in a southerly direction to its intersection with Rue Viard.

eee. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Rue Jolie (North) commencing at its intersection with Woodills Road and extending in a southerly direction to its intersection with Rue Viard be set at 20 kilometres per hour.

fff. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour on Rue Viard commencing at its intersection with Rue Lavaud and extending in a westerly direction to its intersection with Rue Jolie (North).

ggg. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Rue Viard commencing at its intersection with Rue Lavaud and extending in a westerly direction to its intersection with Rue Jolie (North) be set at 20 kilometres per hour.
Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Childrens Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a north westerly direction to its end.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Childrens Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a north westerly direction to its end be set at 20 kilometres per hour.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour speed limit on Onuku Road commencing at a point 23 metres south west of its intersection with Stanley Place and extending in a southerly direction to its intersection with Hamiltons Road.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Onuku Road commencing at a point 23 metres south west of its intersection with Stanley Place and extending in a southerly direction to its intersection with Hamiltons Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Onuku Road commencing at its intersection with Hamiltons Road and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 825 metres with be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Hamiltons Road commencing at its intersection with Onuku Road and extending in a southerly direction to its end.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Hamiltons Road commencing at its intersection with Onuku Road and extending in a southerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Haylocks Road commencing at its intersection with Onuku Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Wainui Main Road commencing at its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a southerly direction to a point 100 metres north east of its intersection with French Farm Valley Road.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour on Wainui Main Road commencing at a point 100 metres north east of its intersection with French Farm Valley Road and extending in a south westerly direction to a point 425 metres south west of its intersection with Bantry Lodge Road.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Wainui Main Road commencing at a point 425 metres south west of its intersection with Bantry Lodge Road and extending in a southerly direction to a point 580 metres east of its western intersection with Cemetery Road.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Wainui Main Road commencing at its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a southerly direction to a point 825 metres north west of its intersection with Hamiltons Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Wainui Main Road commencing at its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a north westerly direction to its end be set at 20 kilometres per hour.
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direction to a point 580 metres east of its western intersection with Cemetery Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

uuu. **Revoking** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Moores Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end.

vvv. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Moores Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

www. **Revoking** the existing permanent speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour on French Farm Valley Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end.

xxx. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on French Farm Valley Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

yyy. **Revoking** the existing permanent speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour on Winery Road commencing at its intersection with French Farm Valley Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end.

zzz. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Winery Road commencing at its intersection with French Farm Valley Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

aaaa. **Revoking** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Bantry Lodge Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end.

bbbb. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Bantry Lodge Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

cccc. **Revoking** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Tikao Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of 100 metres.

dddd. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Tikao Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of 100 metres be set at 20 kilometres per hour.

eee. **Revoking** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Cemetery Road commencing at its northern intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a westerly direction to a point 115 metres east of its intersection with Seaview Lane.

ffff. **Approve** the permanent speed limit on Cemetery Road commencing at its northern intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a westerly direction to a point 115 metres east of its intersection with Seaview Lane be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

gggg. **Revoking** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Donovans Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Valley Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end.
Item 12

h hh  . Approve that the permanent speed limit on Donovans Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Valley Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

iii. Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Edwards Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Valley Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end.

jjj j  . Approve that the permanent speed limit on Edwards Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Valley Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

kkk k  . Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Wainui Valley Road commencing at a point 864 metres north west of its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a northerly then a westerly direction to its end.

lll l  . Approve that the permanent speed limit on Wainui Valley Road commencing at a point 864 metres north of its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a northerly then a westerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.
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1. **Purpose of Report**
   
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Banks Peninsula Community Board to consider the consultation feedback and views on the proposed speed limit changes within the Akaroa Harbour, Bays, and Little River areas, and to make a recommendation to Council.

2. **Executive Summary**

   2.1 This speed limit review is being undertaken to support the objectives of the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) Speed Management Guide, and the overall vision of the Safer Journeys: Road Safety Strategy 2010-2020.

   2.2 The proposed speed limits take into account the safe and appropriate speeds identified in the NZTA Speed Management Guide, practical application, consistency, and aim to support the safe usage of these roads for all road users.

   2.3 Slowing down vehicle operating speeds saves lives, with a strong link between speed and safety. Having speed limits set at the appropriate level for the conditions is one of the most important ways Council can assist people to get where they want to go safely.

3. **Staff Recommendations**

   That the Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū/Banks Peninsula Community Board:

   1. Approve, pursuant to Part 4 Section 27 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 and the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017, that the speed limits on the following roads be revoked and set as listed below in clauses a- llll, and shown in Attachments A- H of the agenda.

   **Le Bons Bay Map – Attachment A**

   a. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour on Le Bons Bay Road commencing at a point 20 metres north west of its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in an easterly direction to a point 715 metres east of its intersection with Le Bons Bay Valley Road.

   b. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Le Bons Bay Road commencing at a point 20 metres north west of its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in an easterly direction to a point 715 metres east of its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

   c. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Le Bons Valley Road commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Bay Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end

   d. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Le Bons Valley Road commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Bay Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.
e. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on The Branch Road commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end.

f. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on The Branch Road commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

g. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Leonardo Lane commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its end.

h. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Leonardo Lane commencing at its intersection with Le Bons Valley Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

Little River Map – Attachment B

i. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Church Road commencing at its intersection with Western Valley Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75).

j. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Church Road commencing at its intersection with Western Valley Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

k. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Cemetery Road commencing at its intersection with Church Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its end.

l. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Cemetery Road commencing at its intersection with Church Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

m. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Western Valley Road commencing at a point 30 metres south west of its intersection with Church Road and extending in a northerly direction to a point 470 metres north of its intersection with Church Road.

n. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Western Valley Road commencing at a point 30 metres south west of its intersection with Church Road and extending in a northerly direction to a point 470 metres north of its intersection with Church Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

Little Akaloa Map – Attachment C

o. **Revoke** the existing permanent 100 kilometres per hour speed limit on Chorlton Road commencing at a point 131 metres south of its intersection with Little Akaloa Road and extending in an easterly direction to a point 75 metres east of its intersection with Lukes Road.

p. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Chorlton Road commencing at a point 131 metres south of its intersection with Little Akaloa Road and extending in an easterly direction to a point 75 metres east of its intersection with Lukes Road be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

q. **Revoke** the existing permanent 100 km/h speed limit on Lukes Road commencing at its intersection with Chorlton Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end.
r. **Approve** that the existing permanent speed limit on Lukes Road commencing at its intersection with Chorlton Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

d. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Little Akaloa Road commencing at a point 397 metres south west of its intersection with Chorlton Road and extending in a south westerly direction for a distance of 300 metres.

t. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Little Akaloa Road commencing at a point 397 metres south west of its intersection with Chorlton and extending in a south westerly direction for a distance of 300 metres be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

**Duvauchelle – Barrys Bay Map – Attachment D**

u. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour on Onawe Flat Road commencing at a point 38 metres south east of its western intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a south easterly direction for a distance of 582 metres.

v. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour on Onawe Flat Road commencing at a point 50 metres south west of its eastern intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 569 metres.

w. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 30 kilometres per hour (SL-41) on Onawe Flat Road commencing at a point 620 metres south east of its western intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a south easterly direction then a northerly direction to a point 619 metres south of its eastern intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75).

x. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Onawe Flat Road commencing at a point 38 metres south west of its eastern intersection with Christchurch- Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a north easterly direction then a northerly direction to a point 50 metres south west of its eastern intersection with Christchurch- Akaroa Road (SH75) be set at 30 kilometres per hour.

**Okains Bay Map – Attachment E**

y. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Okains Bay Road commencing at a point 450 metres south west of its intersection with Chorlton Road and extending in a north easterly direction to its end at Okains Bay Camping Ground.

z. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Okains Bay Road commencing at a point 450 metres south west of its intersection with Chorlton Road and extending to a point 35 metres north east of its intersection with Big Hill Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

aa. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Okains Bay Road commencing at a point 35 metres east of its intersection with Big Hill Road and extending in a north easterly direction to its end at Okains Bay Camping Ground be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

bb. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Knapps Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end.

cc. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Knapps Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.
dd. Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on School House Road commencing at its intersection with Okains River Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end.

e. Approve that the permanent speed limit on School House Road commencing at its intersection with Okains River Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

ff. Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Back Road commencing at its eastern intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a southerly direction to its end.

gg. Approve that the permanent speed limit on Back Road commencing at its eastern intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a southerly direction to its end be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

hh. Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Okains River Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a north easterly direction to its intersection with Chorlton Road.

ii. Approve that the permanent speed limit on Okains River Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a north easterly direction to its intersection with Chorlton Road be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

jj. Revoke any existing permanent speed limit within the Okains Bay Camping Ground commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending throughout the Camping Ground.

kk. Approve that the permanent speed limit within Okains Bay Camping Ground commencing at its intersection and extending throughout the Camping Ground be set at 10 kilometres per hour.

ll. Revoke the existing permanent 100 kilometre per hour speed limit on Chorlton Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a northerly direction to a point 30 metres north of its intersection with Okains River Road.

mm. Approve that the permanent speed limit on Chorlton Road commencing at its intersection with Okains Bay Road and extending in a northerly direction to a point 30 metres north of its intersection with Okains River Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

Onuku and Akaroa Maps – Attachments F and G

nn. Revoke the existing permanent 50 kilometres per hour speed limit on Beach Road commencing at a point 40 metres south west of its intersection with Bruce Terrace and extending in a south westerly direction to its end.

oo. Approve that the permanent speed limit on Beach Road commencing at a point 40 metres south west of its intersection with Bruce Terrace and extending in a south westerly direction to its end be set at 30 kilometres per hour.

pp. Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Grehan Valley Road commencing at a point 926 metres south east of Rue Lavaud and extending in a south easterly direction to its end.

qq. Approve that the permanent speed limit on Grehan Valley Road commencing at a point 926 metres south east of Rue Lavaud and extending in a south easterly direction to its end be set at 50 kilometres per hour.
rr. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Lighthouse Road commencing at a point 154 metres south of its intersection with Onuku Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 146 metres.

ss. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Lighthouse Road be set at 50 kilometres per hour commencing at a point 154 metres south of its intersection with Onuku Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 146 metres be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

tt. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Morgans Road commencing at its intersection with Long Bay Road and extending in a westerly direction to a point 209 metres east of its intersection with Old Coach Road.

uu. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Morgans Road commencing at its intersection with Long Bay Road and extending in a westerly direction to a point 209 metres east of its intersection with Old Coach Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

vv. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Old Coach Road commencing at its intersection with Long Bay Road and extending in a southerly direction to a point 31 metres north of its intersection with Morgans Road.

ww. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Old Coach Road commencing at its intersection with Long Bay Road and extending in a southerly direction to a point 31 metres north of its intersection with Morgans Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

xx. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Rue Balguerie commencing at a point 213 metres south east of its intersection with Rue Cachalot and extending in south easterly direction to its intersection with Stony Bay Road.

yy. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Stony Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Purple Peak Road and extending in south easterly direction for a distance of 40 metres.

zz. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Rue Balguerie commencing at a point 213 metres south east of its intersection with Rue Cachalot and extending in a south easterly direction to its intersection with Purple Peak Road be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

aaa. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Stony Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Purple Peak Road and extending in a south east direction for a distance of 40 metres be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

bbb. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Purple Peak Road commencing at its intersection with Rue Balguerie and extending in a northerly then easterly direction to its end.

ccc. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Purple Peak Road commencing at its intersection with Rue Balguerie and extending in a northerly then easterly direction to its end be set at 50 kilometres per hour.

ddd. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour on Rue Jolie (North) commencing at its intersection with Woodills Road and extending in a southerly direction to its intersection with Rue Viard.

eee. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Rue Jolie (North) commencing at its intersection with Woodills Road and extending in a southerly direction to its intersection with Rue Viard be set at 20 kilometres per hour.
fff. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour on Rue Viard commencing at its intersection with Rue Lavaud and extending in a westerly direction to its intersection with Rue Jolie (North).

ggg. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Rue Viard commencing at its intersection with Rue Lavaud and extending in a westerly direction to its intersection with Rue Jolie (North) be set at 20 kilometres per hour.

hhh. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Childrens Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a north westerly direction to its end.

iii. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Childrens Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a north westerly direction to its end be set at 20 kilometres per hour.

jjj. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Onuku Road commencing at a point 23 metres south west of its intersection with Stanley Place and extending in a southerly direction to its intersection with Hamiltons Road.

kkk. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Onuku Road commencing at a point 23 metres south west of its intersection with Stanley Place and extending in a southerly direction to a point 825 metres north west of its intersection with Hamiltons Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

lll. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Onuku Road commencing at its intersection with Hamiltons Road and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 825 metres with be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

mmm. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Hamiltons Road commencing at its intersection with Onuku Road and extending in a southerly direction to its end.

nnn. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Hamiltons Road commencing at its intersection with Onuku Road and extending in a southerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

ooo. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Haylocks Road commencing at its intersection with Onuku Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its end.

ppp. **Approve** that the permanent speed limit on Haylocks Road commencing at its intersection with Onuku Road and extending in a south easterly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

_French Farm and Wainui Map – Attachment H_

qqq. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Wainui Main Road commencing at its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a southerly direction to a point 100 metres north east of its intersection with French Farm Valley Road.

rrr. **Revoke** the existing permanent speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour on Wainui Main Road commencing at a point 100 metres north east of its intersection with French Farm Valley Road and extending in a south westerly direction to a point 425 metres south west of its intersection with Bantry Lodge Road.
Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Wainui Main Road commencing at a point 425 metres south west of its intersection with Bantry Lodge Road and extending in a southerly direction to a point 580 metres east of its western intersection with Cemetery Road.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Wainui Main Road commencing at its intersection with Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) and extending in a southerly direction to a point 580 metres east of its western intersection with Cemetery Road be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Moores Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Moores Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour on French Farm Valley Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on French Farm Valley Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 70 kilometres per hour on Winery Road commencing at its intersection with French Farm Valley Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Winery Road commencing at its intersection with French Farm Valley Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Bantry Lodge Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Bantry Lodge Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a south westerly direction to its end be set at 60 kilometres per hour.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Tikao Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of 100 metres.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Tikao Bay Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of 100 metres be set at 20 kilometres per hour.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Cemetery Road commencing at its northern intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a westerly direction to a point 115 metres east of its intersection with Seaview Lane.

Approve the permanent speed limit on Cemetery Road commencing at its northern intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a westerly direction to a point 115 metres east of its intersection with Seaview Lane be set at 60 kilometres per hour.
Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Donovans Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Valley Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Donovans Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Valley Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Edwards Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Valley Road and extending in a north westerly direction to its end.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Edwards Road commencing at its intersection with Wainui Valley Road and extending in a westerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

Revoke the existing permanent speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour on Wainui Valley Road commencing at a point 864 metres north west of its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a northerly then a westerly direction to its end.

Approve that the permanent speed limit on Wainui Valley Road commencing at a point 864 metres north of its intersection with Wainui Main Road and extending in a northerly then a westerly direction to its end be set at 40 kilometres per hour.

4. Context/Background

Issue or Opportunity

4.1 This report comprises the roads within the Akaroa Harbour, Bays and Little River areas from the Banks Peninsula Speed Limit Review of 2018/19. This focuses on the higher risk travel routes, small settlements, and situations where pedestrians are likely to be present on the roadway.

4.2 Banks Peninsula is a challenging traffic environment to review due to the wide range of road users, physical conditions and environments. As a result, it benefits from a practical investigative approach to implementing best practice guidance.

4.3 The Wainui Main Road route from Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75) to Wainui is a high risk route to road users, and has been ranked 7th out of 32 priority routes within the Christchurch City Council area. Part of this route is within the NZTA determined top 10% routes nationwide for speed limit intervention to reduce death and serious injury crashes.

4.4 The Onuku Road route from Akaroa to Onuku is a high risk route to road users, and has been ranked 31st out of 32 priority routes within the Christchurch City Council area.

4.5 The NZTA speed management map guidance was updated following the planning of this speed limit review. This provided greater clarity for the safe and appropriate speed recommendations, including the utilisation of 30 kilometre per hour and 50 kilometre per hour speed limits. As a result of this, consultation feedback from NZTA and the community, and subsequent discussions and site visits with NZTA, a number of minor changes to the proposed speed limits have been made.

4.6 In particular this has resulted in the greater utilisation of 60 kilometre per hour speed limits around settlements, and 40 kilometres per hour speed limits where pedestrians are likely to
be present or driving conditions are challenging. Where there is a recommendation to change an existing speed limit, in all cases it is to reduce the existing permanent speed limit.

 Strategic Alignment

4.7 NZTA Safer Journeys Road Safety Strategy 2010-2020 is designed to guide improvements in road safety, with the overall vision of “A safe road system increasingly free of death and serious injury”. This safe system approach has four key pillars, being; safe vehicles, safe road use, safe roads and roadsides, and safe speeds. This approach recognises that road user mistakes are inevitable, but that it is everyone’s responsibility to ensure that the system protects people from death and serious injury when those mistakes occur. The Strategy recognises the speed affects the likelihood and impact of all crashes, and notes that small reductions in impact speed greatly increase the chances of surviving a crash, particularly for pedestrians or cyclists.

4.8 NZTA Speed Management Guide 2016: setting safe and appropriate speeds, plus consistency and credibility of speed limits.

4.9 Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017: requires that road controlling authorities must set speed limits that are safe and appropriate, and encourages a consistent approach to speed management throughout New Zealand.

4.10 Christchurch City Council Road Safety Action Plan July 2018 - June 2019: to enable collaborative planning amongst road safety inter-agencies to reduce death and serious injuries on Christchurch City roads.

4.11 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

  4.11.1 Activity: Traffic Safety and Efficiency
  • Level of Service: 10.0.6.1 Reduce the number of casualties on the road network - =129 (reduce by 5 or more per year)

 Decision Making Authority

4.12 Council.

 Previous Decisions

4.13 Does not apply.

 Assessment of Significance and Engagement

4.14 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

4.15 The level of significance was determined by the various assessment criteria in the CCC Significance and Engagement Policy Worksheet.

4.16 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

5. Options Analysis

 Options Considered

5.1 The following reasonably practicable options were considered and are assessed in this report:
  • Change the identified speed limits.

5.2 The following options were considered but ruled out:
  • Do nothing.
Options Descriptions

5.3 **Preferred Option:** Change the identified speed limits in accordance with the staff recommendations.

5.3.1 **Option Description:** Change the speed limits as outlined in the staff recommendations of this report.

5.3.2 **Option Advantages**
- Better aligns the posted speed limits with the actual operating speeds, the safe and appropriate speeds, and helps improve the credibility and consistency across the network.

5.3.3 **Option Disadvantages**
- Some of the proposed speed limit changes have received unfavourable consultation responses.

5.4 **Do Nothing**

5.4.1 **Option Description:** Retain the existing speed limits.

5.4.2 **Option Advantages**
- There are no identified benefits to road safety or consistency from retaining the existing speed limits.

5.4.3 **Option Disadvantages**
- Does not align with the objectives of the NZTA Speed Management Guide 2016 and overall vision of Safer Journeys: Road Safety Strategy 2010-2020.
- Does not align the posted speed limits with the actual operating speeds, the safe and appropriate speeds, and does not help improve the credibility and consistency across the network.

Analysis Criteria

5.5 Options have been assessed by their contributions to the following issues:
- Identified benefits to road safety.

6. **Community Views and Preferences**

6.1 Community engagement and consultation for this project was undertaken from 11th October to 7th November 2018. Refer to Attachment I.

6.2 The area for the speed review was very large, the project team decided to utilise social media, community development advisors contacts, local businesses, local newsletters and newspapers to let people know about the consultation.

6.3 During the course of the engagement, we received 273 submissions.

6.4 The consultation was split into areas and the analysis was done based on the comments in each area. These can be found in Attachment J.
6.5 The consultation feedback resulted in the following amendments being incorporated into the preferred option:

- Le Bons Bay Road (upper settlement) between existing speed limit change points - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Le Bons Valley Road (all) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- The Branch Road (all) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Leonardo Lane (all) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Church Road (all) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Cemetery Road (all) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Western Valley Road (existing speed limit change point to above Church Rd) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Old French Road (existing speed limit change point - Christchurch Akaroa Road (SH75)) - recommend no change at this point in time until the speed limit on SH75 is determined (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Okains Bay Road (existing speed limit change point - Big Hill Road) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Chorlton Road (Okains Bay Road - Okains River Road) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Okains Bay Road (Big Hill Road - Campground) - recommend 40 km/h (consultation proposal was 30 km/h)
- Knapps Road (all) - recommend 40 km/h (consultation proposal was 30 km/h)
- School House Road (all) - recommend 40 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Okains River Road (all) - recommend 40 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Old Coach Road (existing speed limit change point - Long Bay Road) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Morgans Road (existing speed limit change point - Long Bay Road) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Wainui Main Road (French Farm settlement including Aquatic Club) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- French Farm Valley Road (all) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Winery Road (all) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Bantry Lodge Road (all) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Cemetery Road (existing speed limit change point - Wainui Main Road) - recommend 60 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Donovans Road (all) - recommend 40 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Edwards Road (all) - recommend 40 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)
- Wainui Valley Road (existing speed limit change point to end) - recommend 40 km/h (consultation proposal was 50 km/h)

6.6 A final consultation response from NZTA, which takes into account the proposed changes above, will be made available at the Board meeting.
7. Legal Implications
   7.1 Speed limits must be set in accordance with the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017.
   7.2 Clause 27 (Part 4) of the Christchurch City Council Traffic & Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to set speed limits by resolution.
   7.3 The Council has not delegated its authority to set speed limits.
   7.4 The installation of signs and/or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.
   7.5 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

8. Risks
   8.1 None identified.

9. Next Steps
   9.1 Report referred to Council for a decision.
   9.2 Following approval, implementation within six weeks.
## 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 – Change The Identified Speed Limits</th>
<th>Option 2 – Do Nothing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cost to Implement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nil.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately $25 000 to remove redundant signage, and supply and install new signage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance/Ongoing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Covered under the existing area maintenance contract, and the effect will be minimal to the overall asset.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Does not apply.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Traffic Operations budget.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Does not apply.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on Rates</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nil.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Safety</strong></td>
<td><strong>Supports road safety and is responsive to NZTA best practice guidance.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Does not support road safety and is not responsive to NZTA best practice guidance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment to Council Plans &amp; Policies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aligns with Council’s Plans &amp; Policies- see Strategic Alignment section of this report.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Does not align with Council’s Plans &amp; Policies.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Item 12

### HAVE YOUR SAY

#### Speed limit review

**Banks Peninsula**

Closes Tuesday 6 November 2018

[ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay](ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay)

---

### Speed limit review

To improve safety and provide consistency across the roading network in Banks Peninsula, we are proposing speed limit changes on a number of roads, taking into account the safe and appropriate speed.

The roads have been divided into areas and we welcome your feedback on any or all of the roads identified for a speed limit change.

Once consultation has closed, the Banks Peninsula Community Board will receive a staff report including consultation feedback, and then make their recommendation to Council.

---

### Setting speed limits

The Christchurch City Council’s Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 allows Council to set and change speed limits on roads within Christchurch in accordance with the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017. Consultation is required as part of this process.

---

### To comment on the plan and find out more

- Go online [ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay](ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay)
- or complete the enclosed freepost form and return to:
  - Christchurch City Council,
  - PO Box 73016, Christchurch 8154
  - Samantha.sharland@ccc.govt.nz
  - 03 941 8793

Consultation is open until 5pm Tuesday 6 November 2018

---

### Akaroa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Description</th>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beach Rd (Bruce Tce to end of road)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grehan Valley Rd (existing change point* to end of road)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Rd (existing change point* to above Winery)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Coach Rd (existing change point* to Long Bay Rd)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgans Rd (existing change point* to Long Bay Rd)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylmers Valley Rd (existing change point* to end of road)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rue Balguerie (existing change point*) to Stony Bay Rd (above Purple Peak Rd)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Peak Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rue Jolie (North) (Recreation Area)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rue Viard (Recreation Area)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrens Bay Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### French Farm & Wainui Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Description</th>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wainui Main Rd (Rural)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moores Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainui Main Rd (French Farm Settlement incl. Aquatic Club)</td>
<td>100/70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Farm Valley Rd (all)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winery Rd (all)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantry Lodge Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikao Bay Rd (existing change point* to Wainui Main Rd)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Rd (existing change point* to Wainui Main Rd)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donovans Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainui Valley Rd (existing change point* to end)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Onuku

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Description</th>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onuku Rd (existing change point* to Onuku Settlement)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onuku Rd (Settlement)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamiltons Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haylocks Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change point - this is where a speed limit changes as indicated by speed limit signage
## Proposed speed limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inner Harbour Route (Lyttelton to Camp Bay)</th>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governors Bay Rd (Cass Bay to above Rapaki)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Bay Rd (above Rapaki to Governors Bay existing change point*)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Bay- Teddington Rd (Ohiotahi existing change point to Teddington Straight north end)</td>
<td>70/100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamfords Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Bay-Teddington Rd (Teddington Straight north end) to Charteris Bay Rd (north of Manor Farm)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foleys Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charteris Bay Rd (north of Manor Farm) to Marine Dr (at Ngaio Lane)</td>
<td>100/70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersons Rd (all)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Rd (Marine Dr to existing change point)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Faigan Lane (all)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Rd (outside Diamond Harbour Urban Traffic Area)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters Rd (existing change point* to Bayview Rd)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purau Ave (Diamond Harbour to Purau)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Bay Rd (existing change point* to end of Camp Bay Rd)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gobbies Pass & Gobbies Valley | |
| Gobbies Pass Rd (Governors Bay–Teddington Rd to start of Hill) | 100 | 80 |
| Gobbies Pass Rd (Hill Section) | 100 | 60 |
| Gobbies Pass Rd (above Millers Rd to north of Park Hill Rd) | 100 | 80 |
| Millers Rd (all) | 100 | 80 |
| Withells Rd (all) | 100 | 60 |
| McQueens Valley Rd (Millers Rd to Streeters Rd) | 100 | 80 |
| McQueens Valley Rd (Streeters Rd to end) | 100 | 60 |
| Streeters Rd (all) | 100 | 60 |

*Change point - this is where a speed limit changes as indicated by speed limit signage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Le Bons Bay (Upper Settlement)</th>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le Bons Bay Rd (Upper Settlement between existing change points*)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Bons Valley Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Branch Rd (all)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo Lane</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Little River | |
| Church Rd (all) | 100 | 50 |
| Upper Church Rd (all) | 100 | 50 |
| Western Valley Rd (existing change point* to above Church Rd) | 100 | 50 |

| Little Akaloo | |
| Chorlton Rd (existing change point* to east of Lukes Rd) | 100 | 50 |
| Lukes Rd (all) | 100 | 50 |
| Little Akaloo Rd (existing change point* to south west of Factory Rd) | 100 | 50 |

| Takamatua | |
| Old French Rd (existing change point* to SH75) | 100 | 50 |

| Duvauchelle | |
| Onawe Flat Road (all) | 50 | 30 |

| Okains Bay | |
| Okains Bay Rd (existing lower change point* to Big Hill Rd) | 100 | 50 |
| Chrolton Rd (Okains Bay Rd to River Rd) | 100 | 50 |
| Okains Bay Rd (Big Hill Rd to Campground) | 100 | 30 |
| Knapps Rd (all) | 100 | 30 |
| School House Rd (all) | 100 | 50 |
| Back Rd (all) | 100 | 50 |
| River Rd (all) | 100 | 50 |
| Okains Bay Campground Area (formalise existing posted speed limit) | 10 | 10 |
Banks Peninsula Speed Limit Review

Akaroa Harbour, Bays & Little River
Consultation summary

- Consultation closed Tuesday 7 November
- 273 submissions received

Feedback received from:
- Centrepoint
- Diamond Harbour Community Association
- Ewart Douglas Pharmacy
- Le Bons Bay Environmental Education Trust
- Okains Bay School
- Pigeon Bay Boating Club
- Pigeon Bay Reserve Management Committee
- Shamarra Alpaca Farm
- Spokes Canterbury
- Te Wepu
HAVE YOUR SAY
Speed limit review, Banks Peninsula

To improve safety and provide consistency across the road network in Banks Peninsula, we are proposing speed limit changes on a number of roads, taking into account the safe and appropriate speed.

Consultation is open until 5pm Tuesday 6 November

Have your say today
ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay

Sam Sharland on 03 941 8793 or samantha.sharland@ccc.govt.nz
Common themes

All Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of roads</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More policing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on why the change</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver behaviour/education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please be aware that the numbers will not add up to the total submissions as some people commented on multiple locations.
attachment J

Little River

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of scope</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce to 20km/h</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop town</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce to 30km/h</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase to 60km/h</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### French Farm and Wainui

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower speeds</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional roads</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Road beyond Seaview Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Duvachelle

- Duvachelle bay, 1

### Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipers Valley/Stock Route</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvachelle Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Media summary

- We used Facebook (CCC, targeted Banks Peninsula Facebook community groups), Neighbourly.
- The majority of users on the consultation page on our website came from Facebook.
- High engagement on the topic.
- Deal with issues/complaints as quickly as possible to prevent it escalating

Performance broken down by platform

**Facebook**
- Number of CCC wall posts: 3
- Number of posts total: 12
- People reached on CCC FB: 52,323
- Total engagement: 410
- Total post clicks: 3,562
- Groups targeted: Banks Peninsula Community, Akaroa – What is Happening?, Akaroa “buy sell & exchange” & community notice board

**Neighbourly**
- Number of wall posts: 3
- Neighbourhoods targeted: Banks Peninsula neighbourhood collection
- Number of Christchurch residents on Neighbourly: 62,039

**Website**
- Total page views: 3,676
- Unique page views: 3,007
- Average time on page: 4min36sec
- Bounce rate: 82%
- Main Referrer: Facebook mobile, Direct, Google
Top performing posts

1. **Safety on the roads is important**: People reached: 17,901, Engagement: 155, Post clicks: 1,326, Link clicks: 244
2. **Proposed speed limit changes on the Banks Peninsula**: People reached: 18,608, Engagement: 101, Post clicks: 1,195, Link clicks: 604
3. **Call for feedback on Banks Peninsula speed limits**: People reached: 15,814, Engagement: 154, Post clicks: 1,041, Link clicks: 391
13. 266 Pages Road - Lease
Reference: 19/743529
Presenter(s): Stuart McLeod, Property Consultant

1. Coastal-Burwood Community Board Recommendation to Council
   (Original Staff Recommendation accepted without change)

Part A

That the Council:

1. That it gifts the dwelling and garage situated at 266 Pages Road to the East Christchurch Housing Trust and

2. That it enters into a lease of the land for a term of 6 years with 2 rights of renewal providing that the lessor can cancel the lease for any reason on giving the lessee 12 months written notice and provided that the lessor cannot give such notice within 5 years of the commencement date.

3. That the sum of $14,020.00 inclusive of GST that is being held for the demolition of the dwelling and garage be gifted to the trust as a one off contribution by Council to the East Christchurch Housing Trust on the condition that
   a. Those funds are used solely for the reinstatement of the dwelling within 6 months of the date of the lease and
   b. On termination of the lease the dwelling and garage are removed from the land at the sole cost of the East Christchurch Housing Trust

4. That it delegates to the Manager Property Consultancy the authority to take all necessary steps to negotiate, agree and enter into all necessary documentation on behalf of the Council as he shall consider necessary or desirable to give effect to the above resolutions.

Glenn Livingstone and Tim Baker did not partake in any discussion or decision making.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>266 Pages Road - Lease</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>304/5987 Financial Plan</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>304/5987 Lease proposal and proposed trust document</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose and Origin of Report**

**Purpose of Report**

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waitai/Coastal Burwood Community Board to consider a proposal from the East Coast Housing Trust (the Trust), and if it considers appropriate, recommend to Council that it gift the dwelling and garage located at 266 Pages Road to the East Christchurch Housing Trust for a nominal sum of $1; and

1.2 That the Waitai/Coastal Burwood Community Board recommends to Councils that the funds earmarked for demolition of the dwelling and garage are gifted to the Trust as a Council contribution to the repair of the dwelling by the Trust; and

1.3 That the Waitai/Coastal Burwood Community Board recommends to Council that it enters into a lease of the land as outlined in this report.

**Origin of Report**

1.4 This report is staff generated and is response to an approach from the trust that it take ownership of the dwelling at the above address and make it available for community housing.

2. **Significance**

2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by assessing the impact of the decisions in this report against the worksheet for recording assessments. Of specific relevance is the low cost to Council and possible benefit to the community

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. **Staff Recommendations**

That the Waitai/Coastal-Burwood Community Board recommends to Council:

1. That it gifts the dwelling and garage situated at 266 Pages Road to the East Christchurch Housing Trust and

2. That it enters into a lease of the land for a term of 6 years with 2 rights of renewal providing that the lessor can cancel the lease for any reason on giving the lessee 12 months written notice and provided that the lessor cannot give such notice within 5 years of the commencement date.

3. That the sum of $14,020.00 inclusive of GST that is being held for the demolition of the dwelling and garage be gifted to the trust as a one off contribution by Council to the East Christchurch Housing Trust on the condition that

   a. Those funds are used solely for the reinstatement of the dwelling within 6 months of the date of the lease and
b. On termination of the lease the dwelling and garage are removed from the land at the sole cost of the East Christchurch Housing Trust

4. That it delegates to the Manager Property Consultancy the authority to take all necessary steps to negotiate, agree and enter into all necessary documentation on behalf of the Council as he shall consider necessary or desirable to give effect to the above resolutions.

4. Key Points

4.1 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

4.1.1 Activity: Assisted Housing

- Level of Service: 18.0.6.0 Generate housing options for vulnerable sectors of community through partnerships - Successful implementation of approved initiatives. Success is defined on a case by case basis in the specific project plan.

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 – Gift the dwelling, garage and demotion funds to the East Coast Housing Trust (preferred option)
- Option 2 – Demolish the dwelling and garage

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- Has cost benefit for the Council because the Trust will be responsible for 100% of all outgoings, i.e. it will pay rates
- Provides a dwelling to rent for those in need
- The Trust will remove the dwelling on termination of the lease
- Council retain ownership of the land
- Gives Council time to consider future uses for the land

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Council lose control of the site for a minimum of 6 years

5. Context/Background

Property Details

5.1 266 Pages Road, Wainoni, Christchurch is located on the southern corner of Pages Road and Shortland Street.

5.2 The property was acquired by Council in 2010 using available Transport funding for roading purposes and is held in Record of Title CB5C/754.

5.3 At the time of acquisition the land was subject to a road designation and if the road was widened would have necessitated the demolition of the dwelling, this designation has since lapsed and there are no current plans to widen Pages Road.
5.4 Notwithstanding paragraph 5.3 the Transport Unit consider the property should be retained for strategic purposes, in other words although not designated for road widening, that doesn’t mean it could not serve a useful transport purpose in future.

Background

5.5 After acquisition the property was rented until February 2013, at this time it was realised it was no longer suitable for rental accommodation and the tenancy was terminated.

5.6 In 2017 a damage assessment was completed by a licenced building practitioner to determine cost of repair of the dwelling after the earthquakes. After concluding that it would cost in excess of $170,000 Council staff concluded that the dwelling should be demolished.

5.7 City Care were engaged to demolish the dwelling, at this time it came to the attention of the Waitai / Burwood Coastal Community Board (the Board) and the demolition was halted.

5.8 A Seminar was held with the Board in September 2018 to debate the matter and an idea discussed that a trust be formed to repair the dwelling and provide a form of social housing.

5.9 The core of the proposal is for the Council to gift the dwelling to the trust along with the balance of the funds for demolition and enter into a lease of the land for a minimum term of 6 years. 6 years is considered a minimum amount of time for the trust to generate enough funds to remove or demolish the dwelling and build a contingency fund should the Council require the land.

5.10 The Trust has completed a financial plan that is attached and although “Scenario 1” is based on a slightly greater contribution from Council (thought to be the balance of demolition funds at the time of writing of the financial plan) the Trust is confident it can repair the dwelling at a fraction of the cost estimated by Council contractors.

5.11 The Trust have commissioned its own report that considers the damage to the dwelling is minor and through offers of voluntary labour, competitive quotations and guarantees of interest free loans, it is confident their proposition is viable.

5.12 Mr Tim Baker (Board member) along with prominent members of the local community are in the process of registering the East Christchurch Housing Trust as a Charitable Trust. The proposed Deed of Trust defines the key purpose of the trust is to assist people with a housing need, especially those resident in the eastern suburbs of Christchurch.

5.13 The proposal from the Trust does have some merit, not only would it provided a form of social housing, Council would not be liable for holding costs, i.e. rates and ground maintenance which would be required even if the dwelling was demolished.

5.14 The broad terms of the proposed lease have been agreed
   - 6 year term with 2 rights of renewal
   - A nominal rent
   - The trust to repair the dwelling within 6 months of the date of the lease
   - The Trust to remove the dwelling when the lease is terminated
   - The trust to be responsible for 100% of the outgoings

5.15 Council’s social housing team has considered the potential of including the unit within Council’s social housing portfolio.

5.15.1 At this time the focus of the unit is on investigating the future of complexes that are nearing the end of their economically useful lives or replacing capacity lost during the earthquakes. This requires a focus on solutions that provide tens to hundreds of units.
5.15.2 The East Christchurch Housing Trust is in a better position to undertake the work on a single building, particularly where the proposal involves the use of voluntary labour. We will encourage the Trust to work with community housing providers to find tenants, as this may allow for better access to housing subsidies.

Community Board and Staff Delegations

5.16 The Community Board and staff do not hold delegations to dispose of property including land or buildings. Such a decision would be made by the Council.

Legal Considerations – Dealing Unilaterally

5.17 There are a number of matters that need to be considered when contemplating unilateral dealings to sell the building and grant a new lease.

5.18 First and foremost, the Council must consider and meet the requirements of Section 14 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA), in particular:

- (1)(a) Conduct its business in an open, transparent, and democratically accountable manner,
- (1)(f) Undertake any commercial transactions in accordance with sound business practices.
- (1)(g) Ensure prudent stewardship and the efficient and effective use of its resources in the interests of its district or region, including planning effectively for the future management of its assets.

5.19 Secondly, the Council must also ensure that it complies with its relevant policies. In this instance there are two adopted policies recorded:

Property – Disposal of Council Property

“That the Council’s policy of publicly tendering properties for sale unless there is a clear reason for doing otherwise be confirmed as applying to all areas of the City with the exception of the area in which the (interim) Central City Board is active in pursuit of Council revitalisation goals”. (Adopted 16 December 2000)

Property – Leasing Council Property

"Where the Council recognises there is only one logical lessee for a public property, the Council will unilaterally deal with that lessee."

5.20 The clear reason(s) to deal unilaterally regarding a sale of the building is; this is a one off proposal that would not have come about under ordinary circumstances.

5.21 Subsequently, should the Council elect to gift the building to the group, they will be the only logical Lessee of the land unless the dwelling is removed. This is a clear reason to deal unilaterally with the Trust.

5.22 Staff are of the view that the group’s proposal has potential to benefit the community and outweighs any benefits that may be realised from an open tender process.

Legal Considerations – Public Views and Preferences
There are a number of relevant legal considerations in Sections 76 – 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (the LGA) when making decisions about the proposal received and the future use of the property.

- Section 76 provides that “Every decision made by a local authority must be made in accordance with such of the provisions of sections 77, 78, 80, 81 and 82 as are applicable”. In summary those sections provide:
  - Section 77 a local authority must, in the course of the decision-making process, seek to identify all reasonably practicable options for the achievement of the objective of a decision and in doing so assess the options in terms of their advantages and disadvantages.
  - Section 78 the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by, or to have an interest in, the matter must be considered.
  - Section 79 provides that in considering how to achieve compliance with sections 77 and 78 they must consider the significance of the matter in accordance with its Significance and Engagement Policy.
  - Section 80 sets out the matters that need to be clearly identified when making a decision that is inconsistent i.e. the inconsistency, reason for it and any intention of the local authority to amend the policy or plan to accommodate the decision.
  - Section 81 provides for contributions to decision making by Maori.
  - Section 82 sets out the principles of consultation.

Section 78 does not require the Council to undertake a consultation process in itself but the Council must have some way of identifying the views and preferences of interested and affected persons. In instance the project is being driven by members of the Community Board and as such it is considered that those Board members have sufficient contact with the local community to know their preferences.

Section 79 LGA provides that if the Council is proposing to transfer the control of a “strategic asset” to or from the Council, the Council must not make that decision, unless:

- The decision is explicitly provided for in its LTP; and
- The proposal to provide for the decision was included in a consultation documents in accordance with section 93E.

The Significance and Engagement Policy sets out the list of “strategic assets”. In particular, the Policy lists as “strategic assets”, community facilities as follows:

Community Facilities
(i) Christchurch Town Hall;
(j) Christchurch Art Gallery and its permanent collection;
(k) all land and buildings comprising the Council’s social housing portfolio;
(l) all public library facilities;
(m) all parks and reserves owned by or administered by the Council;
(n) all public swimming pools;
(o) all waterfront land and facilities owned or operated by the Council, including wharves, jetties, slipways, breakwaters and seawalls;
(p) cemeteries and listed heritage buildings and structures.

“All” or “its” means the asset as a whole.
5.27 Where a “strategic asset” is a network or has many components, decisions may be made in respect of individual components within the network without those components being regarded as strategic, unless such decisions are considered to significantly alter the level of service provided by the Council.

5.28 The disposal of this building is not considered a strategic asset because there is no impact on existing network of social housing schemes. The decision to dispose of the building will not alter the level of service provided by the Council.
6. Option 1 - Gift the dwelling and demotion funds to the East Coast Housing Trust (preferred)

Option Description
6.1 This option involves the gifting of the dwelling and the balance of the demolition funds to the East Christchurch Housing Trust. The Trust will refurbish the dwelling within 6 months from the date of the lease and provide rental accommodation in accordance with their Deed of Trust.

Significance
6.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report
6.3 There are no engagement requirements for this level of significance in this instance.

Impact on Mana Whenua
6.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
6.5 It is believed that the community will be supportive to see Council taking some positive action rather than leaving the dwelling in a derelict state.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
6.6 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies

Financial Implications
6.7 Cost of Implementation - $14,020
6.8 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Nil
6.9 Funding source - Capital Account – Surplus Property Development

Legal Implications
6.10 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision
6.11 Although this report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit, they have prepared all required documentation to effect the gifting of the dwelling and lease arrangements.

Risks and Mitigations
6.12 There is a risk that the Trust may not be able to proceed with refurbishment.
6.12.1 Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk after the below treatment(s) is implemented will be low
6.12.2 The trust has spent some considerable time and effort assessing the viability of this project this is considered a low risk. They have offers of voluntary labour, competitive quotations and guarantees of interest free loans. The Trust are required to complete the refurbishment within 6 months.

Implementation
6.13 Implementation dependencies - Council approval and then signing of all legal documents
6.14 Implementation timeframe – 2 months
Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

6.15 The advantages of this option include:

- Has cost benefit for the Council because the Trust will be responsible for 100% of all outgoings, i.e. it will pay rates and maintain the dwelling and grounds
- Provides a dwelling to rent for those in need
- The Trust will remove the dwelling on termination of the lease
- Council retain ownership of the land
- Gives Council time to consider future uses for the land

6.16 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Council lose control of the site for a minimum of 6 years

7. Option 2 – Demolish the dwelling

Option Description

7.1 This option reverts to the original course of action of demolishing the dwelling. This will leave bare land.

Significance

7.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

7.3 There are no engagement requirements for this level of significance.

Impact on Mana Whenua

7.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

7.5 Community views and preferences for this option are not known. It was a management decision to demolish the dwelling because it was subject to vandalism as was considered uneconomic to repair.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

7.6 This option is not consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies

7.6.1 Inconsistency – There is an inconsistency with the Council’s Housing Policy 2016.

7.6.2 Reason for inconsistency – Demolishing a dwelling does not meet the principals of the Housing Policy vision that all people in Christchurch have access to housing that is secure, safe, affordable, warm and dry.

7.6.3 Amendment necessary - none

Financial Implications

7.7 Cost of Implementation - $14,020

7.8 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - None

7.9 Funding source – Corporate Services
Legal Implications
7.10 There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision
7.11 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit

Risks and Mitigations
7.12 There is a risk Council in demolishing the dwelling are seen to be reducing social housing stock This may result in criticism in the media

7.12.1 Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk after the below treatment(s) is implemented will be low

7.12.2 There is no other planned action with this option.

Implementation
7.13 Implementation dependencies - Council decision
7.14 Implementation timeframe – 2 months

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.15 The advantages of this option include:
- The dwelling is removed

7.16 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Contrary to provision of social housing aspirations
- Potential criticism of lowering social housing stock
- One going costs, i.e. rates and ground maintenance
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Confirmation of Statutory Compliance
Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.
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Restoration of House at 266 Pages Road

Financial Plan | Restoration cost of $35,000

Scenario 1  | Council contributes $18,000 (cost of demolition) towards restoration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Rates</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Repay loans</th>
<th>Provision demolition</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>-1250</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-10000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>-2100</td>
<td>-1275</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-7000</td>
<td>-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>-2200</td>
<td>-1300</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>-2300</td>
<td>-1325</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>-2400</td>
<td>-1350</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>16500</td>
<td>-2500</td>
<td>-1400</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>16500</td>
<td>-2600</td>
<td>-1425</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>16500</td>
<td>-2700</td>
<td>-1450</td>
<td>-2200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>17000</td>
<td>-2800</td>
<td>-1475</td>
<td>-2200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>17000</td>
<td>-2900</td>
<td>-1500</td>
<td>-2200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>158500</td>
<td>-24500</td>
<td>-13750</td>
<td>-17600</td>
<td>-17000</td>
<td>-15000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenario 2  | Council makes no contribution to restoration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Rates</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Repay loans</th>
<th>Provision demolition</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>-1250</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-10000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>-2100</td>
<td>-1275</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-10000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>-2200</td>
<td>-1300</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-10000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>-2300</td>
<td>-1325</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>-5000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>-2400</td>
<td>-1350</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>16500</td>
<td>-2500</td>
<td>-1400</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>16500</td>
<td>-2600</td>
<td>-1425</td>
<td>-2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>16500</td>
<td>-2700</td>
<td>-1450</td>
<td>-2200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>17000</td>
<td>-2800</td>
<td>-1475</td>
<td>-2200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>17000</td>
<td>-2900</td>
<td>-1500</td>
<td>-2200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

158500  -24500  -13750  -17600  -35000  -15000  52650

Notes

1. Initial rent - $300 pw X 50 weeks
2. Rates - increases roughly in line with CCC long-term plan
5. Interest-free loans can be repaid in under 4 years.
6. A sum of $15,000 will be invested to provide for demolition cost at some time in the future - unlikely to be before Year 10. Demolition costs will rise over time but interest on the sum invested will cover inflation.
7. Surpluses will be invested in an interest-bearing fund designated for the provision of housing of more affordable housing.
8. Scenarios 1 and 2. Scenario 1 shows that, if the Council makes a contribution of $18,000 for restoration, the Trust can make provision for demolition by Year 4. However, in Scenario 2, where the Council makes no contribution, the Trust would it difficult to fund the full cost of demolition before Year 7 or 8.
East Christchurch Housing Trust

Proposal to Christchurch City Council to purchase or lease dwelling at 266 Pages Road, Aranui

Background

Some years ago the City Council purchased the property at 266 Pages Road for road-widening. It remains a designated property in the new City Plan but it is not expected that Pages Road will be widened for, perhaps, 15-20 years. The property suffered some damage in the earthquakes; there was minor damage to the dwelling and the concrete block fence on the frontage. The garage and some other fences are in a state of disrepair. As there was no money in the Council’s budget to restore the property to a rentable standard, it was decided to demolish the dwelling. However, the Property Manager agreed, at the request of Timothy Baker, a local resident and Community Board member, to halt the demolition. Mr Baker undertook to approach housing providers and community groups to ascertain whether they would be interested in restoring the property and letting it to persons with a housing need.

Mr Baker approached Habitat for Humanity and ACTIS (Aranui Community Trust Incorporated Society). Both groups gave consideration to the proposal but decided against it because they were uncertain as to project costs, or lacked capital resources, or did not have a person with project management skills within their group.

Mr Baker then shared the concept with a number of residents in the eastern suburbs. Five of these were supportive and have now formed the East Christchurch Housing Trust to advance this project and other similar projects. The Trustees include persons experienced in property and project management, financial administration, community service, and the welfare of children and families. A Trust Deed has been prepared but the Trust is not yet registered. A copy of the deed is attached.

Proposal

East Christchurch Housing Trust will:

(i) purchase the buildings (house and garage) from the Christchurch City Council for $1, or if the Council prefers, lease the buildings from the Council for $1 a year
(ii) carry out repairs on the property (house, garage, fences, gardens/lawns and some paths) to a workman-like standard within 6 months of purchase or lease
(iii) rent the property to tenants of their choice and retain all rental income for use in accordance with the charitable purposes set out in the Trust Deed.
(iv) pay rates on the property for both land and improvements.
(v) pay any other charges levied by the Council on residential properties.
(vi) maintain the property in good order and condition until such time as the Council requires the property for road widening or some other municipal purpose
(vii) remove or demolish the house and garage and clear the land at its expense when the Council requires the land for road widening or another municipal purpose.

The Christchurch City Council will:
(i) sell the improvements to the Trust for $1 or lease the property to the Trust for $1 a year.
(ii) contribute $18,000 towards the repairs to the property, this being the sum the Council would have expended to complete the demolition
(iii) give the Trust at least 12 months’ notice that it wishes to use the land for road widening or another municipal purpose
(iv) undertake not to exercise the right to resume use of the land for a minimum of 6 years after an agreement to sell or lease the land to the Trust.

Information relevant to the Proposal

Preparatory work

The Trust has:

(i) commissioned a report from a company specialising in house inspections. The report found that earthquake damage was minor and listed the repairs considered to be necessary.
(ii) received offers of voluntary labour for work able to be carried out by skilled handymen.
(iii) requested quotations from tradesmen for specialist work such as electrical rewiring.
(iv) prepared a draft repair budget totalling $35,000, including a $5000 contingency.
(v) received guarantees of $19,000 in interest-free loans to commence the repair programme.
(vi) held discussions with representatives of a trust that provides support for teenage parents but finds it difficult to locate suitable accommodation.

Advantages of the Proposal for the Council

The Council will:

(i) save the cost of keeping the land tidy (grass mowing, removal of rubbish).
(ii) receive rating income of about $2000 a year.
(i) assist in relieving the shortage of affordable housing.

The Trust believes the Proposal is advantageous to the Council in its current form but is willing to discuss any variations the Council wishes to put forward.

David Lawrence
Interim Secretary to the Trust
2 Strathmore gardens
Shirley

Christchurch 8061
Ph: 021614888
28th August 2018
TRUST DEED OF THE EAST CHRISTCHURCH HOUSING TRUST (DRAFT)

THIS DEED is made the day of August 2018

BETWEEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Lawrence, of</td>
<td>2 Strathamore Gardens, Christchurch</td>
<td>Real Estate Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Close, of</td>
<td>8 Seafield Place, Christchurch</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Perry, of</td>
<td>55 Waratah Street, Christchurch</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Whitcombe-Dobbs, of</td>
<td>41 Stillwater Ave, Christchurch</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Baker, of</td>
<td>19 Lenton Street, Christchurch</td>
<td>Real Estate Agent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHEREAS:
A. The parties to this Deed wish to establish a charitable trust (in this Deed referred to as "the Trust") for the purposes described in Clause 3 of this Deed, and
B. The parties to this deed have agreed to contribute the sum of ten dollars each to establish the Trust; and
C. They have agreed to enter into this Deed specifying the purposes of the Trust and providing for its control and governance.

1. NAME:
The name of the Trust is the East Christchurch Housing Trust, hereinafter called ‘the Trust’.

2. PURPOSE
The purpose of the Trust is to assist people with a housing need, especially those resident in the eastern suburbs of Christchurch, and, in pursuit of this purpose, to:
2.1 acquire suitable housing by purchase, lease or gift
2.2 let such housing to people with a housing need for short or long periods
2.3 keep rents affordable whilst maintaining a good standard of accommodation
2.4 act at all times as a supportive landlord
2.5 encourage and support tenants in steps towards home ownership
2.6 in the case of vulnerable tenants, partner with agencies that can provide wrap-around services where appropriate
2.7 cooperate with other groups or agencies with a similar purpose
2.8 perform other activities that are consistent with the purpose of the Trust

3. ACTIVITIES LIMITED TO AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND
The activities of the Trust will be limited to Aotearoa/New Zealand.

4. OFFICE
The office of the Trust will be at 2 Strathamore Gardens, Christchurch, or such other address in Christchurch, New Zealand as the Board of Trustees may from time to time determine.
5. **THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

5.1 The number of Trustees shall be a minimum of three and a maximum of nine.

5.2 The signatories to this Deed will be the first Board. The Trustees will elect from among themselves a Chairperson. A Secretary and Treasurer will also be appointed from among themselves or from non-trust members. An election of office-bearers will be held at the first meeting of the Board following the execution of this Deed and whenever a vacancy occurs. The positions of Secretary and Treasurer may be combined.

5.3 A person will immediately cease to be Trustee when she or he resigns in writing, dies, is declared bankrupt or is found to be a mentally disordered person within the meaning of the Mental Health (Compulsory Assessment and Treatment) Act 1992 or subsequent enactment.

5.4 The Board will have the power to fill any vacancy that arises in the Board or to appoint any additional trustees subject to clause 5.1.

5.5 The Board may continue to act notwithstanding any vacancy, but if their number is reduced below the minimum number of trustees as stated in this deed, the continuing trustee/s may act for the purpose of increasing the number of trustees to that minimum but for no other purpose.

5.6 The Board may, by a motion decided by a two-thirds majority of votes, terminate a person’s position as a Trustee and member of the Board, if it believes that such action is in the best interests of the Trust.

5.7 The name of the Board will be East Christchurch Housing Trust.

6. **MEETINGS OF THE BOARD**

6.1 The procedure for Board meetings will be as follows:

6.2 If a Trustee does not attend three (3) consecutive meetings of the Board without leave of absence that member may, at the discretion and on decision of the Board, be removed as a Trustee, and/or from any office of the Trust which she or he holds.

6.3 All questions will, if possible, be decided by consensus. In the event that a consensus cannot be reached then a decision will be made by a majority vote by show of hands, unless otherwise determined by the Board.

6.4 If the voting is tied, the motion will be lost.

6.5 In the absence of the Chairperson, the Board will elect a person to chair the meeting from among the Trustees present.

6.6 The Board will meet at least three (3) times every year. Meetings may be held in person or by any other means of communicating as decided on by the Board from time to time. The Secretary will ensure that all members of the Board are notified of the meeting, either verbally or in writing.

6.7 The Secretary will ensure that a minute book is maintained which is available to any member of the Trust and which, for each meeting of the Board, records the names of those present, all decisions made by the Board; and any other matters of significance discussed at the meeting.
7. **POWERS**

In addition to the powers provided by the general law of New Zealand or contained in the Trustee Act 1956, the powers which the Board may exercise in order to carry out its charitable purposes are as follows:

7.1 to use the funds of the Trust as the Board thinks necessary or expedient in payment of the costs and expenses of the Trust, including the employment and dismissal of professional advisors, agents, officers and staff, according to principles of good employment and the Employment Relations Act 2000 or any subsequent enactment;

7.2 to purchase, take on lease or in exchange or hire, or otherwise acquire any real or personal property and any rights or privileges which the Board thinks necessary or expedient in order to attain the purpose of the Trust and to sell, exchange, let, bail or lease, with or without option of purchase or, in any other manner, dispose of such property, rights or privileges;

7.3 to invest surplus funds in any way permitted by law for the investment of Charitable Trust funds and upon such terms as the Board thinks fit;

7.4 to borrow or raise money from time to time with or without security and upon such terms as to priority or otherwise as the Board thinks fit; and

7.5 to do all things as may from time to time be necessary or desirable to enable the Board to give effect to and attain the charitable purposes of the Trust.

8 **INCOME, BENEFIT OR ADVANTAGE TO BE APPLIED TO CHARITABLE PURPOSES**

8.1 Any income, benefit or advantage will be applied to the charitable purposes of the Trust.

8.2 No trustee or members of the Trust or any person associated with a trustee shall participate in or materially influence any decision made by the trustees in respect of any payment to or on behalf of that trustee or associated person of any income, benefit or advantage whatsoever. Any such income paid shall be reasonable and relative to that which would be paid in an arm’s length transaction (being the open market value).

8.3 The provision and effect of this clause shall not be removed from this deed and shall be implied into any document replacing this deed of trust.

9. **POWER TO DELEGATE**

9.1 The Board may from time to time appoint any committee and may delegate any of its powers and duties to any such committee or to any person. The committee or person may without confirmation by the Board exercise or perform the delegated powers or duties in the same way and with the same effect as the Board could itself have done.

9.2 Any committee or person to whom the Board has delegated powers or duties will be bound by the terms of the Trust and any terms or conditions of the delegation set by the Board.

9.3 The Board will be able to revoke such delegation at will, and no such delegation will prevent the exercise of any power or the performance of any duty by the Board.
9.4 It will not be necessary for any person who is appointed to be a member of any
such committee, or to whom such delegation is made, to be a Trustee.

10. FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS
10.1 The financial year of the Trust will be from 1 January to 31 December.
10.2 The Board will appoint a treasurer to manage the finances in accordance with
procedures authorized by the Board for:
(i) operation of bank accounts, including the requirement for all payments to be
authorized by two persons
(ii) receipting and banking of moneys
(iii) investment of funds
(iv) preparation of an annual budget for income and expenditure to be approved by the
Board at the start of the financial year
(v) regular financial reports to the Board, including reports of income and expenditure
against budget
(vi) preparation of annual financial statements for Review by a competent person and
adoption by the Board
(vii) compliance with the requirements of the IRD and the Charities Commission.

11. COMMON SEAL
11.1 The Common Seal of the Board, following its incorporation, will be kept in the
custody and control of the Secretary, or such other officer appointed by the Board.
11.2 When required, the Common Seal will be affixed to any document following a
resolution of the Board and will be signed by the Chairperson (or a trustee acting as the
Chair) and one other trustee appointed by the Board.

12. MEDIATION & ARBITRATION
12.1 Any dispute arising out of or relating to this deed may be referred to mediation.
Mediation may be initiated by either party writing to the other party and identifying the
dispute which is being suggested for mediation. The parties will agree on a suitable
person to act as mediator or will ask the Arbitrators’ and Mediators’ Institute of New
Zealand Inc. to appoint a mediator.
12.2 If the dispute cannot be solved by mediation, it shall be referred to and finally
resolved by arbitration in New Zealand in accordance with New Zealand law and the
current Arbitration Protocol of the Arbitrators’ and Mediators’ Institute of New Zealand
Inc.

13. TRUSTEE LIABILITY
It is declared that:
13.1 The Trustees are chargeable respectively only in respect of the money and
securities they actually receive, or which, but for their own acts, omissions, neglects, or
defaults they would have received, notwithstanding their signing any receipt for the
sake of conformity; and
13.2 They are each answerable and responsible respectively only for their own acts,
receipts, omissions, neglects and defaults and not for those of each other, or of any
banker, broker, auctioneers, or other person with whom, or into whose hands, any Trust money or security is properly deposited or has come;
13.3 No Trustees shall be liable personally for the maintenance, repair, or insurance of any charges on such property;
13.4 No Trustees hereof shall be liable for any loss arising from any cause whatsoever including a breach of the duties imposed by Section 13B and/or Section 13C Trustees Act 1956 (as enacted by the Trustee Amendment Act 1988) (or any statutory replacement or equivalent) unless such loss is attributable to:
   (i) his or her own dishonesty; or
   (ii) the wilful commission by him or her of an act known by him/her to be a breach of Trust.
And pursuant to Section 13D of the Trustees Act 1956 it is intended by this clause that the duties imposed by Section 13B and 13C of the Trustees Act 1956 shall not apply to any Trustee hereof.
13.5 No Trustees shall be bound to take any proceedings against a co-Trustee for any breach or alleged breach of Trust committed by that co-Trustee.
13.6 Notwithstanding the procedure or otherwise of retaining assets in the Trust Fund no Trustee shall be liable for any loss suffered by the Trust Fund by reason of the Trustees retaining any asset forming part of the Trust Fund.

14. DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS ASSETS
On the winding up of the Trust, or on its dissolution by the Registrar, all surplus assets, after the payment of costs, debts and liabilities will be given to other charitable organisation/s within New Zealand as the Board will decide. If the Trust is unable to make such a decision, the surplus assets will be disposed of in accordance with the directions of the High Court pursuant to section 27 of the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 or subsequent enactment.

15. ALTERATION OF THIS DEED
15.1. The Trustees may by consensus or pursuant to a motion decided by a majority of votes, by supplemental deed make alterations or additions to the terms and provisions of this deed provided that no such alteration or addition will detract from the exclusively charitable nature of the trust or result in the distribution of its assets on winding up or dissolution for any purpose that is not exclusively charitable.
15.2. Any alteration or addition must be recorded in writing either in a supplemental deed or a trustees’ resolution signed by all trustees.

IN WITNESS OF WHICH this Deed has been executed:

SIGNED by the above named )
) __________________________

as Trustee in the presence of:  ) __________________________
Full Name of Witness: .................................

Occupation: .................................

Residential address: .................................

SIGNED by the above named ) .................................

as Trustee in the presence of: .................................

Full Name of Witness: .................................

Occupation: .................................

Residential address: .................................

SIGNED by the above named ) .................................

as Trustee in the presence of: .................................

Full Name of Witness: .................................

Occupation: .................................

Residential address: .................................

“A”

This is the document marked “A” referred to in the annexed declaration of
......................................................... made at
Christchurch this ................................. day of August, 2018 before me
.................................................
14. Installation of Public Artwork - Segments of Berlin Wall
Reference: 19/664021
Presenter(s): Brent Smith – Principal Advisor Citizens & Community

1. Social, Community Development and Housing Committee Consideration

The Committee discussed a range of possible locations for the artwork. The Committee recommended the preferred location option, opposite the Floral Clock adjacent to the Town Hall and also requested staff to seek the views of Ngāi Tahu and the Victoria Square Reference Group.

2. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee recommend that Council:

1. Agree to the permanent installation of the two Berlin Wall sections subject to the following:
   a. All necessary consents and approvals are obtained and provided.
   b. Future maintenance costs for the two Berlin Wall sections are included in future maintenance planning
   c. A condition report and long term maintenance and engineering plans are provided.

3. Social, Community Development and Housing Committee Decisions Under Delegation

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee:

d. Request staff to seek the views of Ngāi Tahu and the Victoria Square Reference Group and provide this to Council.
4. Social, Community Development and Housing Committee
Recommendation to Council

Part A

That the Council:

1. Agree to the permanent installation of the two Berlin Wall sections subject to the following:
   a. All necessary consents and approvals are obtained and provided.
   b. Future maintenance costs for the two Berlin Wall sections are included in future maintenance planning
   c. A condition report and long term maintenance and engineering plans are provided.

Secretarial Note: Attachment B - Berlin Wall - Comparative Evaluation Matrix was added following the Committee meeting.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Installation of Public Artwork - Segments of Berlin Wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Project Working Party Report - Berlin Wall Segments</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Berlin Wall - Comparative Evaluation Matrix</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee for the permanent installation and maintenance of two sections of the Berlin Wall as public artwork to be installed on Council land.

2. Executive Summary

2.1 Two sections of the Berlin Wall were gifted to Christchurch by the German construction firm tasked with dismantling the wall which separated East and West Berlin for almost 40 years.

2.2 Council is being requested to approve the permanent installation and maintenance of two sections of the Berlin Wall opposite the Floral Clock adjacent to the Town Hall.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee recommend that Council:

1. Agree to the permanent installation of the two Berlin Wall sections subject to the following:
   a. All necessary consents and approvals are obtained and provided.
   b. Future maintenance costs for the two Berlin Wall sections are included in future maintenance planning.
   c. A condition report and long term maintenance and engineering plans are provided.

4. Key Points

4.1 Council is being requested to approve the permanent installation and maintenance of two sections of the Berlin Wall opposite the Floral Clock adjacent to the Town Hall.

4.2 The permanent installation of the artwork is supported by the Public Arts Advisory Group.

4.3 The artwork is consistent with the Council’s Artworks in Public Places Policy.

4.4 Community Outcomes: Supports Strong Communities: Celebration of our identity through arts, culture, heritage and sport.

4.5 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 – 2028):

- Activity: Recreation, Sports, Community Arts & Events
- Level of Service: Support community based organisations to develop, promote and deliver community events and arts in Christchurch
- Activity: Heritage
- Level of Service: To manage and maintain Public Monuments, Sculptures, Artworks and Parks Heritage Buildings of significance.
5. **Context/Background**

**Issue or Opportunity**

5.1 Two sections of the Berlin Wall were gifted to Christchurch by the German construction firm tasked with dismantling the wall which separated East and West Berlin for almost 40 years.

5.2 An endowment agreement is in place between the Christchurch City Council and EMP Beratungsgesellschaft mbH, Germany.

5.3 SCAPE were engaged to establish the provenance, agree the endowment and manage the procurement and shipping of the sections.

5.4 Shipping costs were covered by Southbase Construction Ltd, a sponsor of SCAPE.

5.5 This deal was brokered by Ministry of Culture and Heritage staff involved in the Christchurch rebuild, and was canvassed with elected members in 2016.

5.6 The acquiring of these sections of wall was brought to the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee in May 2017.

5.7 Sections of the wall are on display around the world and stand for the peaceful and successful pursuit of liberty.

5.8 A group of Berlin-based students with learning disabilities painted one section of the wall, while the second was painted to represent themes from “Doctor Who”.

5.9 2019 marks the 30th anniversary of the Berlin Wall coming down.

---

**Site considerations**
5.10 Three proposed locations were considered for the placement of the artwork:

1. Friendship Corner - a good fit thematically, a nice green gathering space for the public – however two large concrete structures in this setting could be imposing.

2. East Frame (near Margaret Mahy Park near the pump track) - felt like a reasonably ‘heavy’ themed work in an area primarily used by young people / children. Lots of hillocks to contend with.

3. Opposite Floral Clock – Council owned land, flat site with existing lighting. The site is bordered by two significant brutalist architecture buildings characterised by their monolithic concrete construction. West Berlin was home to the height of brutalist architecture after WW2.

5.11 The preferred location is diagonally opposite the Floral Clock.

5.12 This would be a semi-permanent location, but provides a quick win in terms of having the work publically accessible in time for the 30th anniversary this year of the Berlin Wall coming down.

Strategic Alignment

5.13 The site is not identified in the Artwork in Public Places Five Year Plan 2004.

5.14 The artwork is consistent with the Council’s Artworks in Public Places Policy.
Engagement and support

5.15 Staff have liaised with Chancellor Wolfgang Hüsgen at the German Embassy and Dr Christian Riffel, Honorary Consul at the Consulate of the Federal Republic of Germany in Christchurch regarding the installation of the wall sections.

5.16 Their preference is for the sections to be installed as close together as possible in reference to the original function of the wall that separated families for decades and in acknowledgement of their suffering.

5.17 A staff assessment has been carried out by a staff working party as per the Artworks in Public Places – Operational procedures (ATTACHMENT A)

5.18 This assessment outlines the criteria for assessment, issues, maintenance requirements and finance implications. Also included was an engineering design and assessment for the installation of the sections.

5.19 Comment has been sought from the Chair of the Council’s Public Arts Advisory Group (PAAG) and the Director of the Christchurch Art Gallery and they have commented that they have no issues with this proposal.

Financial implications

5.20 Urban regeneration are funding $10,000 for the installation of the two Berlin Wall sections in 2018/19.

5.21 Parks have confirmed that they have funding to carry out the on-going maintenance of the artwork which will involve a monthly wash-down, any required graffiti removal and an annual engineering check.

5.22 Maintenance has been estimated at $5,800 annually.

6. Recommendations

6.1 That Council agree to the permanent installation of the two Berlin Wall sections opposite the Floral Clock subject to the following:

1. All necessary consents and approvals are obtained and provided.

2. Future maintenance costs for two Berlin Wall sections are included in future maintenance planning

3. A condition report and long term maintenance and engineering plans are provided.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Project Working Party Report - Berlin Wall Segments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Brent Smith - Principal Advisor Citizens &amp; Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Mary Richardson - General Manager Citizen and Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Working Party Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Name And Image</th>
<th>Berlin Wall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 March</td>
<td>Consultation / liaison with consulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 March</td>
<td>Finalise install configuration / structural engineering requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 March</td>
<td>Complete PWP doc and send to Community Board Rep for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March</td>
<td>Send to Public Art Advisory Group for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 April</td>
<td>Send to Brent Smith who will prepare report for Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 May 5pm</td>
<td>Final date for staff signoffs on report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May 2019 9:30 a.m</td>
<td>Full Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of 2018/19 financial year (June)</td>
<td>Budget spent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Board Area</th>
<th>Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Working Party Membership</td>
<td>Sarah Amazinnia - Arts Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Adamski Asset Engineer - Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicky Brown - Team Leader Heritage Gardens &amp; City Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebecah Ising - Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diana Saxton - Community Recreation Advisor Linwood Central Heathcote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Support to Project Working Party</th>
<th>Paul Ferguson - Structural Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis Preston - Team Leader TSD Parks &amp; Landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katie Smith - Senior Advisor Urban Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drew Ulrich - Team leader Events Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art Advisory Group (PAAG)</td>
<td>Funding / Financials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Chair: Blair Jackson Director Christchurch Art Gallery  
Project Working Party summary goes to Blair Jackson for review by the PAAG.  
PAAG review and consolidated Project Working Party report to inform the staff report prepared by Brent Smith - Principal Advisor Citizens & Community to standing committee and Council. | Urban Regeneration have agreed to provide up to $10,000 for installation of the pieces within the 2018/19 financial year.  
Ongoing maintenance cost will require Council signoff. |

**Background**

The two pieces of the wall were gifted to Christchurch by the German construction firm tasked with dismantling the wall, which separated East and West Berlin for almost 40 years.

Today, sections of the wall are on display around the world and stand for the peaceful and successful pursuit of liberty.

A group of Berlin-based students with learning disabilities painted one section in late 2014, while the second was painted to represent themes from popular British television show *Doctor Who*.

The Capital Delivery Major Facilities team coordinated the acquisition of the gift of two segments of the Berlin Wall in early 2017. A report was taken to SCDH Committee in May 2017 TRIM 17/378625.

2019 marks the 30 year anniversary of the Berlin Wall coming down.

**Proposal**

To permanently install the two pieces of the Berlin wall in Christchurch.

**PROJECT WORKING PARTY SUMMARY**

The following are recommended if the artwork is to become permanent and owned by Council:

**Engagement and Support**

Staff have liaised with Chancellor Wolfgang Hülsen at the German Embassy and Dr Christian Riffel, Honorary Consul at the Consulate of the Federal Republic of Germany in Christchurch regarding the installation of the wall segments. Their preference is for the segments to be installed as close together as possible in reference to the original function of the wall that separated families for decades and in acknowledgement of their suffering.

Media to date:

https://metronews.co.nz/article/christchurch-gets-two-pieces-of-the-berlin-wall  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifications</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreements</td>
<td>See Appendix 1, Endowment Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting information**

**Artist / Artwork description**
A group of Berlin-based students with learning disabilities painted one section in late 2014, while the second was painted to represent themes from popular British television show *Doctor Who*.

**Location**

| Proposed site | Diagonally opposite floral clock near Victoria Square |

**Site Map**

![Site Map Image]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consents</th>
<th>See Heritage Planner advice below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artwork value</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of Artwork</td>
<td>50 years min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Art in Public Places Policy considerations for Project Working Party:**

**Parks Planner**
Kelly Hansen Team Leader Parks Recreation & Planning
Ensure consistency with the Victoria Square plan.
Aligns with Arts Strategy and Policy.
Ensure asset data is recorded in SAP on completion.

**Heritage Planner**
Clare Dale Senior Planner
It is likely that a consent is required a pre-app meeting with one of CCC planners via the official channels is advised.
Events
Drew Ulrich Team Leader Events Production
Tanya Cokovic Team Leader Events Partnerships and Development
No Events implications in the proposed location

### Art in Public Places Policy Appendix 11 Considerations:

| Practicalities | Easy access, water supply close by, public area with pedestrians walking through and lift, some vulnerability to graffiti or damage due to semi enclosed site (past experience with the floral clock that gets damaged) |
| Relationship to Surrounding Spaces | It is expected that this area may be landscaped at some stage in the future and it may need to be moved. |
| Health and Safety | It is possible people may climb on this, engineering has taken this into account |

#### Policy and Strategy Considerations:

| Artworks in Public Places Five Year Plan November 2004 | This site is not identified as a priority site. |
| Management Plans or Conservation Plans | None applicable |

| Community Board Plan 2017-19 | Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Plan 2017-19  |
| Strong Communities | Advocate for and support improvement of Central City residential areas to bring about a vibrant centre that people are drawn to live in. |

**Prosperous Economy**
Promotion of Christchurch as tourist destination for active lifestyles in a stunning natural setting. [Link](https://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/The-Council/Community-Boards/Linwood-Central-Heathcote-Community-Board-Plan.pdf)

#### Technical

| Materials | Concrete with painted mural |
| Structural engineering | Reviewed by CCC Structural Engineer Paul Ferguson. Installation design and plans attached as appendix 2. |
| Fabricators | Not applicable |

#### Maintenance

<p>| Condition of Artwork | In good condition. |
| Maintenance plan | Monthly wash down with non-ionic cleaner $4800 annually  |
| | Graffiti removal annually provisional $1000  |
| | Annual check of bolt and dowel - $100 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks Estimated Maintenance costs</th>
<th>$5800 annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>A unique opportunity to publicly display objects of social and cultural history. The semi-permanent location near Victoria Square provides a quick win in terms of having the work publically accessible in time for the 30th anniversary of the Berlin Wall coming down, and making use of 2018/10 available budget from the Urban Regeneration team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Notes</td>
<td>Project Working Party report goes to Blair Jackson to progress through the Public Art Advisory Group (PAAG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brent Smith - Principal Advisor Citizens &amp; Community to write report for Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Sign-Offs</td>
<td>Brent Smith - Principal Advisor Citizens &amp; Community to manage through to Mary Richardson – General Manager Citizens and Community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 1: Endowment Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schenkungsvertrag</th>
<th>Endowment Contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zwischen</td>
<td>between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP Beratungsgesellschaft mbH</td>
<td>Represented by Managing Director Elmar Prost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vertreten durch den Geschäftsführer Elmar Prost</td>
<td>Behlertstraße 7, 14469 Potsdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>und</td>
<td>- Im Folgenden „EMP GmbH“ genannt -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Im Folgenden „EMP GmbH“ genannt -</td>
<td>- hereinafter “EMP GmbH” -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAPE Public Art Trust</td>
<td>SCAPE Public Art Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vertreten durch Chair Paige Guthbert und Director Deborah McCormick</td>
<td>Level 1, 301 Montreal Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christchurch 8140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Im Folgenden „SCAPE“ genannt -</td>
<td>- hereinafter “SCAPE” -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Vorbemerkungen**

Die EMP GmbH ist Eigentümer von Betonteil-
len der Berliner Mauer, die derzeit auf den im 
Eigen tum der Klüs ters Baustoffwerke 
GmbHCo KG stehenden Grundstücken in 
Teltow, Oderstr. 13-21, 14513 Teltow, ste-
hen.

Die Mauerteile sind durch fortlaufende Num-
men gekennzeichnet.

2. **Schenkung**

Die EMP GmbH schenkt SCAPE hiermit die im 
Eigentum der EMP GmbH stehenden Mauerte-
ile mit den Nummern:

| 88 und 143 |

Im Folgenden als "Mauerteile" bezeichnet.

3. **Eigentums- und Besitzverschaffung**

3.1 Die Mauerteile stehen ab sofort auf dem 
Grundstück Oderstr. 13-21, 14513 Tel-
tow zur Abholung bereit und werden bis 
spätestens 31.12.2016 durch SCAPE dort 

Endowment

EMP GmbH is the owner of sections of the Ber-
lin Wall, which currently stand on the 
property of the Klüs ters Baustoffwerke 
GmbHCo KG in Teltow, Oderstr. 13-21, 14513 Teltow.

The wall sections are consecutively numbered.

EMP GmbH endows SCAPE herewith the wall 
sections, currently owned by EMP GmbH, with 
the following numbers:

88 and 143

These are hereinafter referred to as "wall 
sections".

The wall sections are immediately available for 
pickup on the premises Oderstr. 13-21, 14513 Teltow and will be collected by...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Auflagen</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Steuern, Abgaben, Zollformalitäten</th>
<th>Taxes, levies, custom formalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sofern Schenkungssteuer oder sonstige Abgaben anfallen, trägt diese SCAPE als Beschenkter für die zollrechtliche Abwicklung und Erledigung der Ausfuhrformalitäten ist SCAPE verantwortlich.</td>
<td>To the extent that endowment tax or other levies are charged, these will be covered by SCAPE as the receiver of the wall sections. SCAPE is responsible for customs clearance and any export-related formalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Sonstiges</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Sollte eine Bestimmung dieses Vertrages unwirksam sein oder werden, so berührt dies die Wirksamkeit der übrigen Bestimmungen nicht. Anstelle der unwirksamen Bestimmung gilt das Gesetz.</td>
<td>Sollte eine Bestimmung dieses Vertrages unwirksam sein oder werden, so berührt dies die Wirksamkeit der übrigen Bestimmungen nicht. Anstelle der unwirksamen Bestimmung gilt das Gesetz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Zusicherung

Die EMP GmbH sichert zu, dass das übertragene Eigentum unbelastet ist (d.h. frei von Rechten Dritter ist) und dass unbeschränkt berechtigt ist, das Eigentum an den Mauerste­llen (ohne Rechte an der Bemalung) an SCAPE zu übertragen.

### Warranty

EMP GmbH warrants that ownership will pass unencumbered (free of any security over the two Berlin Wall pieces) and that they have the ownership rights to pass the two Berlin Wall sections to SCAPE (without the rights on the paintings).

### 8. SCAPE als Erfüllungsgehilfe für den Christchurch City Council

8.1 SCAPE handelt als Erfüllungsgehilfe für den Christchurch City Council, um die Mauerste­llen zu beschaffen und nach Christchurch zu transportieren.

8.2 Der Christchurch City Council wird Eigentümer der Mauerste­llen werden und verantwortlich für ihre Aufstellung, Ausstellung und Wartung sein.

### SCAPE Public Art Agent for Christchurch City Council

SCAPE will act as agent for the Christchurch City Council to arrange aspects of the procurement and transport of the two Berlin Wall pieces to Christchurch.

### Potsdam, im August 2016

Christchurch, New Zealand, 8/08/2016

### EMP GmbH

Elmar Prost
Geschäftsführer/Managing Director

### SCAPE Public Art Trust

Paige Cuthbert
Chair

### Deborah McCormick
Director
### Berlin Wall Comparative Evaluation Matrix

#### Site Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raoura - Gloucester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raoura - Lichfield (two potential sites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commons/Victoria Sq./Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otākaro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Functionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Raoura - Gloucester</th>
<th>Raoura - Lichfield</th>
<th>Cathedral Square</th>
<th>Commons/Victoria Sq./Link</th>
<th>Otākaro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good-Excellent</td>
<td>Good-Excellent</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good-Excellent</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good-Excellent</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good-Excellent</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Raoura - Gloucester</th>
<th>Raoura - Lichfield</th>
<th>Cathedral Square</th>
<th>Commons/Victoria Sq./Link</th>
<th>Otākaro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Limited use as an event space currently. Placement here does not impact use of surrounding spaces for the scale of events likely to be supported in close proximity to a residential area. Development of temporary recreational zone adjacent with moderate use by younger travellers and locals.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate Limited use as an event space currently. Placement here does not impact use of surrounding spaces for the future within broader plans for Cathedral Sq.</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Limited use as an event space currently. Placement here does not impact use of surrounding spaces for the future within broader plans for Cathedral Sq.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor Sloping grassed area which could accommodate smaller groups, intimate space more difficult to create. Significant trees in the space which would change view dependent on persons approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Raoura - Gloucester</th>
<th>Raoura - Lichfield</th>
<th>Cathedral Square</th>
<th>Commons/Victoria Sq./Link</th>
<th>Otākaro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Raoura - Gloucester</th>
<th>Raoura - Lichfield</th>
<th>Cathedral Square</th>
<th>Commons/Victoria Sq./Link</th>
<th>Otākaro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Raoura - Gloucester</th>
<th>Raoura - Lichfield</th>
<th>Cathedral Square</th>
<th>Commons/Victoria Sq./Link</th>
<th>Otākaro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- Access to Arinaq St and Durham St.
- Sloping grades and gravel pathway for pedestrians. Limited cycle access. Public transport hub at some distance. Public ownership easement or licence to occupy would be required for access for install and maintenance.
- Sloping grassed area which could accommodate smaller groups, intimate space more difficult to create. Significant trees in the space which would change view dependent on persons approach.
**Council**

11 July 2019

**Attachment B**

**Item 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacencies:</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with existing and potential future adjacent development/activities.</td>
<td>Future residential developments are planned for the East Frame Ruatahia. Placing this artwork in the area may challenge future looking aspiration of the precinct.</td>
<td>Cathedral Square is currently busy with a range of buildings, sculptures, structures and food and craft vendors, as well as construction hoardings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst:</td>
<td>Excellent-Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A site that will act as a catalyst for recovery of the central area.</td>
<td>New anchor/destination. Good proximity to core of central city. Easily walkable from core. Contributes to an area with recreational activities present.</td>
<td>Torango is a significant attraction and destination already. These works would not add to this greatly. Excellent proximally to Anchor Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty:</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent-Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A site that has sufficient certainty in relation to context and adjacencies.</td>
<td>Relatively known, no significant uncertainty except timing of developments in the future.</td>
<td>Good proximity to core of central city. Easily walkable from core.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence:</td>
<td>Good-Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A site with the potential for visible connections to its surroundings.</td>
<td>Locations along the East Frame Ruatahia are visible and relatively open. Distance from Manchester and Gloucester Streets may limit opportunity for engagement.</td>
<td>Development of The Commons and restoration of the amphitheatre unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity:</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A site that is not affected / compromised by cultural or social sensibilities.</td>
<td>Site is part of green space incorporated into new inner city residential development.</td>
<td>Many interests in this area including heritage, religious, cultural (Ngā Tahu) and recreational (events).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Meaning:</td>
<td>Good-Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A site that can develop its own meaning and significance over time, rather than a site which already has a fixed meaning/symbolism, unknown significance.</td>
<td>The area has been developed to create housing within the Central City and will form a distinct identity over time which will incorporate new artworks.</td>
<td>Many interests in this area including heritage, religious, cultural (Ngā Tahu) and recreational (events).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good-Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate-Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The area has been developed to create housing within the Central City and will form a distinct identity over time which will incorporate new artworks.</td>
<td>The relative sheltered nature of the site as an access way between the Town Hall, The Commons and old Courts has potential to develop its own story. Proximity to Floral clock may impact on this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEANING:**

**Sensitivity:**

- A site that is not affected / compromised by cultural or social sensibilities.
- Site is part of green space incorporated into new inner city residential development.
- Many interests in this area including heritage, religious, cultural (Ngā Tahu) and recreational (events).

**Presence:**

- Locations along the East Frame Ruatahia are visible and relatively open.
- The area is imbued with strong cultural and social meaning and sensibilities.
- The relative sheltered nature of the site as an access way between the Town Hall, The Commons and old Courts has potential to develop its own story.

**Certainty:**

- Relatively known, no significant uncertainty except timing of developments in the future.
- Good proximity to core of central city.
- Development of The Commons and restoration of the amphitheatre unknown.

**Catalyst:**

- New anchor/destination. Good proximity to core of central city.
- Torango is a significant attraction and destination already.
- Excellent proximally to Anchor Projects.

**Adjectives:**

- Excellent-Good
- Good
- Adequate
- Good-Adequate
- Adequate-Poor
- Poor

**Criteria:**

- Adequate: Future residential developments are planned for the East Frame Ruatahia. Placing this artwork in the area may challenge future looking aspiration of the precinct.
- Adequate: Cathedral Square is currently busy with a range of buildings, sculptures, structures and food and craft vendors, as well as construction hoardings. Torango is a significant attraction and destination already. These works would not add to this greatly. Excellent proximally to Anchor Projects.
- Adequate-Poor: Many interests in this area including heritage, religious, cultural (Ngā Tahu) and recreational (events).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity: Whether the site has connection to features that enhance the setting - views, water, trees, shelter, and aspect.</th>
<th>Good Excellent</th>
<th>Good Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Good Excellent</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The area features lots of open space currently through much of this is planned for housing. Gardens and broad pathways have been created through the area.</td>
<td>The area features lots of open space currently through much of this is planned for housing. Gardens and broad pathways have been created through the area.</td>
<td>Would be framed by buildings.</td>
<td>Large open green spaces with current plans incorporating artwork, heritage elements. Trees frame the site.</td>
<td>High amenity area with mature trees and gardens providing a strong setting, however trees do shade large areas. Not immediately adjacent to the Avon but in close proximity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICIES AND PLANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment: Whether installation of the artwork aligns with policies or plans in place.</th>
<th>Anchor Project</th>
<th>Anchor Project</th>
<th>Heritage Setting</th>
<th>Heritage Setting</th>
<th>Heritage Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Raоторi The East Frame will be a new residential area in the heart of the city, built around a large park. It will be enhanced by cafes, restaurants and outdoor entertainment areas.</em></td>
<td><em>Raоторi The East Frame will be a new residential area in the heart of the city, built around a large park. It will be enhanced by cafes, restaurants and outdoor entertainment areas.</em></td>
<td><em>May require resource consent for an alteration to the setting</em></td>
<td><em>May require resource consent for an alteration to the setting</em></td>
<td><em>May require resource consent for an alteration to the setting</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND VALUE**

| Approximate value: Based on current comparable metre squared rates. |  |

**MATTERS/ISSUES TO NOTE**

| Easy access. Can be achieved within budget. | Excellent access for installation. Can be achieved within budget. Two possible sites identified. | Access possible though would disrupt surrounding uses (Te ringa and Hotel). Can be achieved within budget. | Ground level raised so no need to break ground below original paved area. Excellent access for installation. Can make use of existing lighting. Can be achieved within budget. Temporary sitting here 5-10 years. | Access difficulties for installation, and cost to install beyond budget (sloping site with requirement to engage archaeologist). May not be achieved within budget. |
1. Purpose of Report

The Regulatory Performance Committee held a meeting on 5 June 2019 and is circulating the Minutes recorded to the Council for its information.

2. Recommendation to Council

That the Council receives the Minutes from the Regulatory Performance Committee meeting held 5 June 2019.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Minutes Regulatory Performance Committee - 5 June 2019</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liz Ryley - Committee Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regulatory Performance Committee
OPEN MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 5 June 2019
Time: 2pm
Venue: Committee Room 1, Level 2, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch
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The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   
   Part C  
   Committee Resolved RPCM/2019/00010
   
   That an apology from Councillor Templeton for early departure, be accepted.
   
   Councillor Scandrett/Councillor Chen  
   Carried

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   Part B  
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   
   Part C  
   Committee Resolved RPCM/2019/00011
   
   That the minutes of the Regulatory Performance Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 3 April 2019 be confirmed.
   
   Councillor Gough/Councillor Chen  
   Carried

4. **Public Forum**
   
   Part B  
   There were no public forum presentations.

5. **Deputations by Appointment**
   
   Part B  
   There were no deputations by appointment.

6. **Presentation of Petitions**
   
   Part B  
   There was no presentation of petitions.
7. **Christchurch City Council BCA Accreditation Assessment 2019**

   **Committee Comment**
   
   1. Sam Hay, Head of Business Solutions, spoke to the IANZ report.
   2. The Committee passed on its thanks for the work carried out by the staff to achieve the BCA accreditation.

   **Committee Resolved RPCM/2019/00012**

   **Part C**
   
   That the Regulatory Performance Committee:
   
   1. Receive the information in this report.

   Councillor Chen/Councillor Galloway  
   
   **Carried**

   Councillor Templeton left the meeting at 2:10 pm during discussion on Item 7, and returned to the meeting following the conclusion of Item 7.

8. **Building Consenting Unit Update**

   **Committee Resolved RPCM/2019/00013**

   **Part C**
   
   That the Regulatory Performance Committee:
   
   1. Receive the information in the Building Consenting unit update report.

   Councillor Chen/Councillor Galloway  
   
   **Carried**


   **Committee Resolved RPCM/2019/00014**

   **Part C**
   
   That the Regulatory Performance Committee:
   

   Councillor Scandrett/Councillor East  
   
   **Carried**

10. **Regulatory Performance Committee - Regulatory Compliance Unit Status Report**

    **Committee Comment**
1. The Committee requested that “Abandoned/Vacant Properties” only be included in the report in exceptional circumstances.

**Committee Resolved RPCM/2019/00015**

**Part C**

That the Regulatory Performance Committee:

1. Receive the information in the Regulatory Compliance Unit Status Report.

Councillor Gough/Councillor Galloway

Carried

Councillor Templeton departed at 2.48pm.

**Meeting concluded at 2.49pm.**

**CONFIRMED THIS 3RD DAY OF JULY 2019**

COUNCILLOR JAMES GOUGH
CHAIRMAN
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1. Purpose of Report
   The Audit and Risk Management Committee held a meeting on 18 June 2019 and is circulating the Minutes recorded to the Council for its information.

2. Recommendation to Council
   That the Council receives the Minutes from the Audit and Risk Management Committee meeting held 18 June 2019.
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The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   - **Part C**
   - **Committee Resolved ARCM/2019/00026**
     - That the apologies from Councillor East and Deputy Mayor Turner be accepted.
     - Councillor Clearwater/Mayor
     - Carried

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   - **Part B**
   - There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   - **Part C**
   - **Committee Resolved ARCM/2019/00027**
     - That the minutes of the Audit and Risk Management Committee meeting held on Thursday, 30 May 2019 be confirmed.
     - Mr Rondel/Ms Wallace
     - Carried

4. **Public Forum**
   - **Part B**
   - There were no public forum presentations.

5. **Deputations by Appointment**
   - **Part B**
   - There were no deputations by appointment.

6. **Presentation of Petitions**
   - **Part B**
   - There was no presentation of petitions.
7. Committee-Only Time with Auditors for Public Excluded Items

   Part B
   It was noted that under its Terms of Reference, the Committee should meet with the internal and the external auditors without Management present at each meeting where external reporting is approved, and at other meetings if requested by any of the parties. This Committee-only time with the auditors to be part of the consideration of a relevant item on the public excluded agenda and requested during the consideration of the item.

8. Updated Risk Management Policy

   Committee Resolved ARCM/2019/00028 (Original Staff Recommendations Accepted without Change)

   Part C
   That the Audit and Risk Management Committee:
   1. Endorses the updated draft Risk Management Policy.
   Deputy Chair Manji/Ms Wallace  Carried

   Committee Decided ARCM/2019/00029 (Original Staff Recommendations Accepted without Change)

   Part A
   That the Audit and Risk Management Committee recommends that the Council:
   1. Approves the updated draft Risk Management Policy.
   2. Requests that a joint briefing with elected members and executive management is scheduled after the 2019 elections to discuss the refreshed expectations set within this policy.
   Deputy Chair Manji/Ms Wallace  Carried

9. Report Back on Weather Tightness

   Committee Resolved ARCM/2019/00030 (Original Staff Recommendations Accepted without Change)

   Part C
   That the Audit and Risk Management Committee:
   1. Receive this report on future claims under the Weathertight Home Resolution Service Act.
   Ms Wallace/Mr Rondel  Carried
10 Resolution to Exclude the Public
Committee Resolved ARCM/2019/00031

Part C

That at 1:35pm the resolution to exclude the public set out on pages 35 to 36 of the agenda be adopted.

Ms Wallace/Mr Rondel

Carried

The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 1:52pm.

Meeting concluded at 1:53pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 28TH DAY OF AUGUST 2019

KIM WALLACE
CHAIRPERSON
17. Updated Risk Management Policy

Reference: 19/676258
Presenter(s): Shaun Dowers, Head of Risk and Audit

1. Audit and Risk Management Committee Decisions Under Delegation
   (Original Staff Recommendations Accepted without Change)

   Part C

   That the Audit and Risk Management Committee:
   1. Endorses the updated draft Risk Management Policy.

2. Audit and Risk Management Committee Recommendation to Council

   Part A

   That the Council:
   1. Approves the updated draft Risk Management Policy.
   2. Requests that a joint briefing with elected members and executive management is scheduled after the 2019 elections to discuss the refreshed expectations set within this policy.
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1. **Purpose of Report**
   1.1 Present the updated draft Risk Management Policy (attachment A) for endorsement and approval.
   1.2 Note that the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) has recently endorsed the updated draft policy and feedback from the 28 May Councillor briefing is incorporated.

2. **Executive Summary**
   2.1 The Council approved its first Risk Management Policy in September 2015. Since this time, this policy has been implemented through numerous initiatives to improve risk management practice across the organisation - with a goal of improving the Council’s risk maturity.
   2.2 A recent independent Risk Maturity Assessment completed by Deloitte in January 2019 provided a risk maturity benchmark, confirmed progress, and identified opportunities and initiatives to further improve the Council’s risk management maturity. The assessment applied a broad and new risk maturity assessment criteria (known as gERM – all of government Enterprise Risk Maturity assessment framework).
      2.2.1 This independent assessment concluded the Council was at a maturity of M3 (on a 5-rating scale).
   2.3 As well as needing periodic review and refresh, the draft updated Risk Management Policy has factored in our improved risk maturity and incorporated recommendations from the Deloitte maturity assessment. This updated policy will also set the platform for our next phase of risk maturity improvement.

3. **Staff Recommendations**
   That the Audit and Risk Management Committee:
   1. Endorses the updated draft Risk Management Policy.
   2. Recommends the Council approves the updated draft Risk Management Policy.
   3. Recommends to the Council that a joint briefing with elected members and executive management is scheduled after the 2019 elections to discuss the refreshed expectations set within this policy.

4. **Context/Background**
   **Background**
   4.1 In 2015 Christchurch City Council’s Audit and Risk Management Committee expressed that priority was needed to rapidly improve the Council’s risk management framework.
   4.2 In response, the Council’s Risk and Audit unit developed a Risk Management Improvement Plan dated May 2015. This plan set out foundational tasks and actions that were completed in partnership with the Executive Leadership Team (ELT), including establishing policy, process and reporting, along with aligning and refreshing existing risk capture at the executive management level.
4.3 In 2017, the Council’s Risk and Audit team prepared an updated Improvement Plan, which set out an 18-month programme to further embed and improve risk management practice across the Council. This extended actions and initiatives into: governance risk engagement; supporting/enabling business unit risk activity; aligning top/bottom risk capture; and a risk-system implementation. This improvement plan has been largely completed, with the initiatives resulting in ongoing and periodic business engagement, risk reporting and workshop sessions.

**Risk Maturity Assessment**

4.4 An independent Risk Maturity Assessment was completed by Deloitte in January 2019. The assessment provided an independent benchmark, confirmed progress, and identified opportunities and initiatives to further improve the Council’s risk management maturity. The assessment applied a broad and new risk maturity assessment criteria (known as gERM – all of government enterprise risk maturity assessment framework).

4.4.1 This assessment concluded the Council was at a maturity of M3 (on a 5-rating scale).

4.5 The assessment provided thirteen recommendations around opportunities and initiatives to continue building the Council’s risk management maturity beyond a M3 rating. These recommendations fall into the following four categories:

- Leadership / direction;
- People / development;
- Process / tools; and
- Business performance.

4.6 ELT has subsequently approved a Risk Improvement Plan in May 2019 with a schedule of initiatives to address these recommendations.

4.7 The Deloitte assessment agreed with draft policy content regarding risk appetite, and provided guidance and recommendations for two further policy improvements, including:

- definition for risk culture along with clear expectations; and
- what risk management should achieve (the benefits and outcomes of risk management).

**Key Policy Changes**

4.8 The main changes to current policy are driven from the Council’s improvement in risk maturity (becoming more of a governance and principles level document), the recommendations from the Deloitte Risk Maturity Assessment, and some minor changes from the updated ISO Risk Management Guideline. In summary, these changes involve:

- Incorporation of risk culture language and concept.
- A clearer policy statement and language throughout.
- Inclusion of risk management principles (previously in Council risk guidance documentation).
- A new expression for risk appetite.

**Risk Appetite**

4.9 A key change within the draft policy includes a clearer definition and expression for risk appetite.
4.9.1 The ISO 31000 risk management standard defines risk appetite as the "Amount and type of risk that an organization is prepared to pursue, retain or take to achieve its objectives".

4.9.2 Section 3.2 within the draft policy defines the Council’s risk appetite as “the level of risk or uncertainty that the Council is willing to accept or take-on in pursuit of achieving our objectives”.

4.10 This draft policy recognises that for any business the taking on of risk to achieve objectives is at times necessary. Regardless, every business also recognises that in taking on any risk (with negative or positive outcomes) this risk exposure is expected to be managed.

4.11 The policy defines three risk appetite grades - these being “risk adverse”, “risk neutral” and “risk seeking” (refer section 3.2 of the policy for more detailed definition). As indicated in the table below, this grading scale is applied to each of the Council’s seven risk categories (illustrated below using CCC’s logo as the indicator of the risk grading). This then provides an overall risk appetite profile for the Council as provided in the updated policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Risk Appetite Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers / citizens</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Blue Logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise our front facing interactions and services provided to customers and citizens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Operations</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Blue Logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise or disrupt the state or operation of infrastructure and assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Engagement</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Blue Logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise the performance and/or the engagement of staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Blue Logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise financial stability and reporting, credit rating or lending covenants, and/or the return from our assets/investments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Safety and Wellbeing</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Blue Logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise the health, safety and wellbeing of staff, citizens, suppliers, contractors and members of the public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Blue Logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks that could improve/compromise the trust, confidence and reputation Council has with our citizens, public, central government and other stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Blue Logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise ecosystems, or impact/displace native species of wildlife/plant/fauna.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item No.: 17
4.12 In general, the Council’s overall risk profile is “risk adverse”, which is common for public sector organisations given the obligations around transparency and accountability. There are also some obvious individual risk categories like finance and health, safety and wellbeing that Council would be seeking to manage associated risks with negative impacts as a priority.

4.13 This overall risk appetite profile does not prevent the Council from taking on risk, where it may be beneficial to pursue positive outcomes. For example, opening a new swimming pool or implementing online payments for rates and dog registrations. It instead sets out expectations that risks are managed.

4.14 With most operational and council decisions, there are a mix of risks that span across different risk categories, and therefore these need to be balanced or prioritised.

4.14.1 For example, opening a swimming pool balances risks in health, safety and wellbeing (trips, slips through to drowning), financial risk (build and operating cost/revenue), and risks in meeting service level expectations (type of facility and opening hours).

4.14.2 The appetite expression can help to balance these risks, indicating for example that managing health, safety and wellbeing risks might be prioritised at the expense of associated financial risk.

4.15 The risk appetite profile for each risk category is also an ‘in-general’ expression. Sometimes the risk appetite for particular categories can shift depending on the situation. This policy provides the flexibility for potential decisions or situations that require a different risk appetite stance. Under these circumstances, the policy supports this through escalation/transparency mechanisms to ensure decisions are informed and made at appropriate levels.

4.16 The following examples have been included to help in understanding the application of this policy and new risk appetite approach:

**Decision to allow e-scooters in Christchurch**

4.16.1 This decision balanced Council objectives regarding improving the vibrancy of the city with risks regarding the Council and Christchurch’s reputation, health, safety and wellbeing of our city’s people, and the financial risk in taking on a new business model for e-scooter sharing.

4.16.2 The resulting decision by the Council to allow a trial e-scooter model in Christchurch accounted for this balance (i.e. considering supplier, equipment, financial modelling and public reaction).

**Decision to chlorinate drinking water**

4.16.3 This decision balanced risk regarding the Council and Christchurch’s reputation for having pure unchlorinated water, the Council fulfilling its regulatory obligations, financial implications to treat water and repair/upgrade infrastructure and the ability to repair/upgrade infrastructure without functional interruption of essential operations (drinking water).

4.16.4 The decision to chlorinate was reflective of the risk adverse grading applicable to the legislative and reputation risk categories. The decision to chlorinate avoided a regulator action or intervention.
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## 1. SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Introduction

All organisations are exposed to risk. Managing risks through culture, discipline and process, greatly enhances our ability to achieve objectives, deliver service, and create value and positive outcomes for the Council and people of Christchurch.

The Council is a diverse organisation that delivers a broad range of services to the people of Christchurch, and as such faces a wide range of different types of risks posing up and downsides for our organisation.

The purpose of this policy is to clearly set out and communicate the requirements and expectations for effective risk management by staff at all levels, for all types of risks, and across all activities of the Council.

Risk management at its core, applies discipline and process that enables more informed decisions. Risk management is required to be a part of all functions and activities of the Council, including strategic planning, decision-making, operational activity, and service delivery. In this broader context, the Council also sets out decision-making limits and strategic objectives within a number of key documents. These assist with risk management and enable business operation whilst maintaining alignment and appropriate decision-making levels. These include (but not limited to):

- Strategic Framework;
- Annual and Long Term Plans; and
- Delegations Register.

### 1.2 Context


This Policy is a formal and essential component of the Councils risk management framework covering:

- Risk Management Principles, adopted from ISO 31000;
- The Councils appetite for risk;
- Risk management culture, and leadership; and
- Risk management responsibilities for all Council staff.
2 SECTION 2 – POLICY STATEMENT

Policy

2.1 The Council is committed to integrating effective risk management into all aspects of Council’s activities. This includes integrating risk management into Council culture, planning and strategies, business operations, projects and decision-making processes.

2.9 All staff are required to follow this policy, through undertaking their risk management responsibilities outlined in section 3.3. This includes promoting our culture of managing risk, and applying the risk management principles, appetite and process/guidance provided in this policy to their everyday business functional planning, decisions and operational activity.

3 SECTION 3 – APPLICATION

Application

3.1 Risk Management Principles

The Council has adopted and reinforces the application of the risk management principles established within ISO 31000.

These risk management principles are the foundation for good organisational risk management and underpin the Council’s risk management framework. They create and protect the Council’s values and support the achievement of objectives.

The risk management principles are outlined below.

Risk management is:

**An integral part of all Council processes and decision making;**

Risk Management is not a stand-alone activity, separate from the main activities and processes within Council. Risk management is integral to all organisational activities. This means considering and managing uncertainty through daily and strategic planning, decision making and operational activity.

Risk management helps decision makers at all levels of the Council understand and deal with the uncertainties they face in pursuit of their objectives. Risk management allows decision makers to make informed choices, prioritise actions and distinguish among alternative courses of action.

**Systematic, structured and comprehensive;**

A structured and comprehensive risk management approach contributes to consistent and comparable results.

**Customised;**

The Council’s risk management framework and process are customised and proportionate to the organization’s external and internal context related to its objectives.
**Transparent and inclusive;**
Appropriate and timely involvement of stakeholders enables their knowledge, views and perceptions to be considered. This results in improved awareness and informed risk management.

**Dynamic, iterative and responsive to change;**
Risks can emerge, change or disappear as the Council’s external and internal context changes. Managing risk needs to anticipate, detect, acknowledge and respond to these changes and events in an appropriate and timely manner.

**Based on the best available information;**
The inputs to risk management are based on information sources such as historical data, experience, observations, forecasts and judgment. Managers should take into account any limitations and uncertainties with the data and information used.

**Inclusive of human and cultural influence; and is**
Human behaviour and culture significantly influence all aspects of risk management at each level and stage.

**Continually improving.**
Risk management is continually improved through learning and experience.

### 3.2 Risk Appetite and Tolerance

We define risk appetite as representing the level of risk or uncertainty that the Council is willing to accept or take-on in pursuit of achieving our objectives.

Taking on risk (uncertainties) in order to achieve Council objectives is recognised as necessary, and some of these risks will be significant. Risk appetite has been graded across three levels of appetite, being: risk adverse, risk neutral, and risk seeking, which are defined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Appetite Grade Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk seeking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When applied to the various categories of risk in our business, shown in the table below, we build our profile for acceptable risk appetite and tolerance across the Council. This shapes our risk management culture, planning, operations, decision making, process and guidance.

Council expects that identified risks across the various categories are assessed, treated and managed within these appetite levels.

The Council has extended these risk appetite grading’s into a risk assessment framework (attached at Appendix A). This facilitates a practical and consistent
application to derive risk ratings, and prescribe minimum risk escalation, ownership and reporting requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Risk Appetite Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customers / citizens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise our front facing interactions and services provided to customers and citizens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise or disrupt the state or operation of infrastructure and assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise the performance and/or the engagement of staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise financial stability and reporting, credit rating or lending covenants, and/or the return from our assets/investments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Safety and Wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise the health, safety and wellbeing of staff, citizens, suppliers, contractors and members of the public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks that could improve/compromise the trust, confidence and reputation Council has with our citizens, public, central government and other stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise ecosystems, or impact/displace native species of wildlife/plant/fauna.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks/uncertainties that could improve/compromise our compliance with statutory/regulatory obligations or other applicable laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 This Policy is a formal and essential component of the Council’s risk management framework. Other key components are summarised below.

3.3.1 Risk Management Culture

The Council desires a risk management culture, where all staff instinctively manage risk through daily and strategic planning, decision making and operational activity. Our culture extends an expectation that risk management principles, appetite and process are intrinsically applied throughout the Council to enhance the achievement of positive objectives and outcomes.
3.3.2 Risk Management Leadership
The Council has established strong risk management leadership within governance and management structures. This includes:
- A Council Audit and Risk Management Committee;
- An Executive Leadership Team Risk Management Group; and
- A Risk and Audit Unit.
These groups each have formal Terms of References’ or Charters’ that detail their roles in leading, supporting and assessing/challenging the Councils risk management culture and process. This aligns with ISO 31000, and helps the Council:
- Align risk management with objectives, strategy and culture;
- Ensure necessary resources are allocated to managing risk;
- Establish the amount and type of risk that may or may not be taken;
- Communicate the value of risk management to the organisation and its stakeholders;
- Ensure the risk management framework remains appropriate to the context of the organisation.

3.3.3 Risk Management Guidance, Tools and Templates
The Council has established guidance, tools and templates to assist in risk management application and consistency.
These guidance, tools and templates can be found on the Risk and Audit team webpage, and are linked in Section 5 of this policy: References and Related Documents.
### 3.4 Risk Management Roles and Responsibilities

Everyone has a role to play in knowing, understanding and managing risk at Christchurch City Council, set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person(s)</th>
<th>Risk Management Roles and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Council Elected Members                        | • Approve the Council’s Risk Management Policy setting the tone for risk culture, appetite, tolerance and management across the organisation.  
                                               | • Understand and assist identifying the most significant risks to the Council, and gain comfort from management over the management of these risks.  
                                               | • Apply the risk management principles and appetite to decision making.                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Audit and Risk Management Committee (ARMC)     | • Assist the Council to discharge its responsibilities by making recommendations to the Council and/or management on the robustness of risk management systems, process and practice. This includes assisting with the determination of risk appetite, review of managements’ risk management framework and consideration of whether appropriate action is being taken by management to mitigate Council’s significant risks. (Extracted from the Committee’s Terms of Reference). |
| Committee and Community Board Members          | • Apply the risk management principles and appetite. Understand and gain comfort over key planning and decision-related risks and the treatments proposed/in-place.                                                                             |
| Chief Executive Officer                        | • Apply the risk management principles and appetite.  
                                               | • Understand and assist identifying the most significant risks to the Council, and gain comfort over the treatments proposed/in-place.                                                                                                         |
|                                               | • Maintain an effective Risk Management culture, by providing leadership in risk management, and ensuring key decisions take risk into account.                                                                                               |
|                                               | • Accountable to Council Elected Members and the ARMC for the effective and efficient management of strategic, operational and project risks.                                                                                                |
| Executive Leadership Team (ELT)                | • Apply the risk management principles and appetite.  
                                               | • Understand and assist identifying the most significant risks to the Council, and seek/gain/provide comfort over the treatments proposed/in-place.                                                                                     |
|                                               | • Assist the Chief Executive Officer to maintain an effective risk management culture, by providing leadership in risk management, and ensuring key decisions take risk into account.                                                             |
|                                               | • Endorse, lead and deliver risk management improvement initiatives scheduled within a risk management improvement programme.                                                                                                                  |
|                                               | • Utilise the Risk Management Team to identify, regularly review, manage, report and escalate the most significant Council risks to the ELT, ARMC and Council.                                                                                       |
### Person(s) | Risk Management Roles and Responsibilities
--- | ---
**Risk Management Team** | • Facilitate, cultivate and support application of Council’s risk management principles, appetite and process through:  
  o Reporting on and escalating risks and risk management activity to the ELT and, on their behalf, to the ARMC and Council Elected Members.  
  o Develop/maintain guidance, tools and templates, and provide support, coaching, and advice to Unit Heads, Managers and their staff regarding risk management.  
  o Propose and support ELT’s delivery of a risk management improvement programme, containing scheduled initiatives for improving risk management maturity across the Council.

**Heads, Managers and Leaders of teams** | • Apply Council’s risk management principles and appetite and provide leadership in risk management by ensuring  
  o key decisions take risk into account, and  
  o systems, procedures and controls are in place, so that risks affecting their functional objectives, planning and operations are managed to an acceptable level as defined by the Council’s risk appetite.  
  • Apply risk management discipline, process, and assessment ratings set out in the Council’s guidance, tools, and templates.  
  • Embed Risk Management Culture, by ensuring their teams and staff understand and are aware of this policy, their role and the systems, procedures and controls in place to manage Council risk.

**Employees / Staff** | • Understand Council’s risk management principles and appetite and use the risk management guidance, tools and templates in everyday planning and decision-making.

### 3.5 Evaluation and improvement.
For the policy to remain relevant and effective, it is fundamental that changes in the organisation, its personnel and its objectives are identified, monitored and reviewed, and action taken to update this Policy and risk management practice as necessary.

Formal review of this Risk Management Policy will occur every three years (in line with the Council’s Long Term Plan), but certain conditions should initiate an ad-hoc revision. These include (but are not limited to), a change in Council strategic objectives or a significant change in regulatory environment.
4 SECTION 4 – DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>The effect of uncertainty on objectives. A potential event or occurrence that helps or hinders one or more Council objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk appetite</td>
<td>Risk appetite represents the amount of risk an organisation will tolerate as it seeks to achieve its objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>The combination of specialist and general activities undertaken to methodically address risks (identify, assess, treat, monitor and report risk). Risk Management encompasses the full Risk Process (refer to Appendix 1), and is further defined within the guidance and templates developed/maintained by the Risk Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Activities to mitigate and/or control risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inherent risk</td>
<td>The expression to describe un-managed risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual risk</td>
<td>The expression to describe managed risks (after factoring in existing treatments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>A hazard is an object or situation that could cause a risk. Applying risk management methodology/process (where relevant) would consider the impact/risk that could occur, and the likelihood of occurrence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>An issue is a risk that has or is occurring. There may be risk or uncertainty associated with the extent of damage/impact that the issue causes, and the actions/costs/timeframes to resolve. Risk Management discipline can and should be applied to these avenues of uncertainty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 SECTION 5 – REFERENCES AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

This policy should be read in conjunction with the:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Strategic Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Council Annual and Long Term Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Delegations Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Risk Management Guide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 SECTION 6 – DEVIATION FROM POLICY

Once this policy has been implemented, any deviations from this policy can only be made with the approval of the Policy Owner.

Failure to comply with the requirements of this policy may be considered a breach of your contract or employment agreement.

Contact the owner of this policy, your Manager or Risk and Audit Unit for advice regarding potential breaches of a policy.
APPENDIX 1 – RISK ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

This risk assessment framework extends the Council’s risk appetite (expressed in section 3.2) into a practical model for application. This consists of a Risk Response table, Risk Rating Matrix and definitions for Risk Likelihood and Risk Impact.

The risk rating matrix and definitions are used to assess and determine a risk rating, and helps to drive a level of consistency across the Council. While the risk response table sets out minimum risk escalation, ownership and reporting requirements.

The Risk Assessment Framework is a guide and should be applied in conjunction with the Council’s risk appetite.

Risk Response table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residual Risk Rating</th>
<th>Risk Ownership and Response</th>
<th>Minimum Escalation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>- Risk ownership: ELT</td>
<td>- Escalate immediately to GM and ELT, and arrange appropriate escalation to ARMC and Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Risk treatment strategies to be developed and implemented immediately.</td>
<td>- Include within risk reporting to ELT and ARMC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A full risk analysis to be undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assigned GM responsibility and with ELT oversight.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Risk is outside of Council Appetite, acceptance without further treatment requires Council approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Risk ownership: Relevant GM</td>
<td>- Escalate immediately to relevant GM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Risk treatment strategies to be developed and implemented as soon as possible.</td>
<td>- Include within risk reporting to ELT and ARMC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A full risk analysis to be undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assigned Unit Head responsibility, managed and reviewed with GM on a regular basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Risk is likely to be outside of Council Appetite, acceptance without further treatment requires ELT approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>- Risk ownership: Unit Head</td>
<td>- Escalate to Unit Head through risk reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implement strategy to monitor and review risk and effectiveness of existing treatments.</td>
<td>- Unit Heads to monitor through unit/team reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider additional treatment if the cost is justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assigned relevant manager responsibilities, with Unit Head oversight.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>- Risk ownership: Relevant Manager</td>
<td>- Escalate to process owner and appropriate business manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Managed by routine business procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In most cases requires no specific actions or treatment strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requires periodic monitoring of existing controls by process owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Risk Rating Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact v Likelihood</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Certain</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unlikely</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Likelihood Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Certain</td>
<td>&gt; 90%</td>
<td>Virtually guaranteed to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>&gt; 70%</td>
<td>Will probably occur in most circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>&gt; 40%</td>
<td>Could occur at some stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>&gt; 10%</td>
<td>Could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>&lt; 10%</td>
<td>May occur only in exceptional circumstances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Risk Impact Definitions

Impact assessment must consider short, medium, and long term effects. Where a risk impact is across multiple factors such as financial and reputation, the highest impact must be used in rating the risk. However, all impacts / factors will require appropriate management action and mitigation.

The impact definitions provided are not extensive and will not cover every scenario. Management’s best judgement through the use of these definitions will likely be required. Assistance from the Risk Management team can also be sought.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management response effort</td>
<td>Managed as a day-to-day event, not requiring management attention / involvement</td>
<td>Managed by line manager with Head of Unit (or equivalent) oversight, under normal operating conditions.</td>
<td>Managed by Head of Unit, with General Manager (or equivalent) oversight.</td>
<td>Active management by General Manager (or equivalent), with CEO oversight.</td>
<td>Significant Executive Management involvement, and/or managed by CEO and with Council oversight/involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers / Front-facing service delivery Unplanned disruption</td>
<td>Negligible/isolated and/or brief impact to customer(s). (E.g. waste bin non-collection at a small number of properties).</td>
<td>Small groups of customers are affected, with disruption lasting up to 1 day. (E.g. unplanned pool closure).</td>
<td>Wider customer group impact such as suburb or a large facility. Disruption extends past 1-day. (E.g. Central Library has sprinkler malfunction causing minor flooding). Or, the impact affects a network of customer groups but with disruption lasting less than 1-day. (E.g. closure of a number of parks due to strong winds. Or library IT network is temporarily down).</td>
<td>A network of customer groups affected (multi-suburb or network of service delivery centres). Disruption extends past 1-day. (E.g. power or key IT system outage lasting for more than 1 day). Or, the impact is on a very broad city scale but with disruption lasting less than 1-day. (E.g. all Council facilities are locked down, lasting a number of hours).</td>
<td>Service delivery disruption impacts on broad Council customers and the city population (e.g. total network failure). Disruption to this broader customer group extends past 1-day. Some form of coordinated response will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure / Operations Unplanned disruption</td>
<td>No measurable disruption to delivery. Negligible performance impact. (E.g. a set of traffic lights defaulting to orange flash for an hour).</td>
<td>Brief (&lt;4hr) impact/outage to core/critical service delivery.</td>
<td>Isolated, or suburb-wide impact to core/critical service delivery/facility, lasting less than 24 hours.</td>
<td>Suburb, multi-suburb or critical facility impact to core service delivery that is extended over 12 hours. (E.g. Hospital loses waste water connection for &gt;12hours).</td>
<td>Suburb, multi-suburb or critical facility impact to core service delivery extending (beyond 36 hours).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff engagement</td>
<td>Minor staffing issues dealt with through normal HR processes</td>
<td>Disengagement across small groups of staff or external stakeholders, resulting in some impact on business operations.</td>
<td>Disengagement across groups of staff disrupting business operations and having some impact on service delivery performance.</td>
<td>Staff disengagement with disruption to business operations impacting on ability to deliver service.</td>
<td>Significant disengagement with ongoing widespread operational disruption having significant impact on ability to deliver service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Loss of key person, or a number of team-members in short succession with some resulting (efficiency) impact on business operations. | Loss of a number of key persons, impacting on re-training with short to medium term impact on businesses operations. Negligible impact to service delivery. | Loss of multiple key persons or a critical staff member with unique and valuable experience / knowledge having extended impact on business operations affecting service delivery. | Loss of 2 or more critical staff with unique and valuable experience / knowledge or large groups/teams of key persons. Extended adverse impact to operations and service delivery. | Short term impact on our CDEM response capability | Extended impact to our CDEM response capability. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational funding loss or cost overrun up to $50K. Unit level net impact is below $50K.</td>
<td>Operational funding loss or cost overrun, with unit level net impact between $50K and $100K.</td>
<td>Operational funding loss or cost overrun, with unit level net impact between $100K and $1M.</td>
<td>Operational funding loss or cost overrun, with unit level net impact exceeding $1M, and with net group level impact below $1M.</td>
<td>Group net operational funding loss or cost overrun greater than $1M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual and unforeseen (based on cash forecast 1-July): A capital project/programme with a net budget under/overspend of &lt;0.5M; Or, a project/programme of smaller value capital works/projects (inc delivery packages) with a net over/underspend of up to 10%.</td>
<td>Annual and unforeseen (based on cash forecast 1-July): A capital project/programme with a net budget under/overspend of 0.5M to 1M; Or, a project/programme of smaller value capital works/projects (inc delivery packages) with a net over/underspend of between 10-25%.</td>
<td>Annual and unforeseen (based on cash forecast 1-July): A capital project/programme with a net budget under/overspend of $1M to $5M; Or, a project/programme of smaller value capital works/projects (inc delivery packages) with a net over/underspend of between 25-50%.</td>
<td>Annual and unforeseen (based on cash forecast 1-July): A capital project/programme with a net budget under/overspend of $5M to $10M; Or, a project/programme of smaller value capital works/projects (inc delivery packages) with a net over/underspend of between $10M to $1B.</td>
<td>Annual and unforeseen (based on cash forecast 1-July): A capital project/programme with a net budget under/overspend of &gt;$10M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated fraud of very low value (under $100k) cash or non-cash items.</td>
<td>&quot;Except-for&quot; audit opinion, relating to uncontrollable events (earthquake).</td>
<td>&quot;Qualified&quot; audit opinion, relating to uncontrollable events (earthquake).</td>
<td>&quot;Qualified&quot; audit opinion, relating to system or management control failure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee fraud of low value cash or non-cash items, up to $1000. Could involve more than one person.</td>
<td>Fraud with a value of up to $1M. Fraud could be isolated or involve others (with some collusion).</td>
<td>Significant fraud exceeding $1M. Fraud could be isolated or involve others (with some collusion).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast breach of lending covenants that is unplanned or without an approval/exception.</td>
<td>Actual breach of lending covenants without approval/exception.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, safety and wellbeing</td>
<td>Injury/illness requiring first-aid treatment. E.g. minor cut requiring plaster, or burn treated with cold water.</td>
<td>Medical treatment not requiring hospital admission. E.g. sprain requiring physiotherapy or a simple fracture.</td>
<td>Injury or illness (health/wellbeing) which results in person being admitted to hospital for &gt;48 hours. E.g. complicated fracture or crushing injury. Lost time injury &lt; 2 weeks. Restricted work case &gt; 28 days.</td>
<td>Seriousness illness or injury resulting in permanent effects to person’s quality of life. Hospital admission &gt;48 hours. E.g. Paralysis or amputated limb. Lost time injury &gt; 2 weeks.</td>
<td>One or more fatalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputational</td>
<td>No or negligible (one-off) media coverage or comment.</td>
<td>Minor short term media coverage with negative correlation and small/local audience.</td>
<td>Negative media coverage with broader audience (regional and/or some national coverage) and involving more than one media agent. Short term focus (&lt;5days).</td>
<td>Negative national media coverage with extended coverage (&gt;5days) involving multiple news and media agents. Sustained negative national and/or international media coverage, with focus investigative segments, re-occurring coverage and involving multiple news and media agents.</td>
<td>Sustained adverse impact on stakeholder confidence with extended effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>Minor non-compliance with legal / regulatory requirements.</td>
<td>Non-compliance with legal / regulatory requirements, resulting in possible investigation, Judicial Review or comment/censure by legal or government authority.</td>
<td>Crown advisory intervention, or other direct intervention or supervision by a regulator. Internal non-compliance (i.e. where Council is regulator).</td>
<td>Civil action or attempt at civil prosecution with potential damages/ fine of &lt;$100,000</td>
<td>Crown managerial intervention, or loss of license to operate service. Criminal prosecution of an officer punishable by imprisonment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Moderate effects on biological or physical environment but little or quickly remedied impact to ecosystem.</td>
<td>Serious environmental effects, such as displacement of species and partial impairment of ecosystem. Reversible but widespread medium term (&lt;12 months) impact/damage to biological or physical environment.</td>
<td>Significant impact on highly valued species or habitats. Reversible, but long term (&lt;5 years) damage to biological or physical environment.</td>
<td>Destruction of significant ecosystem, or significant effects on endangered species or habitat. Irreversible or long term (&gt;5 years) damage to biological or physical environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Te Hononga Council – Papatipu Rūnanga Committee Minutes - 20 June 2019

Reference: 19/701485
Presenter(s): Aidan Kimberley – Committee Advisor

1. Purpose of Report
The Te Hononga Council – Papatipu Rūnanga Committee held a meeting on 20 June 2019 and is circulating the Minutes recorded to the Council for its information.

2. Recommendation to Council
That the Council receives the Minutes from the Te Hononga Council – Papatipu Rūnanga Committee meeting held 20 June 2019.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Minutes Te Hononga Council – Papatipu Rūnanga Committee - 20 June 2019</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signatories

| Author          | Aidan Kimberley - Committee and Hearings Advisor             |
Te Hononga Council - Papatipu Rūnanga Committee
OPEN MINUTES

Date: Thursday 20 June 2019
Time: 5.34pm
Venue: Council Chambers, Level 2, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

Present
Members

Mayor Lianne Dalziel (Chairperson)
Dr Te Maire Tau - Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga (Chairperson)
Councillor Vicki Buck
Councillor Jimmy Chen
Councillor Phil Clearwater
Councillor Pauline Cotter
Councillor David East
Councillor Raf Manji
Deputy Mayor Andrew Turner
Henrietta Carroll - Wairewa Rūnanga
Elizabeth Cunningham - Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata
Elizabeth Brown - Te Taumutu Rūnanga
Gail Gordon - Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke
Rik Tainui - Īnui Rūnanga

In Attendance
Councilor Glenn Livingstone
David Perenara-O’Connell - Te Taumutu Rūnanga

20 June 2019

Principal Advisor
Gabrielle Huria
Principal Advisor Ngai Tahu Relationships

Aidan Kimberley
Committee and Hearings Advisor
941 6566
aidan.kimberley@ccc.govt.nz
www.ccc.govt.nz

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, visit:
www.ccc.govt.nz/the-council/meetings-agendas-and-minutes/
The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   - **Part C**
     - **Committee Resolved THCP/2019/00001**
       - That the apology from Councillor East for lateness be accepted.
       - Deputy Mayor/Member Cunningham
       - **Carried**

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   - **Part B**
     - There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   - **Part C**
     - **Committee Resolved THCP/2019/00002**
       - That the minutes of the Te Hononga Council - Papatipu Rūnanga Committee meeting held on Tuesday, 4 December 2018 be confirmed.
       - Chairperson/Tau/Councillor Chen
       - **Carried**

4. **Public Forum**
   - **Part B**
     - There were no public forum presentations.

5. **Deputations by Appointment**
   - **Part B**
     - There were no deputations by appointment.

6. **Presentation of Petitions**
   - **Part B**
     - There was no presentation of petitions.
     - Councillor East joined the meeting at 5:37 p.m.
7. Building in the Papakainga/Kāinga Nohoanga Zones

Committee Resolved THCP/2019/00003

Part C

That the Te Hononga Council - Papatipu Rūnanga Committee:

1. Receive the information in the report and thank everyone who was involved in the development of the booklets.

2. Request staff to work with Rūnanga to enable development on the Papakainga/Kāinga Nohoanga zones.

3. Requests the Chief Executive to adopt the correct Ngāi Tahu name when referring to Māori Reserves in the South Island in Christchurch City Council documents. The correct name is ‘Kāinga Nohoanga’.

Chairperson Dalziel/Chairperson Tau  

Carried

8. Update on the Work Programme

Committee Resolved THCP/2019/00004

Part C

That the Te Hononga Council - Papatipu Rūnanga Committee:

1. Receive the information in the report.

Chairperson Tau/Councillor Cotter  

Carried

Committee Recommendation to Council/Committee

Part A

That the Te Hononga Council - Papatipu Rūnanga Committee:

1. Receive the information in the report.

9. Other Business

Part B

There was no other business considered at this meeting.

Meeting concluded at 5.56pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 19TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2019
19. Climate Change Programme - Consultation on Draft Targets

Reference: 19/719631
Presenter(s): Emma Davis, Head of Strategic Policy

1. Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee Consideration

The Committee requested staff to add additional context to the consultation document to inform the public why the consultation is occurring. The Committee also requested that the final document, including graphic design, be presented to Councillors prior to being finalised.

2. Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee Recommendation to Council

That the Council:

1. Approve that the consultation document on emissions targets (Attachment B of the report in the agenda), be released for public consultation subject to minor amendments based on feedback from the Committee.

Secretarial Note: Attachment B has been added following the Committee meeting with the additions requested.
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Climate Change Programme - Consultation on Draft Targets

Reference: 19/643803
Presenter(s): Emma Davis, Head of Strategic Policy

1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek a recommendation from the Innovation and Sustainability Committee to the Council to approve that the consultation document on setting emissions targets for the Christchurch District be released for public consultation.

2. Executive Summary
   2.1 The Council resolved CNCL/2019/00063 at its meeting on 11 April to, recognising the urgency of the climate crisis, establish by September 2019 a net carbon neutral target for Christchurch as a whole.

   2.2 The Council has instigated a climate change programme that builds upon the action that Council has taken on climate change to date. This programme of work includes developing a climate change strategy with reference to the existing Climate Smart Strategy and developing the action plans to support this. The full strategy development will be undertaken in the FY19/20 with the first stage being to establish an emissions target for the Christchurch District.

   2.3 An emissions target consultation document has been prepared, for which approval for public consultation is being sought.

3. Staff Recommendations
   That the Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee recommend that Council:

   1. Approve that the consultation document on emissions targets (Attachment A), be released for public consultation.

4. Context/Background
   Opportunity

   4.1 The Christchurch City Council is committed to climate change leadership. The evidence is clear – greenhouse gas emissions are causing unprecedented increases in global temperatures, and we must rapidly cut our emissions to prevent further warming and disruption in the future.

   4.2 The emissions target consultation document provides the background on greenhouse gas emissions including the Christchurch Districts emissions profile. This shows that in the 2016/2017 financial year, transportation was the largest contributor at 53%, followed by stationary energy (from homes and buildings) at 22%, agriculture at 10.5%, waste at 9% and industry at 4.7%.

   4.3 The discussion document seeks feedback on how quickly or boldly we should aim to reduce emissions across our District. The proposal sets out the approach by central government (net zero emissions of GHG, other than biogenic methane by 2050) or a more ambitious pathway (e.g. net zero emissions of GHG, other than biogenic methane by 2040). The proposal also
presents an additional target of a 50% reduction in GHG emissions (other than biogenic methane) district wide by 2030 (from 2016/2017 baseline levels).

4.4 The consultation is designed to seek the community’s feedback and views on setting an emissions target for the Christchurch District.

**Strategic Alignment**

4.5 This report is aligned with the Council’s strategic priority, Climate Change Leadership and this aligns with all the Community Outcomes.

4.6 This report supports the Council's Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

4.6.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy

- Level of Service: 17.0.1.7 Advice to Council on high priority policy and planning issues that affect the City. Advice is aligned with and delivers on the governance expectations as evidenced through the Council Strategic Framework - Policy advice to Council on emerging issues.

**Assessment of Significance and Engagement**

4.7 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

4.8 The level of significance was determined by the fact that the decision to publically consult is not a statutory one, as the setting of targets is not a statutory decision.

5. **Community Views and Preferences**

5.1 A sentiment survey was conducted in May which asked residents about their views on climate change, which showed that the majority of respondents perceive climate change as extremely important. There has also been some initial engagement with an external technical advisory group on the broader climate change strategy to inform its development.

5.2 The next step, subject to Council approval will be to undertake public consultation on setting an emissions target for the Christchurch District council.

6. **Legal Implications**

6.1 There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision. This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit

7. **Risks**

7.1 The risk is that without including the targets within a broader strategy for consultation, there may be a missed opportunity to position the targets within a broader context linked to overall goals and principles. This risk can be managed by giving visibility on our wider programme of work.

8. **Next Steps**

8.1 Once the consultation document has been approved for public consultation, the document will be prepared for publication.

8.2 It is anticipated that public consultation would begin in early to mid-July. Submissions on the document will be heard by the Innovation and Sustainability Development Committee.
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Have your say: Emissions Target DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.
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Have your say: Emissions Target

The Christchurch City Council is committed to climate change leadership. The evidence is clear – greenhouse gas emissions are causing unprecedented increases in global temperatures, and we must rapidly cut our emissions to prevent further warming and disruption in the future.

Christchurch’s greenhouse gas emissions are only a small part of total global emissions, but New Zealand’s per capita emissions are among the highest in the world. Countries which individually emit less than 1% of global totals, collectively contribute significantly to total emissions. This means we all have an important part to play in limiting warming.

We are currently in the process of developing our district’s climate change strategy to ensure it reflects community aspirations for Christchurch. Our district includes Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula. As part of this work, we want to hear your views on what targets we should be adopting. Do we go with the proposed national targets, or do you want us to be more ambitious? We want to hear your views.

Graphics:

- **What is our current footprint?**
  The Christchurch district currently produces far more greenhouse gas emissions than we offset. During the 2016/2017 June financial year (our baseline year), Christchurch emitted an estimated 2,485,335 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂e) equating to 6.6 t CO₂e per person. This is lower than Auckland (7.9 t CO₂e) and Dunedin (11.4 t CO₂e), but more than Wellington (5.7 t CO₂e). Forestry in Christchurch resulted in sequestration of an estimated 362,679 t CO₂e, which reduced Christchurch’s net greenhouse gas emissions to 2,122,656 t CO₂e.¹

- **Where do our greenhouse gas emissions come from?**
  A breakdown of our emissions in the 2016/2017 financial year found that transportation was the largest contributor at 53.1%, followed by stationary energy (from homes and buildings), at 22.7%, agriculture at 10.5%, waste at 9% and industry at 4.7%.

What are the proposed targets for New Zealand?

If passed into law, the Government’s Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act will contain the national targets for New Zealand to collectively meet.

The government’s proposed targets can be summarised as:

- net zero emissions of greenhouse gases by 2050, other than biogenic methane (then remaining at net zero for each subsequent year),
- by 2030, gross annual emissions of biogenic methane are 10% less than 2017 emissions; and are at least 24% to 47% less than 2017 emissions by 2050 (and for each subsequent year)²

---


The government’s Zero Carbon Bill proposes treating biogenic methane (largely emitted by the agriculture and waste sectors) differently from other greenhouse gases. Although it has stronger warming effects than carbon dioxide, methane is a relatively ‘short lived’ gas (doesn’t last as long in the atmosphere) compared with other greenhouse gases. It remains in the atmosphere for about 12 years, whereas carbon dioxide can remain in the atmosphere for thousands of years.

Reductions are needed in all areas
New Zealand needs to reduce its emissions drastically across all areas in order to reach this net zero emissions target. This will require a number of different approaches, and the support of government, business, and the community. As a country, we will need to reimagine the way we travel, generate energy, produce food, manage waste, develop agriculture, build infrastructure, and develop our towns and cities. We can also ‘offset’ our emissions through carbon sequestration, or carbon capture. This means capturing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and storing it using trees, wetlands and soils.

The Council recognises the importance of reducing greenhouse gas emissions as quickly as possible, while continuing to support the wider needs of the community. This means we need to manage the speed at which we reduce greenhouse gas emissions to enable there to be time for a just and equitable transition to a low carbon economy.

If our cuts are too drastic before we undertake detailed analysis, there is the risk of not understanding potentially harmful impacts on the community and the economy. However, if we act too slowly to reduce our emissions, we won’t be taking the necessary action to limit warming to 1.5°C, may miss opportunities to adopt useful new technologies, and won’t be leading on climate action.

Should we be more ambitious?
We have the option of setting more ambitious targets for emissions reductions (along with more ambitious actions) in the Christchurch district if we have community support for this kind of approach.

Some people believe the government’s targets are too conservative, and that we should make the necessary sacrifices and lifestyle changes to reduce emissions faster. This could include getting out of our cars, or travelling less, investing in new technology earlier, reducing meat in our diets, planting more trees, and investing in more efficient homes and buildings sooner than would be necessary to achieve the government’s proposed targets.

One way we could be more ambitious than the national targets is to aim for net zero emissions across all greenhouse gases, including methane. Agricultural emissions in our district (10.5% in 2016/17)\(^3\) are much lower than in New Zealand as a whole (48.1% in 2017). This means achieving net zero emissions across all gases should be more achievable in our district, although more work will need to be done to understand how we can reduce methane from our waste management systems, including landfills.

A more ambitious approach for Christchurch could also include bringing forward the target year to reach net zero greenhouse gas emissions (for example to 2040).

---

Reducing our greenhouse gas emissions will create a cleaner healthier environment, while providing the opportunity for innovative solutions and new industries to be developed in Christchurch.

An interim target

Whether our district supports aligning with the national Zero Carbon Bill targets, or adopting a more ambitious approach, we believe setting an intermediary target will help ensure we are making good progress towards our target. In line with the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) advice on the need to roughly halve recent emissions by 2030, we suggest setting an additional target for the district:

- 50% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions district-wide by 2030 (from our 2016/17 baseline levels)

BREAKOUT BOX: What is climate change and how will it affect us?

Climate change refers to significant changes in global temperature, precipitation, wind patterns and other measures of climate that occur over several decades or longer.

Earth’s climate has changed over millions of years - from warmer periods to ice ages and back again. In the past, changes in the earth’s climate were usually gradual, which allowed time for plants and animals to adapt. In recent decades the climate has been changing far more rapidly. Since the industrial revolution there has been a noticeable increase in greenhouse gas producing activities such as transportation, industry, and agriculture. These human-induced (anthropogenic) activities are increasing the level of greenhouse gases in our atmosphere and causing the Earth to heat up at an unprecedented rate.

Climate change is likely to mean less rainfall and more droughts for the Eastern coastline of New Zealand. Christchurch will also be affected by sea level rise in the coming decades, with low lying areas particularly vulnerable to a projected increase in extreme weather events. This will impact all of us in the future – our environment, our health and wellbeing, our communities and our economy.

BREAKOUT BOX: What are greenhouse gases?

Greenhouse gases - including carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O) - trap heat from the sun in the atmosphere and prevent the planet’s surface from freezing. Recently though, the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere has significantly increased, causing the atmosphere to retain more heat. Without swift action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions there will likely be serious consequences later this century.

The scientific consensus behind international climate policy is that warming needs to be restricted to less than 2°C above pre-industrial levels to prevent damaging effects later this century. The strong preference is limiting warming to below 1.5°C, which would likely prevent the worst

---

¹ https://climatechange.ucdavis.edu/science/climate-change-definitions/
consequences of climate change. To avoid warming greater than 1.5°C, global carbon emissions need to rapidly reduce, and then remain at very low (even net negative) levels in the future.

The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reported that human activities are already estimated to have caused approximately 1.0°C of global warming above pre-industrial levels, and that global warming is likely to reach 1.5°C between 2030 and 2052 if it continues to increase at the current rate. If we don’t take any action and global emissions remain high, New Zealand could reach a potentially devastating 3.7°C rise by the end of the century.

**BREAKOUT BOX: International and national context**

At an international level, New Zealand is a party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol, and must report progress on our obligations. In 2016 parliament ratified the Paris Agreement, which comes into effect from 2020.

At a national level the Ministry for the Environment provides guidance on climate change issues. A Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill is currently moving through parliament. In addition to setting national emissions reduction targets, the Bill will establish a Climate Change Commission to provide independent advice to the government on setting emission budgets and further guidance on adaptation issues.

**Have your say**

We’d like to hear your thoughts on whether our district should use the national emissions targets, or whether you would like the district to take a more ambitious approach when setting our targets.

**Comments:**

Do you support an interim target as a way to encourage early action?  YES / NO

**Any other comments**

**What’s next after setting targets?**

Once we’ve heard your views and the targets are adopted, we’ll continue our work with the community on actions we can take towards achieving the targets. The targets will be integrated into development of our upcoming climate change strategy. The strategy will also consider wider

---

6 IPCC Special Report: Global Warming of 1.5°C [https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/chapter/summary-for-policy-makers/](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/chapter/summary-for-policy-makers/)


issues around climate change in the district, including how we'll plan and adapt to changes in the future, the importance of ensuring a just and equitable transition to a low carbon economy, and how we'll continue to care for our natural environment.

Developing the climate change strategy
We'll be closely engaging with the community as we develop our district’s climate change strategy to ensure it reflects community aspirations for Christchurch. Once we’re sure we’re on the right track we'll begin work on implementation planning with the community.

While developing our strategy we will continue to build on our existing climate change programme. You can find out more about what we’re already doing here and how you can get involved: https://ccc.govt.nz/environment/climate-change/
Consultation document

Consultation timing

- Consultation opens: Wednesday 17 July 2019
- Consultation closes: Wednesday 14 August 2019
- Opportunity for people to speak to their submissions at the end of August 2019.

Have your say on our district’s net zero greenhouse gas emissions target

Christchurch City Council is committed to climate change leadership. The evidence is clear – greenhouse gas emissions are causing unprecedented increases in global temperatures, and we must rapidly cut our emissions to prevent further warming and disruption in the future.

Christchurch’s greenhouse gas emissions are only a small part of total global emissions, but New Zealand’s per capita emissions are among the highest in the world. Countries which individually emit less than 1% of global totals collectively contribute significantly to total emissions. This means we all have an important part to play in limiting warming.

We are currently in the process of developing our district’s climate change strategy to ensure it reflects community aspirations for Christchurch. Our district includes Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula. As part of this work, we want to hear your views on what emissions targets we should be adopting. Do we go with the proposed national net zero greenhouse gas emissions target, or do you want us to be more ambitious? We want to hear your views.

What is our current footprint?

Graphic showing tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per person, each year in Auckland, Tauranga, Wellington, Christchurch and New Zealand

- **What is our current footprint?**
  The Christchurch district currently produces far more greenhouse gas emissions than we offset. During the 2016/2017 June financial year (our baseline year), Christchurch emitted an estimated 2,485,335 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO₂,e) equating to 6.6 t CO₂,e per person. This is lower than Auckland (7.9 t CO₂,e) and Dunedin (11.4 t CO₂,e), but more than Wellington (5.7 t CO₂,e). Forestry in Christchurch resulted in sequestration of an estimated 362,679 t CO₂,e, which reduced Christchurch’s net greenhouse gas emissions to 2,122,656 t CO₂,e.¹

Consultation document

Where do our greenhouse gas emissions come from?

Graphic showing where Christchurch’s greenhouse gas emissions come from.

- **Where do our greenhouse gas emissions come from?**
  A breakdown of our emissions in the 2016/2017 financial year found that transportation was the largest contributor at 53.1%, followed by stationary energy (from homes and buildings), at 22.7%, agriculture at 10.5%, waste at 9% and industrial product use at 4.7%.

What are the proposed targets for New Zealand?

If passed into law, the Government’s Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act will contain the national targets for New Zealand to meet collectively.

The government’s proposed targets can be summarised as:

- **net zero emissions of greenhouse gases by 2050, other than biogenic methane (then remaining at net zero for each subsequent year),**
- **by 2030, gross annual emissions of biogenic methane are 10% less than 2017 emissions, and are at least 24% to 47% less than 2017 emissions by 2050 (and for each subsequent year)**

The government’s Zero Carbon Bill proposes treating biogenic methane (largely emitted by the agriculture and waste sectors) differently from other greenhouse gases. Although it has stronger warming effects than carbon dioxide, methane is a relatively ‘short lived’ gas (doesn’t last as long in the atmosphere) compared with other greenhouse gases. It remains in the atmosphere for about 12 years, whereas carbon dioxide can remain in the atmosphere for thousands of years.

Reductions are needed in all areas

New Zealand needs to reduce its emissions drastically across all areas in order to reach this net zero emissions target. This will require a number of different approaches, and the support of government, business, and the community. As a country, we will need to reimagine the way we travel, generate energy, produce food, manage waste, develop agriculture, build infrastructure, and develop our towns and cities. We can also ‘offset’ our emissions through carbon sequestration, or carbon capture. Carbon sequestration means capturing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and storing it using trees, wetlands and soils.

The Council recognises the importance of reducing greenhouse gas emissions as quickly as possible, while continuing to support the wider needs of the community. This means we need to manage the speed at which we reduce greenhouse gas emissions to enable time for a just and equitable transition to a low greenhouse gas emissions economy.

If our cuts are too drastic before we can undertake detailed analysis, there is the risk of not understanding potentially harmful impacts on the community and the economy. However, if we

---
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act too slowly to reduce our emissions, we won’t be taking the necessary action to limit warming to 1.5°C, may miss opportunities to adopt useful new technologies, and won’t be leading on climate action.

Should we be more ambitious?

We have the option of setting more ambitious targets for emissions reductions (along with more ambitious actions) in the Christchurch district if we have community support for this kind of approach.

Some people believe the government’s targets are too conservative, and that we should make the necessary sacrifices and lifestyle changes to reduce greenhouse gas emissions faster. This could include reducing our reliance on cars, travelling less, investing in new technology earlier, reducing meat in our diets, planting more trees, and investing in more energy-efficient homes and buildings sooner than would be necessary to achieve the government’s proposed targets.

One way we could be more ambitious than the national targets is to aim for net zero emissions across all greenhouse gases, including methane. Agricultural emissions in our district (10.5% in 2016/17)\(^1\), are much lower than in New Zealand as a whole (48.1% in 2017). This means achieving net zero emissions across all greenhouse gases should be more achievable in our district, although more work will need to be done to understand how we can reduce methane from our waste management systems, including landfills.

A more ambitious approach for Christchurch could also include bringing forward the target year to reach net zero greenhouse gas emissions (for example from 2050 to 2040).

Reducing our greenhouse gas emissions will create a cleaner, healthier environment, while providing the opportunity for innovation and new industries to be developed in Christchurch.

An interim target

Whether our district supports aligning with the national Zero Carbon Bill targets, or adopting a more ambitious approach, we believe setting an intermediary target will help ensure we are making good progress towards our target. In line with the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) advice on the need to roughly halve recent emissions by 2030, we suggest setting an additional target for the district:

- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 50% district-wide by 2030 (from our 2016/17 baseline levels)

Consultation document

BREAKOUT BOX: What is climate change and how will it affect us?
Climate change refers to significant changes in global temperature, precipitation, wind patterns and other measures of climate that occur over several decades or longer.

Earth’s climate has changed over millions of years from warmer periods to ice ages and back again. In the past, changes in the earth’s climate were usually gradual, which allowed time for plants and animals to adapt. In recent decades the climate has been changing far more rapidly. Since the Industrial Revolution there has been a noticeable increase in greenhouse gas producing activities such as transportation, industry, and agriculture. These human-induced (anthropogenic) activities are increasing the level of greenhouse gases in our atmosphere and causing the Earth to heat up at an unprecedented rate.

Climate change is likely to mean less rainfall and more droughts for our area. Christchurch will also be affected by sea level rise in the coming decades, with low lying areas particularly vulnerable to a projected increase in extreme and more frequent weather events. This will impact all of us in the future – our environment, our health and wellbeing, our communities and our economy.

BREAKOUT BOX: What are greenhouse gases?
Greenhouse gases - including carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O) - trap heat from the sun in the atmosphere and prevent the planet’s surface from freezing. Recently, the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere has significantly increased, causing the atmosphere to retain more heat. Without swift action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions there will likely be serious consequences later this century.

The scientific consensus behind international climate policy is that warming needs to be restricted to less than 2°C above pre-industrial levels to prevent damaging effects later this century. The strong preference is limiting warming to below 1.5°C, which would likely prevent the worst consequences of climate change. To avoid warming greater than 1.5°C, global carbon emissions need to rapidly reduce, and then remain at very low (even net negative) levels in the future.

The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reported that human activities are already estimated to have caused approximately 1.0°C of global warming above pre-industrial levels, and that global warming is likely to reach 1.5°C between 2030 and 2052 if it continues to increase at the current rate. If we don’t take any action and global emissions remain high, New Zealand could reach a potentially devastating 3.7°C rise by the end of the century.

---

4 https://climatechange.ucdavis.edu/science/climate-change-definitions/
6 IPCC Special Report: Global Warming of 1.5°C https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/chapter/summary-for-policy-makers/
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**BREAKOUT BOX: International and national context**

At an international level, New Zealand is a party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol, and must report progress on our obligations. In 2016 parliament ratified the Paris Agreement, which comes into effect from 2020.

At a national level the Ministry for the Environment provides guidance on climate change issues. A Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill¹ is currently moving through parliament. In addition to setting national emissions reduction targets, the Bill will establish a Climate Change Commission to provide independent advice to the government on setting emission budgets and further guidance on adaptation issues.

**Have your say**

*We’d like to hear your thoughts on our district’s net zero greenhouse gas emissions targets.*

Should we align with the proposed national net zero greenhouse gas emissions target by 2050 (that has a separate approach to methane gases) or should we take a more ambitious approach?

If you think we should be more ambitious, what year should our net zero greenhouse gas emissions target be set at (and why) and how should we consider methane (and why)?

Do you support an interim target as a way to encourage early action? YES / NO

Any other comments

**What’s next after setting targets?**

Once we’ve heard your views and the emissions targets are adopted by Council (in September 2019), we’ll continue our work with the community on actions we can take towards achieving the targets.

Setting the emissions target in just one part of work on climate change.

The targets will be integrated into development of our upcoming climate change strategy. We’ll be working closely with the community to ensure the strategy reflects community aspirations for Christchurch. The strategy will also consider wider issues around climate change in the district,

---
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including how we'll plan and adapt to changes in the future, the importance of ensuring a just and equitable transition to a low greenhouse gas economy, and how we'll continue to care for our natural environment.

While developing our strategy we will continue to build on our existing climate change programme. You can find out more about what we’re already doing here and how you can get involved: https://ccc.govt.nz/environment/climate-change/
20. Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee Minutes - 26 June 2019

Reference: 19/719677
Presenter(s): Aidan Kimberley – Committee Advisor

1. Purpose of Report

The Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee held a meeting on 26 June 2019 and is circulating the Minutes recorded to the Council for its information.

2. Recommendation to Council

That the Council receives the Minutes from the Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee meeting held 26 June 2019.
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OPEN MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 26 June 2019
Time: 9.04am
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The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   
   Part C
   
   Committee Resolved ISDC/2019/00018
   
   That the apologies from Councillor Davidson and Deputy Mayor Turner for lateness, and apology from Councillor Gough for early departure be accepted.

   Councillor Templeton/Councillor Livingstone  
   
   Carried

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   Part B
   
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   
   Part C
   
   Committee Resolved ISDC/2019/00019
   
   That the minutes of the Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee meeting held on Monday, 20 May 2019 be confirmed.

   Councillor Livingstone/Councillor Gough  
   
   Carried

4. **Public Forum**
   
   Part B
   
   4.1  *Whākōki*
   
   Bridget Frame and Michael Toothill addressed the Committee on behalf of Whākōki, regarding a joint venture between Space Craft Systems and Kilmarnock Enterprises, who together bring a shared vision about improving lives by empowering people with the tools needed to build thriving communities

   4.2  *Canopy of Lights – GHD Smart Seeds Project Presentation*
   
   Shane Sword addressed the Committee on behalf of the project team regarding their recent involvement in the challenge, and their proposal: Canopy of Lights.

   4.3  *Food Repurposing*
   
   Heidi Rada addressed the Committee regarding repurposing food and employing our disadvantaged people in the city.
5. **Deputations by Appointment**
   
   Part B
   
   There were no deputations by appointment.

6. **Presentation of Petitions**
   
   Part B
   
   There was no presentation of petitions.

7. **Climate Change Programme - Consultation on Draft Targets**
    
   **Committee Comment**
   
   The Committee requested staff to add additional context to the consultation document to inform the public why the consultation is occurring. The Committee also requested that the final document, including graphic design, be presented to Councillors prior to being finalised.

   **Committee Decided ISDC/2019/00020**
   
   **Part A**
   
   That the Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee recommends that the Council:
   
   1. Approve that the consultation document on emissions targets (Attachment A), be released for public consultation subject to minor amendments based on feedback from the Committee.

   Councillor Templeton/Councillor Gough

   **Carried**

8. **Update on Extinction Rebellion Deputation Request**
    
   **Committee Resolved ISDC/2019/00021**
   
   **Part C**
   
   That the Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee:
   
   1. Receive the information in the report

   Councillor Templeton/Councillor Galloway

   **Carried**

   Councillor Davidson joined the meeting at 10.11am during the discussion on item 9.

9. **Update from ChristchurchNZ on the Antarctic Gateway Strategy**
    
   **Committee Resolved ISDC/2019/00022**
   
   **Part C**
   
   That the Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee:
   
   1. Receive the information in the report.

   Councillor Davidson/Councillor Chen

   **Carried**
10. Suburban Regeneration Biannual Report to end of March 2019

Committee Resolved ISDC/2019/00023

Part C

That the Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee:

1. Receive the report.

Councillor Davidson/Councillor Chen

Carried

12. Enliven Places Projects Fund - Grant Approval - Little Andromeda 2019

Committee Decided ISDC/2019/00024

Part A

That the Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee recommends that the Council:


2. Approve that funding is allocated from the 2018/2019 Urban Design, Urban Regeneration and Heritage Unit operational budget.

Councillor Buck/Councillor Gough

Carried

11. Smart Christchurch Programme Update

Committee Resolved ISDC/2019/00025

Part C

That the Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee:

1. Receive the Smart Christchurch programme update.

Councillor Templeton/Councillor Livingstone

Carried

The meeting adjourned at 11.04am and resumed at 11.18am.
Councillor Gough left the meeting during the adjournment.
Deputy Mayor Turner joined the meeting at 11.18am.

13 Resolution to Exclude the Public

Committee Resolved ISDC/2019/00026

Part C

That at 11.19 the resolution to exclude the public set out on page 76 to 77 of the agenda be adopted.

Councillor Davidson/Councillor Livingstone

Carried

The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 11.50am at which time the meeting concluded.
CONFIRMED THIS 24th DAY OF JULY 2019

COUNCILLOR VICKI BUCK
CHAIRPERSON

Reference: 19/440166
Presenter(s): David Falconer – Team Leader City Planning
Sarah Oliver - Principal Advisor Planning

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Council to consider the recommendations within the Recommendations Report produced by the Hearings Panel for Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga (Our Space). In particular, the Council must decide whether to adopt Our Space 2018-2048 as its future development strategy (FDS), a requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS).

2. Executive Summary

2.1 The NPS requires all local authorities within a high-growth urban area to produce a FDS demonstrating that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term (up to 30 years ahead). The Christchurch Urban Area, which includes Kaiapoi and Prebbleton (2016 Statistics NZ boundaries), is defined as a high growth area.

2.2 The NPS strongly encourages local authorities that share jurisdiction over an urban area to work together to produce a FDS. Christchurch City has been working collaboratively with the Greater Christchurch Partnership (GCP) to produce a FDS for Greater Christchurch, which has also resulted in a review of the settlement pattern set under the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS).

2.3 A draft FDS for Greater Christchurch (Our Space) was produced by the GCP and released for public consultation in November 2018.

2.4 When the Council ratified Our Space for public consultation on 11 October 2018, it resolved that there were critical matters to be addressed prior to the final version being presented to Council for ratification.

2.5 These matters related to the housing sufficiency conclusions; social and affordable housing; sequencing the release of greenfield land; alternative options to urban expansion to reduce the impact on versatile soils and climate change; and ensuring that Our Space fully satisfies Council’s legal responsibilities under the NPS. Council lodged a submission to ensure these matters of concern were considered by the Hearings Panel.

2.6 Through the hearings process a number of changes to Our Space were made, which went some way towards addressing the Council’s concerns. Key changes made include:

- removing some rural demand from the housing sufficiency conclusions to reduce the housing shortfall to more accurately reflect reality;
- expanding actions on social and affordable housing;
- clarifying that greenfield land will only be released in the medium term; and
- including a requirement for the districts to consider downstream transport effects.

2.7 From a Council officer perspective, the changes made go part way in addressing the Council’s concerns (in particular with regard to minimum housing density requirements for the Future
Development Areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts). However, there will be opportunities to address the outstanding issues as part of future capacity assessments, District Plan reviews, and most importantly through the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) in 2022. Staff therefore recommend that *Our Space* is adopted.

2.8 The GCP Committee received and endorsed the Recommendations Report from the Hearings Panel, and the final version of *Our Space*, at its meeting on 14 June 2019. Each partner council is now required to make a separate decision whether to adopt *Our Space*, to fulfil their obligations under the NPS.

3. **Staff Recommendations**

   That the Council resolves to:

1. **Receive the recommendations from the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee to:**
   b. **Adopt the final version of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga** as recommended by the Hearings Panel as the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch for the purposes of meeting the Council's obligation to produce a future development strategy under Policies PC12 to PC14 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity; and
   c. **Set and incorporate the territorial authority housing targets for the district as identified in Table 2 of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga** within respective district plans, in accordance with policies PC9 and PC11 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity at the Council meeting that considers adopting *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga*.

2. **Adopt the final version of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga** as recommended by the Hearings Panel on *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga* and endorsed by the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee as the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch for the purposes of meeting the Council’s obligation to produce a future development strategy under policies PC12 to PC14 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, shown as **Attachment B** which incorporates the changes identified in **Attachment A**.

3. **Set and incorporate the housing targets for Christchurch City as identified in Table 2 of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga** within the Christchurch District Plan, in accordance with policies PC9 and PC11, of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, shown as **Attachment C**.

4. **Authorise staff to correct any minor errors or make typographical and formatting changes to the final version of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga**, following approval from the Independent Chair of the Greater Christchurch Partnership.
4. **Context/Background**

**Obligations under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity**

4.1 The NPS-UDC directs local authorities to provide sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing and business growth to meet demand in the short (1 to 3 years), medium (3 to 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years). This capacity can be provided on greenfield sites, or by intensifying existing urban environments. The NPS requires all local authorities with a high-growth urban area to produce an FDS that demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term.

4.2 An FDS is required to:

- demonstrate that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term;
- set out how minimum housing targets will be met;
- identify the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity in new urban environments and intensification opportunities within existing urban environments;
- balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development;
- be informed by a capacity assessment, the relevant long term plans and infrastructure strategies required under the Local Government Act 2002, and any other relevant strategies, plans and documents; and
- have particular regard to NPS-UDC Policy PA1, which requires that local authorities ensure that at any one time there is sufficient housing and business land development capacity.

4.3 The NPS requires local authorities to respond to the conclusions of a housing and business land capacity assessment, and to set and include minimum housing targets in their respective District Plans, in accordance with section 55(2A) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), without using the process in Schedule 1 of the RMA.

4.4 The Christchurch Urban Area, which using the 2016 Statistics NZ boundaries includes Kaiapoi and Prebbleton, is defined as a high growth area. NPS-UDC Policy PD3 strongly encourages local authorities that share jurisdiction over an urban area to collaborate and cooperate on the development of a joint FDS and the associated specification of minimum housing targets. If they do not have a joint one then they must have separate ones.

4.5 The GCP has been working collaboratively to undertake a Settlement Pattern Review for Greater Christchurch. This project has been structured to enable the partner councils (Canterbury Regional Council, Waimakariri District Council, Christchurch City Council, and Selwyn District Council) to meet the requirements of the NPS. It reviews the existing strategic planning context outlined in the Greater Christchurch UDS and Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuild of Greater Christchurch) of the CRPS. A key phase of the project was the preparation of *Our Space*.

4.6 The partner councils agreed to prepare a joint FDS to meet NPS obligations. The GCP Committee has endorsed the final version of *Our Space*, and each partner council is now required to make a separate decision whether to adopt *Our Space*, in order to fulfil their requirements under the NPS.

---

1 Refer to NPS-UDC Policies PC12 and PC13.
Development of Our Space

4.7 The Council agreed the scope of Our Space at its meeting on 24 May 2018 and, following consideration by partner councils, the GCP Committee resolved at its meeting on 12 October 2018 that a draft Our Space document be released for public consultation throughout November 2018.

4.8 On 13 July 2018, the GCP Committee established a sub-committee to act as the Hearings Panel for consultation on the draft Our Space, to be undertaken in accordance with Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002. The Hearings Panel was delegated responsibility to make recommendations to the GCP Committee on any changes considered necessary to the draft.

4.9 Following a public consultation period in November 2018, the Hearings Panel convened to hear from submitters wishing to be heard, review the content of all submissions and make recommendations to the GCP Committee. Hearings and deliberations were held on 25 February to 1 March, 11 March to 12 March, 29 April, 10 May, 31 May, and 5 June 2019. The hearings and deliberations were open to the public to attend.

4.10 The Recommendations Report produced by the Hearings Panel is included as Attachment A to this report. Appendix 2 of the Recommendations Report of the Hearings Panel identifies the recommended changes considered necessary to the draft document. These changes have now been incorporated into the final version of Our Space, shown as Attachment B.

Content of Our Space

4.11 Our Space generally supports the vision and principles identified in the Greater Christchurch UDS, albeit providing for more growth in the districts over the short to medium term as the region continues to rebound from the Canterbury earthquakes. It reaffirms and builds on existing plans that show that we are already well placed for future development over the next 30 years.

4.12 Specifically, Our Space:

- Sets out how targets for housing for the next 30 years will be met, accommodating an additional 150,000 people.
- Identifies locations for housing growth, encouraging Central City and suburban centre living while providing for township growth in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi.
- Apportions the housing targets to each territorial authority in accordance with an urban consolidation strategy that promotes greater growth in Christchurch City over time.
- Reinforces the role of key centres in providing additional retail and office floor space as required, in particular the Central City and, if needed, a transition of its surrounding light industrial zones.
- Recognises the existing industrial land provision as sufficient to cater for industrial growth for some time yet.
- Outlines a series of implementation actions and further work required to give effect to Our Space.

4.13 In terms of housing targets, the Panel considered three options for how the minimum housing targets are apportioned between the three Greater Christchurch territorial authorities. They were:

- Projection-led option - 53% of the growth being allocated to Christchurch City, and remaining 47% to Selwyn and Waimakariri districts, based on the medium–high Statistics New Zealand projection for Selwyn and Waimakariri district and medium projection for Christchurch City
- **UDS-aligned option** - 70% of the growth being allocated to Christchurch City, and remaining 30% to Selwyn and Waimakariri districts, based on the agreed apportionment contained in the UDS

- **A Hybrid option** - projection-led for the first ten years and UDS-aligned for the remaining 20 years, from 2028-2048

4.14 *Our Space* has been prepared on the basis of the hybrid option and this has been endorsed by the GCP Committee. The justification for this approach is not only that it signals a shift towards achieving the policy direction outlined by the 2007 UDS, but also that Christchurch City has development capacity in excess of what it is projected to need over the long term. Furthermore, the City is well positioned through its District Plan and Long Term Plan to provide for a broad range of housing typologies in a number of locations, which are well supported and accessible to community infrastructure and services, and places of business and employment.

**Key issues with Our Space**

4.15 When the Council ratified *Our Space* for public consultation on 11 October 2018 (CNCL/2018/00227), it resolved that there were critical matters that needed to be addressed prior to the final version being presented to Council for ratification. These matters related to:

- the uncertainty of the housing sufficiency conclusions;
- social and affordable housing;
- the need to sequence the release of greenfield land to manage the impact on the City’s transport network and regeneration of the Central City and surrounding suburbs;
- consideration of alternative options to urban expansion, such as increasing densities, to reduce the impact on versatile soils, and on climate change from increased travel distances; and
- ensuring that *Our Space* fully satisfies Council’s legal responsibilities under the NPS.

4.16 The Council made a submission regarding the critical issues it raised in resolution (CNCL/2018/00227), to enable the Hearings Panel to fully consider those matters. A number of Christchurch’s Community Boards also raised similar issues and their concerns were incorporated into the Council’s submission.

4.17 As a result of the public consultation, through the hearings process, a number of changes to *Our Space* were made, including the following key changes:

- Clarification that greenfield land should only be released to meet a demonstrable medium-term need.
- The minimum density for the Future Development Areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri has been set at 12 dwellings per hectare. This is higher than the 10 dwellings per hectare minimum density for the Current Greenfield Priority Areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri.
- Structure planning of Future Development Areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri will need to consider downstream transport effects and housing densities.
- Correction was made to the sufficiency conclusions to discount some rural demand from the supply figures, reducing the housing shortfall in the districts to more accurately reflect reality. This reduces the need for urban expansion in these areas.
- More detail has been provided on the Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan, including indicative timeframes and key steps in the process.
4.18 The principal matter that remains is the extent to which the *Our Space* document addresses the matters of concern that Council raised in its submission. All aspects of the Council’s submission (minimum required densities, the extent of sequencing of greenfield land, and housing sufficiency conclusions) have been addressed in some way by the Panel, however the actual outcome required is not explicitly directed. *Our Space* leaves this level of direction, namely with regard to densities and sequencing of housing in neighbouring Future Development Areas, to be resolved through statutory plan reviews (the Waimakariri and Selwyn District Plans and the CRPS) and other non-statutory processes. The outcomes sought by Council can still be achieved and addressed through forthcoming statutory processes.

4.19 Importantly, the most recent changes made by the Panel recognise the issues raised by the Council and provide a pathway for resolution, based on further technical assessment (e.g. the recent transport modelling) and a more extensive evidence base (e.g. through the 2020 Urban Capacity Assessment). The Government is also considering releasing a draft National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land later this year, and a review of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity. These actions would provide, respectively, some direction on development of versatile soils, and clarification of how policy requirements are to be met through future development strategies.

4.20 Staff consider that whilst *Our Space* does not fully demonstrate that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term, it does not preclude partner councils providing more development capacity than assumed, particularly through intensification and increased densities, so that long-term demands can be met. It proposes to do this generally in accordance with the urban consolidation strategy of the UDS. *Our Space* contains some scenarios of how long-term growth needs can be meet without urban expansion beyond the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary. For Waimakariri this requires higher greenfield densities to be achieved and/or more intensification to occur. The feasibility of these scenarios have not yet been confirmed, however partner councils have committed to investigate this further.

4.21 **Attachment D** contains a table detailing the issues raised by the Council, how they have been addressed, any outstanding matters, and how they might be addressed going forwards.

**Greater Christchurch Partnership Decision**

4.22 The GCP Committee considered the Recommendations Report of the Hearings Panel at its meeting on 14 June 2019. The Committee resolved to [GCPC/2019/00019]:


2. Endorse the recommendations of the Hearings Panel for *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga*, included in Attachment A

3. Endorse the final version of *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga*, as recommended by the Hearings Panel in Attachment A, as the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch for the purposes of meeting the obligation to produce a future development strategy under policies PC12 to PC14 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

4. Recommends that the Canterbury Regional Council, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council adopt the recommendations of the Hearings Panel for *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga*, included in Attachment A.
5. Recommends that the Canterbury District Health Board, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, New Zealand Transport Agency, Regenerate Christchurch and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet convey their support for the recommendations of the Hearings Panel for *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga*, in a manner that is appropriate within the context of their respective governance arrangements.

6. Recommends that the Canterbury Regional Council, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council adopt the final version of *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga* as recommended by the Hearings Panel in *Attachment A* as the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch for the purposes of meeting the obligation to produce a future development strategy under policies PC12 to PC14 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

7. Recommends that the Canterbury District Health Board, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, New Zealand Transport Agency, Regenerate Christchurch and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet convey their support for the final version of *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga*, as recommended by the Hearings Panel in *Attachment A*, as the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch, in a manner that is appropriate in the context of their respective governance arrangements.

8. Recommend that the Canterbury Regional Council resolves to set the regional housing targets as identified in Table 2 of *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga* within the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in accordance with policies PC5 and PC8 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity at the Council meeting that considers adopting *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga*.

9. Recommend that the Canterbury Regional Council resolves to incorporate the housing targets as identified in Table 2 of *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga* within the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in accordance with policies PC5 and PC8, of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity and section 55(2A) of the Resource Management Act 1991 following resolutions of the respective territorial authorities to set the territorial authority targets.

10. Recommends that the Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council each resolve to set and incorporate the territorial authority housing targets for its district as identified in Table 2 of *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga* within the respective district plans, in accordance with Policies PC9 and PC11, of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, at the Council meeting that considers adopting *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga*.

11. Delegate authority to the Independent Chair to make any amendments of minor effect to the final version of *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga* prior to consideration by all partners.

12. Note the offer to all partners, when considering this matter, for the Chair of the Hearings Panel (and other Hearings Panel members as required) to attend and support the presentation of this item at relevant meetings.

13. Acknowledge and thank Hearings Panel members for the considerable time and effort expended as part of undertaking their role as Hearings Panel members.
Strategic Alignment

4.23 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

4.23.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy

- Level of Service: 17.0.42.0 Support the Greater Christchurch Partnership - Contribute to the settlement pattern review as and if agreed by Council and as funding permits.

Decision Making Authority

4.24 The GCP Committee has made recommendations that this Council and the partner councils adopt Our Space as their FDS under the NPS-UDC. However the statutory responsibility to comply with the NPS-UDC sits with the Council.

Previous Decisions


4.26 When the Council ratified Our Space for public consultation on 11 October 2018, it resolved that there were critical matters to be addressed prior to the final version being presented to Council for ratification. These matters related to the housing sufficiency conclusions; social and affordable housing; sequencing the release of greenfield land; alternative options to urban expansion to reduce the impact on versatile soils and climate change; and ensuring that Our Space fully satisfies Council’s legal responsibilities under the NPS.

Assessment of Significance and Engagement

4.27 The decision in this report is of high significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

4.28 The level of significance was determined predominantly by the large number of people affected or likely to have an interest in Our Space, and the need to meet the Council’s statutory obligations under the NPS-UDC to produce a FDS.

5. Options Analysis

Options Considered

5.1 The following reasonably practicable options were considered and are assessed in this report (see Options Matrix for more detail):

- Adopt the recommendations report and ratify Our Space
- Do not ratify Our Space and instead develop a separate FDS

Options Descriptions

5.2 Preferred Option: Option 1 – Adopt the recommendations report and ratify Our Space

5.2.1 Option Description: Under this option, the Council would ratify Our Space.

5.2.2 Option Advantages: This decision enables the Council to have a future development strategy in place now, as required by the NPS. This would support the position of the Greater Christchurch Partnership, which has endorsed the document. The Council would have the opportunity to work with the partners to address outstanding issues at CRPS reviews and the Capacity Assessment 2020, and through other less formal and more collaborative processes.
5.2.3 Ratifying the document would provide an agreed FDS that enables cross-boundary strategic planning between Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City, and Waimakariri and Selwyn Districts.

5.2.4 **Option Disadvantages:** *Our Space* does not fully resolve all the issues raised in the Council submission. Although all aspects have been addressed in some way by the Panel, the actual outcome required is not explicitly directed (i.e. there is only a commitment to further investigation, rather than a commitment to resolve the issues).

5.2.5 Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils are still proposing a lower minimum density greenfield development than required for Christchurch. This also means that the minimum density for Waimakariri District is not sufficient to meet its long-term housing demand, unless significant intensification in Waimakariri District can be achieved (which to date has not been demonstrated through the Housing Capacity Assessments).

5.3 **Option 2 - Do not ratify *Our Space* and instead develop a separate FDS**

5.3.1 **Option Description:** Under this option, the Council would not ratify *Our Space*. In this case, this Council would then develop its own FDS and the other councils would adopt either the current version of *Our Space*, or an amended one that responds to this Council not being party to it.

5.3.2 **Option Advantages:** The Council does not support a document that does not fully address the issues raised in its submission. The Council is able to develop a document that is accurate in terms of its responsibilities.

5.3.3 **Option Disadvantages:** This decision would not support the position of the other Greater Christchurch partners, and would not benefit from a shared strategic approach to cross-boundary planning. The Council would have no input into the other councils’ strategies, which could be developed in a way that negatively affects Christchurch City. The future development strategies across the districts could potentially conflict.

5.3.4 The Council would need to develop its own FDS, which would incur costs and delays.

5.3.5 Each district would need to provide for housing projections within their own districts (i.e. projection-led rather than the hybrid option), in their strategies. This would see more housing and urban development in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts, away from where the majority of employment is, in Christchurch City. This would increase commuter travel, and thus carbon emissions.

**Analysis Criteria**

5.4 The analysis criteria used for the assessment of the options can be found in the Options Matrix table in Section 10 of this report.

**6. Community Views and Preferences**

6.1 Consultation on *Our Space* was undertaken in accordance with Part 6 of the Local Government Act, during November 2018.

6.2 Consultation included a public notice, press release, stakeholder mailout, dedicated web pages, public drop-in sessions, Ngāi Tahu engagement, and targeted stakeholder briefings and engagement sessions. 92 submissions were received. Submitters were also asked whether they agree with *Our Space*’s approach to managing growth (in particular that growth will be provided within existing urban areas and proposed new greenfield areas at Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi). The majority of the respondents did not agree with this approach. In terms of other aspects of *Our Space*, feedback was more favourable.
6.3 Following consultation, the Hearings Panel convened to hear from submitters wishing to be heard, review the content of all submissions and make recommendations to the GCP Committee on changes to the consultation draft. The hearings and deliberations were open to the public to attend.

7. Legal Implications
    7.1 The Council has received separate confidential and privileged legal advice.

8. Risks
    8.1 As outlined throughout this report, there are risks involved in the Council not adopting *Our Space*, and in alternative processes being run that could conflict and compromise outcomes for Christchurch City.

    8.2 There are also risks involved in adopting *Our Space*, given that not all of the Council’s concerns have been fully addressed. The Council will need to continue to monitor this situation and present its position throughout future statutory and non-statutory processes, to ensure the outstanding matters are addressed.

9. Next Steps
    9.1 **Change to CRPS Chapter 6 in 2019:** Once *Our Space* is adopted by partner councils, the Canterbury Regional Council will coordinate the collaborative preparation of a change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS as outlined in *Our Space*. This change is intended to provide for Future Development Areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts.

    9.2 **Capacity Assessment 2020:** Important elements in the schedule of further work outlined in Section 6.2 of *Our Space* include actions to improve the tools and evidence base that inform decision-making with regard to land use and transport integration.

    9.3 The NPS requires the preparation of capacity assessments at least every three years and so during 2019 CEAG will be considering partner staff advice to ensure a consistent and robust approach is in place to undertake the next capacity assessment, due in 2020.

    9.4 **Further work:** Other key immediate actions in *Our Space* include developing a social and affordable housing action plan (Action 2) and an evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum residential densities specified in the CRPS. CEAG will oversee the timely scheduling and resourcing of these actions.
## 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 - Ratify <em>Our Space</em> (Preferred Option)</th>
<th>Option 2 – Do not Ratify <em>Our Space</em> and develop a separate future development strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost to Implement</strong></td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance/Ongoing</strong></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Source</strong></td>
<td>Existing operational District Plan budget</td>
<td>Existing operational District Plan budget. However, developing a new Future Development Strategy has not be budgeted for, so would be required to be prioritised over other budgeted work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on Rates</strong></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 1 – Increasing efficiency of transport/travel times</strong></td>
<td>Releases of greenfield land only for medium term, to manage the impact on the City’s transport network. District councils to consider downstream transport effects in future planning.</td>
<td>In order to comply with the NPS, each district will need to develop their own FDS and will need to provide for their housing projections within their own districts. This would see more housing and urban development in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts away from where the majority of employment is in Christchurch City. This would increase commuter travel, and carbon emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 2 – Mitigating impacts on versatile soils</strong></td>
<td>Considers investigating alternatives to urban expansion, such as intensification, which could protect versatile soils.</td>
<td>More housing and urban development in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts could be located on versatile soils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria 3 – relationships with partner councils and strategic planning coordination</strong></td>
<td>Supports relationships with partner councils and their position on <em>Our Space</em>. The Council would have the opportunity to work with the partners to address outstanding issues at CRPS reviews, Capacity Assessment 2020, and other collaborative processes.</td>
<td>Would not support the position of the Greater Christchurch partners, and would not benefit from a shared strategic approach to cross-boundary planning. The Council would have no direct input into other councils’ strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue: Enables cross-boundary strategic planning between the partner councils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 - Ratify Our Space (Preferred Option)</th>
<th>Option 2 – Do not Ratify Our Space and develop a separate future development strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Christchurch District Plan</strong> – Christchurch City housing targets will be updated as required, as per Attachment C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on Mana Whenua</strong></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment to Council Plans &amp; Policies</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Priorities</strong></td>
<td>Provides for a social and affordable housing action plan.</td>
<td>This would likely increase commuter travel, and thus carbon emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable 21st century city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Climate change leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increasing active, public and shared transport opportunities and use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact on Mana Whenua:** Nil

**Alignment to Council Plans & Policies:**
- **Christchurch District Plan** – Christchurch City housing targets will be updated as required, as per Attachment C
- N/A

**Strategic Priorities:**
- Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable 21st century city
- Climate change leadership
- Increasing active, public and shared transport opportunities and use

Provides for a social and affordable housing action plan. See above for other relevant effects on transport network, carbon emissions, and versatile soils.
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## Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

(i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and

(ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.
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Executive Summary

[1] This is a recommendations report on Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update (Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga). The ‘Strategy’, or ‘Our Space’ is a strategy prepared under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). The Strategy has been prepared by the local authorities of Greater Christchurch in conjunction with the Greater Christchurch Partnership.

[2] The purpose of Our Space is to fulfil the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) by developing a future development strategy for Greater Christchurch in accordance with Policies PC12-14 of the NPS-UDC. Our Space builds on, and is in addition to, the existing Urban Development Strategy for Greater Christchurch 2007 and the 2016 update (UDS).

[3] The settlement pattern and actions identified in Our Space provide sufficient, feasible capacity for the minimum area required to provide for short (0-3 years), medium (0-10 years) and long term (10-30 years) projections for growth.

[4] The key findings on the evidence presented to us are:

a. The methodology for undertaking the capacity assessment to determine sufficient, feasible capacity for housing and business is adequate for the present purpose. Future changes to the methodology (including a common agreed methodology between local authorities) can be undertaken for future capacity assessments.

b. Monitoring, future capacity assessments, and analysis of population projections provide for a responsive planning framework.

c. A targeted change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to be promulgated in 2019 will be limited to those areas identified in Our Space for future residential development. This will enable Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to provide for short to medium term capacity in their district plans.

d. No additional development areas are proposed to be added to those identified in the areas notified. The merits of any further additional areas will be considered as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. This will include consideration of the vision and principles of the UDS.
e. New development in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts is expected to achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare. Further work on minimum densities will be undertaken as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

f. Further emphasis is required to recognise sustainability in Our Space, including recognition of the effects of climate change and sea-level rise, and the contribution of a compact urban form to transport efficiency and public transport.

[5] We are satisfied that Our Space appropriately implements the provisions of the NPS-UDC.

INTRODUCTION

[6] The Greater Christchurch Partnership has produced a draft Our Space for consultation under Part 6 of the LGA.

[7] As part of this consultation, the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee established a Future Development Strategy Hearings Panel Subcommittee (the Hearings Panel) comprising the following representatives:

a. Bill Wasley, Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee Independent Chair (Chair)
b. Councillor Peter Skelton, Canterbury Regional Council
c. Councillor Sara Templeton, Christchurch City Council
d. Deputy Mayor Malcolm Lyall, Selwyn District Council
e. Councillor Neville Atkinson, Waimakariri District Council
f. Gail Gordon, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
g. Tā Mark Solomon, Canterbury District Health Board
h. Jim Harland, New Zealand Transport Agency (non-voting representative)

[8] In accordance with our Terms of Reference, our role is to consider the content of all submissions, allowing an opportunity for submitters wishing to be heard to present
submission points to us and receive an Officers’ Report in response to the matters raised through submissions. Following the consideration of submissions, hearing from submitters and receiving of an Officers’ Report, our role is to hold deliberations and make recommendations to the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee on any changes considered necessary to the draft Our Space document.

[9] This is the recommendations report of the Hearings Panel on changes considered necessary to Our Space.

WHAT IS OUR SPACE?

[10] Our Space is a non-statutory document prepared under Part 6 of the LGA to meet the requirements of the NPS-UDC for local authorities in high growth areas to produce a future development strategy.

[11] A future development strategy is required to demonstrate that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term and set out how the minimum targets for sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing will be met.² It is informed by the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (Capacity Assessment), and the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies required under the LGA.³ It shall identify future urban environments and intensification opportunities and balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development.⁴ Local authorities are encouraged to amend, refresh and build on existing strategies to meet the NPS-UDC requirements rather than developing an entirely new strategy.⁵

[12] The Greater Christchurch Partnership (previously the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Committee) has worked collaboratively over more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development in Greater

---

¹ Tā Mark Solomon was appointed to hear submissions on behalf of the Christchurch District Health Board but was unable to attend and was excused. He did not take part in the Hearings Panel’s deliberations.

² NPS-UDC, Policy PC12.

³ NPS-UDC, Policies PC13 and PC14. Local authorities are also required to have particular regard to Policy PA1 of the NPS-UDC.

⁴ NPS-UDC, Policies PC13 and PC14.

Christchurch to support the long term needs of people and communities, including through the development of the UDS and subsequent updates. Given the work that has already been done, the Partnership has been able to address the requirements of the NPS-UDC in the context of a review of the strategic land use framework provided by the UDS (Settlement Pattern Review Update).

[13] The Settlement Pattern Review Update has focussed on the key strategic planning directions that need to be undertaken collaboratively through the Greater Christchurch Partnership to address the land use and infrastructure issues identified in the Capacity Assessment. It recognises that providing development capacity is not just about land supply and therefore also considers other more detailed planning and policy actions that will need to be implemented to realise the broader growth aspirations for Greater Christchurch.

[14] In summary, Our Space:

a. Focuses on how urban areas accommodate growth and how efficient infrastructure planning can support and guide development decisions;

b. Builds on existing plans that show that Greater Christchurch is already well-placed for future development over the next 30 years;

c. Balances the projected future demands of housing and business markets with the urban form that will best enable sustainable growth whilst acknowledging the effects that the Canterbury earthquakes have had on the demand for, and distribution of, housing and businesses in Greater Christchurch; and

d. Recognises that how we live today will be quite different 30 years from now, so we need to be responsive to change.

[15] Specifically, Our Space:

a. Sets out how Greater Christchurch and territorial authority targets for housing for the next 30 years will be met, accommodating an additional 150,000 people;

b. Identifies locations for housing growth through to 2048, encouraging central city and suburban centre living while providing for township growth in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi;
c. Reinforces the role of key centres in providing additional retail and office floorspace, in particular the central city and the potential for surrounding industrial zones to transition to commercial uses over time, if needed;

d. Recognises the existing industrial land provision as sufficient to cater for anticipated industrial growth; and

e. Outlines a series of implementation actions and further work required by partners, recognising that although the long term is addressed in Our Space, additional work is required to ensure that planning directions for the longer term are appropriately investigated and implemented, and effectively respond to emerging drivers of change for Greater Christchurch.

[16] The Strategy is set out in six parts which can be summarised as follows:

a. The place and context of Greater Christchurch and explanation of the NPS-UDC

b. Business and residential growth needs for Greater Christchurch

c. The key challenges facing Greater Christchurch when providing for growth

d. The plan for growth, including locations, how sequencing is to be provided for, and transport and infrastructure

e. Future actions and monitoring

[17] The Strategy is part of a policy cycle of ongoing monitoring and a frequently updated evidence base. The NPS-UDC requires local authorities to carry out a housing and business development capacity assessment on a three-yearly basis and monitor a range of indicators on a quarterly basis. When this evidence or monitoring indicates that development capacity is not sufficient in any of the short, medium or long term, local authorities are required to respond by providing further development capacity and enabling development. We set out below the legal framework for the Strategy and its development under the NPS-UDC.

[18] As indicated in the Ministry for the Environment Guidance material, as a future development strategy, Our Space will guide and inform future planning and decision-making about future urban growth, potential constraints to urban growth and
opportunities and solutions to respond to growth over the next 30 years.\(^6\) Our Space will be a relevant strategy for decision-makers to have regard to on any change to, or review of, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) and district plans.

**LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

[19] The legal framework for Our Space is summarised in the Officers' Report, and we adopt that as set out below. We have slightly re-ordered these to recognise up front the NPS requirements to prepare a future development strategy.

[20] The NPS-UDC came into effect in 2016. It directs local authorities to provide sufficient development capacity in their resource management plans, supported by infrastructure, to meet demand for housing and business land. This capacity can be provided outwards (on greenfield sites) and/or upwards (by intensifying existing urban environments).

[21] Policies PC12 to PC14 of the NPS-UDC relate to the production of a future development strategy, as set out in the following table. A key requirement of a future development strategy is that it demonstrates there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing and business in the medium and long term. Our Space is the future development strategy for Greater Christchurch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC12</td>
<td>Local authorities shall produce a future development strategy which demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term. This strategy will also set out how the minimum targets set in accordance with policies PC5 and PC9 will be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC13</td>
<td>The future development strategy shall:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) identify the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity over the long term in future urban environments and intensification opportunities within existing urban environments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) be informed by the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies required under the Local Government Act 2002, and any other relevant strategies, plans and documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC14</td>
<td>The future development strategy can be incorporated into a non-statutory document that is not prepared under the Act, including documents and strategies prepared under other legislation. In developing this strategy, local authorities shall:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Undertake a consultation process that complies with:
   ○ Part 6 of the Local Government Act; or
   ○ Schedule 1 of the Act;

b) be informed by the assessment under policy PB1; and

c) have particular regard to policy PA1.

[22] Policy PA1 is a central policy of the NPS-UDC, stating that local authorities shall ensure that at any one time there is sufficient, feasible development capacity, according to the table below, in the short (three years), medium (ten years) and long term (thirty years).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Policy PA1 Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Term (0-3 years)</td>
<td>Development capacity must be feasible, zoned and serviced with development infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term (3-10 years)</td>
<td>Development capacity must be feasible, zoned and either:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ serviced with development infrastructure, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ the funding for the development infrastructure required to service that development capacity must be identified in a Long Term Plan required under the Local Government Act 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term (10-30 years)</td>
<td>Development capacity must be feasible, identified in relevant plans and strategies, and the development infrastructure required to service it must be identified in the relevant Infrastructure Strategy required under the Local Government Act 2002.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[23] We received legal advice from Wynn Williams\(^7\) as part of the Officers’ Reply Report on the requirements of the NPS-UDC for assessing sufficiency and feasibility. Development capacity, sufficient, feasible and demand are all separately defined in the NPS-UDC.

[24] Policies PA2, PA3 and PA4 also direct local authority decision making. These policies recognise the importance of infrastructure to support urban development and that in providing development capacity, local authorities need to provide for the wellbeing of people, communities and future generations, but not without considering the effects of development.

\(^7\) Memorandum from Wynn Williams, Legal advice to accompany any Officers’ Response to Panel questions in relation to sufficiency and feasibility dated 8 March 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA2</td>
<td>Local authorities shall satisfy themselves that other infrastructure required to support urban development are likely to be available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PA3    | When making planning decisions that affect the way and the rate at which development capacity is provided, decision-makers shall provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations, whilst having particular regard to:  
  a) providing for choices that will meet the needs of people and communities and future generations for a range of dwelling types and locations, working environments and places to locate businesses;  
  b) promoting the efficient use of urban land and development infrastructure and other infrastructure; and  
  c) limiting as much as possible adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets. |
| PA4    | When considering the effects of urban development, decision-makers shall take into account:  
  a) the benefits that urban development will provide with respect to the ability for people and communities and future generations to provide for their social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing; and  
  b) the benefits and costs of urban development at a national, inter-regional, regional and district scale, as well as the local effects. |

[25] Policies PA3 and PA4 impose obligations on a decision-maker, which is defined in the NPS-UDC as any person exercising functions and powers under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

[26] While the objectives and high level policies of the NPS-UDC apply to all local authorities, some policies apply only to local authorities that have part, or all, of either a medium growth urban area or high growth urban area within their district or region.

[27] In 2016, the Christchurch urban area (which includes the towns of Prebbleton in the Selwyn District and Kaiapoi in the Waimakariri District) was defined by Statistics NZ as a high growth urban area.

[28] Given the strategic planning arrangements that already exist between Greater Christchurch councils through the Greater Christchurch Partnership, it was agreed that the urban area covered by the UDS would be the more appropriate geographic focus for the purposes of meeting the NPS-UDC requirements. This area is defined in Map A of Chapter 6 of the CRPS.

[29] The key additional NPS-UDC requirements for local authorities with high growth urban areas are:
  a. commence quarterly monitoring of market indicators (PB6)
b. complete a housing and business development capacity assessment (PB1 to PB5)

c. produce a future development strategy (PC12 to PC14)

d. set minimum housing targets in regional policy statements and district plans (PC5 to PC11).

[30] Recognising the importance of coordinated planning and decision making, policies PD1 and PD3 strongly encourage local authorities that share jurisdiction over an urban area to collaborate and cooperate to reach agreement on the content of a capacity assessment, the specification of the minimum targets and the production of a joint future development strategy.

[31] Policies PB1 to PB7 of the NPS-UDC relate to the preparation of a comprehensive evidence base to support planning decisions. Key requirements of these policies include monitoring market indicators and completing a housing and business development capacity assessment (Capacity Assessment). The Greater Christchurch Partnership has met these two requirements, with links to the relevant outputs provided in the following table: 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPS-UDC Output</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Development Indicators - Quarterly Monitoring</td>
<td><a href="http://greaterchristchurch.org.nz/ourspace/urban-development-indicators/">Link</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[32] The NPS-UDC requires high growth area local authorities to prepare a capacity assessment every three years and monitor market indicators on a quarterly basis. This ensures that local authorities have a robust and up-to-date base of information on which to make decisions that impact development capacity and, ultimately, the supply and price of housing and business space. When the evidence base or

---

8 The Greater Christchurch Partnership’s housing and business development capacity assessment has been held in draft form at this stage so that it may be informed by additional information provided through consultation on the draft future development strategy (Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update).
monitoring indicates that development capacity is not sufficient in any of the short, medium or long term, local authorities shall respond by providing further development capacity and enabling development in accordance with policies PA1, PC1 or PC2, and PC4.

[33] Policies PC5 to PC11 relate to the setting of minimum targets for sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing. The targets should reflect the overall quantity of demand for housing identified in the capacity assessment and include the additional margins required under policies PC1 or PC2. Minimum targets must be set for the medium and long term, and be reviewed every three years.

[34] The NPS-UDC directs regional councils to incorporate minimum targets for sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing into their regional policy statements and territorial authorities to incorporate minimum targets, as a proportion of the regional minimum target, into a relevant resource management plan.9

PREPARATION OF OUR SPACE – BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

[35] When the NPS-UDC was introduced in 2016, the Greater Christchurch Partnership was well placed to respond to the requirement to produce a future development strategy given the work it had undertaken for more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development in Greater Christchurch to support the long term needs of people and communities. As set out in the Harrison Grierson Report, a collaborative approach to spatial planning underpinned by a robust-evidence base as required by the NPS-UDC is not a new concept for the Greater Christchurch Partnership.10

[36] The vision, principles and strategic goals of the UDS recognise the importance of leadership, partnership and collaboration and integrating environmental, land use, infrastructure, social, cultural, economic and governance goals, working with the environment, and using the best available information and evidence in decision making, policies, plans and activities.

[37] The UDS was developed with significant community consultation and set out an approach to managing growth and providing for community wellbeing in Greater Christchurch to 2041. The UDS and the Greater Christchurch Partnership played a

---

9 NPS-UDC, Policies PC5-PC11.
crucial role in coordinating and facilitating rebuild and recovery activities after the earthquakes. This included implementation of a land use framework inserted into the CRPS by the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP).

[38] Prior to the NPS-UDC taking effect in 2016, the Greater Christchurch Partnership had endorsed an update to the UDS to respond to the significant events and changes that had occurred in Greater Christchurch, particularly in relation to the Canterbury earthquakes. This did not attempt to revise the land use framework outlined for Greater Christchurch in the LURP and in Chapter 6 of the CRPS. Instead it contained a priority action relating to a comprehensive review of the UDS.

[39] Following the NPS-UDC taking effect, the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee endorsed a review of the UDS to focus on the settlement pattern aspects needed to meet the requirements of the NPS-UDC. The main objective of the Settlement Pattern Review Update was to enable the local authorities across Greater Christchurch to collaboratively review the existing settlement pattern arrangements and ensure they fulfil their statutory obligations under the NPS-UDC.

[40] A further objective seeks to ensure appropriate alignment with other planning and strategy processes, including:

a. The District Plan review underway in the Selwyn District
b. The District Development Strategy and District Plan review underway in the Waimakariri District
c. The Christchurch District Plan
d. The Greater Christchurch Transport Statement, Canterbury Regional Land Transport Plan and Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan
e. The development by councils of 2018-2028 Long Term Plans and 30 Year Infrastructure Strategies.

[41] In May 2018, the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee endorsed a scoping paper that outlined how a future development strategy for Greater Christchurch would be produced. It stated that it would be guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals of the UDS, and would represent the integrated land use and infrastructure planning response to the findings of the Capacity Assessment.

[42] It stated the principles that would shape the approach of the future development strategy as being that it:

a. Helps deliver and aligns with the vision for Greater Christchurch
b. Demonstrates a collaborative approach through leadership and partnership
c. Integrates, supports and builds on existing strategies and initiatives through an efficient, fit-for-purpose and holistic process

d. Enables a responsive approach that can address any changes to Government policy, changes arising from the drivers and disruptions that may influence urban development, and further long term spatial planning following the adoption of the future development strategy

e. Achieves the NPS-UDC requirements

f. Is informed by a robust evidence base and feedback from stakeholder and community engagement.

CONSULTATION AND THE HEARING PROCESS

[43] The Greater Christchurch Partnership prepared a draft Our Space document for consultation under Part 6 of the LGA. The Officers’ Report\textsuperscript{11} sets out the comprehensive consultation process undertaken as part of the development strategy. This included formal public consultation from 1 to 30 November 2018, stakeholder mailouts, public notices and press releases, targeted engagement and workshops, presentations and seminars and public drop in sessions.

[44] A total of 92 submissions were received on Our Space. The public hearings occupied 5 days commencing 25 February 2019. The hearings were held at the offices of the Canterbury Regional Council (CRC or Environment Canterbury), and the Christchurch City Council (CCC) in Christchurch City, as well as the Waimakariri District Council (WDC) in Rangiora and the Selwyn District Council (SDC) in Rolleston. The hearing process enabled submitters who wanted to be heard to present their submissions to us in a public forum. Where we had questions of submitters, we asked these, and also provided opportunities for clarification from the submitters.

[45] As part of our proceedings, we issued three Minutes. The first Minute\textsuperscript{12} issued on 8 February 2019 discussed potential for conflicts of interest and disclosure relating to those, with provision for any party to raise issues. No issues were raised by submitters in relation to those matters.

[46] We issued a second Minute\textsuperscript{13} on 7 March 2019 outlining matters which we considered relevant to our consideration of the Strategy, and arising from the content

\textsuperscript{11} At Section 3, pages 9-12.
\textsuperscript{12} Minute 1 of the Hearing Panel dated 8 February 2019.
\textsuperscript{13} Minute 2 of the Hearing Panel dated 7 March 2019.
of the submissions and evidence presented to us. We provided Officers with the opportunity to respond to those questions, and commenced our deliberations in public on 11 March 2019.

[47] In a third Minute issued on 11 March 2019, we invited the Chief Executives of the Partner Councils to address us in relation to outstanding matters between the Partner Councils, which they did on Wednesday 13 March 2019.

[48] At its meeting on 31 May 2019, the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee received our Recommendations Report dated 3 May 2019. At the meeting the Committee requested that we provide clarification on our recommendations in relation to four matters. The Hearings Panel met on 31 May and 5 June 2019 to deliberate on these matters. We have addressed the Committee’s request as an Addendum to our Recommendations Report and for ease of reference have incorporated our further recommended amendments to Our Space in Appendix 2.

[49] We are grateful for the assistance of both the Officers and submitters in the hearing process for providing thoughtful, informed and useful information to us. We address what we consider to be the key issues raised in submissions later in this report.

[50] We are satisfied that no party has raised with us any procedural matters in relation to the process and hearings that are not addressed in this report.

[51] This report encompasses our recommendations to the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee on Our Space. Appendix 1 sets out our recommendations and reasons in response to every submission (whether heard or not) lodged on Our Space. A copy of Our Space 2018-2048 incorporating our recommendations is attached as Appendix 2. Copies of the Minutes issued by the Hearings Panel are included as Appendix 3. The Addendum to the Report and Recommendations of the Hearings Panel dated 5 June 2019 is attached as Appendix 4.

RECOMMENDATION AND REASONS

[52] In the sections below we address the key issues raised in submissions on Our Space. In making our recommendations we have considered all material provided to us and presented during the course of the hearings. In setting out our reasons for our recommendations in this report we have not discussed all individual comments in detail, but have grouped these according to the issues raised. We have in some
cases referred to individual comments made, where doing so assists in explaining our reasoning and recommendations.

[53] In Appendix 1 to this report we have set out our recommendations in response to each of the individual submissions lodged on Our Space. Again, in setting out our reasons for the recommendations we have not discussed all individual comments in detail.

[54] The Panel adopts the recommendations in the Officers’ Report unless otherwise stated.

**Role and scope of Our Space considering the requirements of the NPS-UDC**

[55] We asked Officers about the role and scope of Our Space considering the requirements of the NPS-UDC.

[56] They told us that the principal objective of Our Space is that the councils in Greater Christchurch meet their obligations under policies PC12 to PC14 of the NPS-UDC to produce a future development strategy, and that this is achieved through a collaborative approach guided by the comprehensive strategic planning framework that already exists for Greater Christchurch.

[57] In this context, they said, Section 1 of Our Space outlines the purpose and scope of the document. This includes “to address the need for housing and business development capacity in Greater Christchurch”, and in doing so, that “it will satisfy the requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity for high growth councils to produce a ‘future development strategy’”.

[58] Officers recommended strengthening the wording in Section 1 to make it clear that Our Space has principally been prepared to satisfy the requirements to produce a future development strategy.

[59] During discussion between the Hearings Panel and Mr Matthew Bonis, a planning consultant and an expert witness for the Lyttelton Port Company (LPC), Mr Bonis mentioned that perhaps a good way of bringing clarity to the purpose of the Our Space document, which he considered was lacking, might be to strip back the content of it so that it just responded to the capacity requirements under policies PC12 to PC14 of the NPS-UDC.

---

[60] Officers told us that they acknowledge that there are elements in Our Space that do not directly contribute to meeting the statutory requirements under policies PC12 to PC14 of the NPS-UDC to produce a future development strategy. Such sections mostly cover context and trends, cultural values and aspirations, strategic and policy background, growth challenges, and integrated land use and transport planning.

[61] They said that while the main objective of Our Space is to ensure that the councils in Greater Christchurch meet their obligations under the NPS-UDC, sections covering wider considerations, beyond those required by the NPS-UDC, are still important for providing the bigger picture for how Our Space proposes to accommodate future housing and business needs across Greater Christchurch. These matters are considered to be complementary to, and not conflicting with, the NPS-UDC objectives and requirements. Such elements have also been included in recognition of Our Space’s broader audience, which includes a mix of stakeholders, businesses, community groups and residents that are likely to expect some consideration of such elements as part of this growth planning exercise for Greater Christchurch.

[62] We are satisfied that the overall content and specificity of Our Space is appropriate and accept the Officers’ recommendation as set out in their reply.

Accuracy and uncertainties of projected future demand
[63] Our Space adopts population projections that reflect recent growth trends in Greater Christchurch. The rationale for the adopted projections is set out in the Capacity Assessment. However, in short, the Capacity Assessment is based on the adoption of medium population projections for Christchurch City and medium-high projections for both Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. This approach in the Capacity Assessment sought to “balance a desire to be ‘ahead of the curve’ when planning for growth, with ensuring that the financing and provision of new infrastructure is timely to support future growth needs.”\(^{15}\) A report published by the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry for Innovation Business and Enterprise in July 2018\(^{16}\) considered the demand assessment for Greater Christchurch to be best practice amongst high growth areas.

[64] As summarised in the Officers’ Report, submitters have questioned the ability to accurately determine projected demand, particularly over a thirty year period, and

\(^{15}\) Our Space, Section 3.1, page 20.
how this might alter with changes in migration, working practices, uptake of new technologies and the impacts of affordability constraints. Submitters also questioned the veracity of the data used given Greater Christchurch’s unique circumstances following the earthquakes.

[65] Some submitters disagreed with the projected demand for specific needs and/or locations. For example, projected demand for industrial land in Rolleston and household growth in Waimakariri were considered to be under projected by some submitters. Submitters also questioned the appropriateness of the approach taken to set housing targets.

[66] During the course of the hearings, we heard from a number of submitters who were critical of the Capacity Assessment methodology. Officers have accepted that there are significant uncertainties in determining future demand. This is reflected in the NPS-UDC requirements for ongoing monitoring and review of projections and targets as part of the periodic capacity assessments. Officers stated that subsequent capacity assessments will benefit from new data and information, for example, the results of the 2018 Census and the anticipated release of new sub-regional and territorial authority household projections by Statistics NZ in 2020.

[67] Officers have not recommended any changes to the adopted projections and targets set out in Section 3 of Our Space.

[68] We address some of the specific issues raised further below. However, in general we are satisfied that the uncertainties of projecting future demand can be appropriately dealt with through the ongoing monitoring and review requirements of the NPS-UDC and the Schedule of Future Work identified in Section 6.2 of Our Space to improve the tools and evidence base underpinning Our Space. As the Capacity Assessment is updated, assumptions and projections can be amended should monitoring indicate that this is appropriate. In our view this is consistent with the requirements of the NPS-UDC which anticipates a frequently updated evidence base.

---

Appropriateness of methodology for determining commercial and industrial land capacity

[69] Policy PC12 of the NPS-UDC requires a future development strategy to demonstrate that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term.

[70] We heard from a number of submitters challenging the appropriateness of the Capacity Assessment in relation to commercial and industrial land and whether Our Space provides sufficient feasible development capacity for business.\(^{17}\)

[71] In accordance with Policy PB1 of the NPS-UDC, the Capacity Assessment, in so far as it relates to business, is required to:

(b) Estimate[s] the demand for the different types and locations of business land and floor area for business, and the supply of development capacity to meet that demand, in the short, medium and long-terms; and

(c) Assess[es] interactions between housing and business activities, and their impacts on each other.

[72] When carrying out the Capacity Assessment, local authorities are required to seek and use the input of iwi authorities, the property development sector, significant land owners, social housing providers, requiring authorities, and the provisions of development infrastructure and other infrastructure.\(^{18}\)

[73] We understand from the Officers’ Reply that engagement and consultation was clearly undertaken with stakeholders, and evidence was provided of this, including specifically, approaches to Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL) and LPC. Not only does this appear to be adequate, we consider it was comprehensive. We do note that it is unfortunate that opportunities to provide input were not fully taken up by some stakeholders.

[74] The Capacity Assessment shows a large surplus of industrial land in the Greater Christchurch area, both in the medium and long term and small localised shortfalls in commercial land that are not forecast to occur until near the end of the longer term planning horizon (2044).

[75] In the course of the hearings, while we heard from a number of submitters who were critical of the Capacity Assessment methodology, we were not given any specific

\(^{17}\) Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (#73), Woolworth NZ Limited (#52), Cockburn Family Trust (#53), Christchurch International Airport Limited (#39).

\(^{18}\) NPS-UDC, Policy PB5.
changes to improve it. We did not receive any assessment as to the relationship of existing business with those ports and freight hubs, or information as to how land is allocated in those areas by developers, based on need. No suggestions were made for specific changes to the Capacity Assessment methodology or how that should be undertaken.

[76] Some of the concerns raised with the Capacity Assessment related to having industrial land in the right place, particularly as it related to the ability to move freight to other freight hubs such as the Christchurch International Airport, Lyttelton Port, City depot (Lyttelton Port) and the inland ports located at Rolleston.

[77] Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited asserted that the Capacity Assessment and recommendations flowing from it are fundamentally flawed as they do not allow for potential growth at and around the inland port. Ms Lauren Semple, counsel for this company, submitted at the hearing that the Officers’ Report did not adequately address the submitter’s concerns as it showed a fundamental misunderstanding of the drivers of demand. By utilising employee to floorspace/land area ratios, the demand for industrial land is underestimated as it relates to activities at i-Zone and i-Port. Mr Michael Copeland’s expert economic evidence was that having the inland port at Rolleston means that industrial land demand will be driven by freight volume growth and trends in freight handling logistics rather than population or employment growth.19

[78] In Minute 2, we asked Officers to address us further on this matter as part of their reply. They referred to the Economic Future Model (EFM) used to determine future demand for business land, that has been peer reviewed and found to be robust and appropriate in informing the evidence base that is integral to Our Space. Officers consider that the EFM approach does include a broad assessment of the anticipated drivers of growth for industry sectors relating to the inland ports at Rolleston and the Christchurch International Airport and incorporates appropriate consideration of their larger land requirements per employee. Officers also addressed existing industrial development capacity at Rolleston and the Christchurch International Airport in their Reply Report.

[79] We are satisfied with this response and note the Officers’ support for undertaking a collaborative and transparent piece of work (involving LPC, KiwiRail and CIAL) to ensure future freight needs are refined and further integrated with growth and

---

19 Statement of Evidence of Mr Michael Copeland at [14].
transport models operating in Greater Christchurch. This is provided for in Section 6.2 of Our Space in Items 3 and 4 of the Schedule of Future Work.

[80] We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from Officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the business land capacity and feasibility work done by the Greater Christchurch Partnership to be an example of ‘best practice’.

[81] We accept that the Capacity Assessment is adequate for the present purpose and has been appropriately consulted on. However, as there will be improvements with any assessment model over time, we do consider it appropriate to recommend that as part of future Capacity Assessments, regard is had to demand and location of industrial and business land in close proximity to freight hubs. This will contribute to the consideration of overall capacity and sufficiency of industrial and business zoned land and may identify opportunities for consideration of specific areas feeding into the review of the CRPS.

Requests for additional land to be included for future commercial and industrial development

[82] A number of requests were received for additional land to be provided for commercial and industrial use. The consideration of greenfield business and industrial land is slightly different from that of residential land, as it does not have the same potential impact on intensification targets. Submitters placed emphasis on the supply of additional land keeping land prices low, and the addition of more sellers in the industrial land market increasing competition in a market that is dominated by a relatively small number of existing industrial land owners. Submitters also noted the existence of locational constraints (close to strategic freight networks) as well as the impact of ownership and development models, resulting in a lack of bare zoned land of different sizes.

[83] We received a number of submissions that opposed general greenfield expansion, however none with a particular focus on the expansion of industrial or business land. Notwithstanding that, there are effects that are created by the expansion of greenfield

---


21 Foddercube Products Limited (#47), Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (#73), Woolworths (NZ) Limited (#52), Cockburn Family Trust (#53), Mrs Sally and Mr Ben Tothill (#40), R J Civil Construction (#35), Christchurch International Airport Limited (#39), Lyttelton Port Company (#67), Carter Group Limited (#76), Mr John Law (#92).
land for business purposes that are similar to those identified for greenfield residential land. That includes the contribution of it to urban sprawl, impacts on versatile and high quality soils, impacts on existing zoned industrial land, contribution of trip distances and private vehicle use on contribution to climate change, and impacts on the amenity of the rural land resource.

[84] The Capacity Assessment shows a large surplus of industrial land in the Greater Christchurch Area, in both the medium and medium to long term. There are potential shortfalls in commercial space over the longer term. Officers advised that shortfalls in the long term will be met by transitioning industrial land over time and that future monitoring will identify the extent of any shortfalls. Mr Dean Chrystal, planning expert for Woolworths NZ Ltd expressed his concern with the Officers’ approach to any shortfall of commercial land in the northern quadrant of Christchurch City, being that there is sufficient inner-city industrial land available to transition to commercial use to meet longer term needs; that future monitoring will identify the extent of any shortfalls; and that other methods available to meet more localised demands in the northern quadrant without needing to expand the urban boundary would be explored as part of subsequent capacity assessments and district plan reviews. Rather, Mr Dean Chrystal noted that other methods are not available to locate a supermarket and that a supermarket would not have distributional effects on surrounding key activity centres or the central city. We agree with the Officers that changes to the urban area need to be supported by wider analysis of business development in the north. We accept the Officers’ position that opportunity needs to be provided for development of the Key Activity Centre at Northwood/Belfast, and that the proper opportunity to address this further is as part of the review of the CRPS.

Land in close proximity to freight hubs

[85] We are, however, cognisant of the request from a number of property owners at Rolleston requesting additional land that has the ability to access a rail siding, for access to the Port of Lyttelton or the wider rail network. As noted above, we recommend that further work is done in the next Capacity Assessment in relation to demand and location of industrial and business land in close proximity to freight hubs. The next Capacity Assessment will inform the full review of the CRPS. In addition to this work, given the evidence that we have received from the Cockburn Family Trust\(^22\) and Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited\(^23\) we consider it appropriate

\(^{22}\) Cockburn Family Trust (#53).
that Environment Canterbury engages with these parties prior to the notification of the review of the CRPS in relation to the appropriateness of including their land within Map A of Chapter 6, in light of the results of the next Capacity Assessment.

[86] Having regard to the evaluation and reasons given above, and the responses provided to individual submissions, we are satisfied that Our Space appropriately implements the provisions of the NPS-UDC as it relates to business land capacity. We note that additional refinement of the methodology as part of the next Capacity Assessment may inform additional changes as part of the review of the CRPS.

Port of Lyttelton

[87] LPC was particularly concerned that it may have difficulty consenting development on future reclaimed land adjacent to the existing Port area, in Te Awaparahi Bay (future reclamation site). This is due to concerns that LPC’s activities on its future reclamation site will be constrained by Objective 6.2.1 and Policy 6.3.1 of the operative CRPS if the future reclamation site is not identified in Our Space such that it can be identified in Map A when the CRPS is reviewed.

[88] The geographic extent of Greater Christchurch, for the purposes of Chapter 6 of the CRPS and Our Space, is the area shown on Map A. The reclamation area facilitated by the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan is not located within the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A. This is because the boundary of the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A represents the territorial authority boundaries at the time that Map A was inserted into the CRPS. As the reclamation area was not ‘land’ at that time it did not fall within the territorial authority boundaries. Therefore, the reclamation area is not within the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A and the provisions of Chapter 6 of the CRPS do not apply. Likewise, the reclamation area sits outside the geographic area of focus for Our Space. On that basis, we do not consider Our Space or Chapter 6 of the CRPS to be an impediment to activities on the future reclamation site and do not consider it necessary, or appropriate, to identify the future reclamation site in Our Space.

Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the 10-Minute neighbourhood and 8-80 concept

[89] One of the key approaches in terms of developing Our Space is consideration of the strategic growth directions of the UDS and CRPS, which support development
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23 Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (#73).
around Key Activity Centres, addressed in section 5.7 of Our Space. Consolidated growth enables towns and centres to more easily provide the local facilities and services that communities need and maximises the efficiency of key transport routes and other infrastructure services. Supporting the growth and vitality of Key Activity Centres is engrained in the UDS and Chapter 6 of the CRPS which provides direction that the Central City and Key Activity Centres are the focus for commercial activity (office and retail), not just shopping malls, but also other public and community facilities such as education, health and leisure services. These centres integrate high quality public realm spaces and are well-connected by public transport services and safe cycle networks. Medium density housing in and around such centres supports their vitality and viability.

[90] Figure 19 of Our Space encapsulates this approach through use of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’ conceptual diagram. The fundamental concept behind this is the ability for a resident to meet most of their everyday needs locally within a 10-minute journey from home, by either walking, cycling, or by public transport. The purpose behind it is to provide opportunities for modal shift away from private vehicle usage.

[91] In the course of the hearing, we heard from several submitters supporting the 10-minute neighbourhood concept, as well as comments from others seeking that priorities for centres should be revisited or there should be identification of new centres such as a Key Transport and Economic Node (KTEN) at the Christchurch International Airport.

[92] We explored with officers the concept of the 10-minute neighbourhood, as well as the 8-80 cities model, that is, making city’s accessible for those between the ages of 8 and 80 as described in the submission of Mr Hawke.

[93] Officers recommended amended wording in Section 5 to provide a better explanation of Key Activity Centres and the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept shown in Figure 19. We agree that the recommended amendments are appropriate.

[94] Officers said that many aspects of the 10-minute neighbourhood are consistent with the 8-80 concept, including walkability, safe streets and places, and safe cycling.
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24 Ms Suzanne Vallance (#18), Spokes Canterbury (#41), Canterbury District Health Board (#58).
25 Woolworths NZ Limited (#52).
26 Christchurch International Airport Limited (#39).
27 Mr David Hawke (#10).
networks. However, they noted that whereas the 10-minute neighbourhood concept promotes accessibility as it relates to proximity, the 8-80 concept emphasises principles of accessibility as it relates to mobility and the need to provide inclusive, well-designed environments for all ages. It was the Officers’ position that these more detailed urban design principles are supported and already captured by the NZ Urban Design Protocol 20051 referenced in CRPS Policy 6.3.2, so are more appropriately addressed in local design guides produced by territorial authorities.

[95] We accept the Officers’ response to this and that no further changes are required to Our Space.

[96] We consider that the centres-based approach to providing for commercial land and floorspace remains the most appropriate to achieve NPS-UDC requirements and achieve the UDS vision and strategic goals. We note our discussion above that the refinement of data and methodologies relating to commercial and industrial land needs can be considered as part of subsequent capacity assessments and inform the monitoring and review aspects of the NPS-UDC requirements and the broader review of Chapter 6 of the CRPS.

**Sufficient feasible development capacity for housing**

[97] PC12 of the NPS-UDC requires the future development strategy to demonstrate two key outcomes in relation to housing:

a. That there will be sufficient feasible development capacity available to meet housing demands in the medium and long term.

b. Set out how the minimum targets for housing will be met.

[98] Our Space identifies the demand for housing and the associated minimum housing targets. The housing targets are being consulted on through Our Space and will be set by the Greater Christchurch local authorities and inserted into the CRPS and district plans in accordance with section 55(2A) of the RMA.

[99] In relation to demand, a comprehensive report on the demand profile for housing in Greater Christchurch was commissioned as part of the Capacity Assessment.\(^28\) The report projects demand for:

a. Housing in different groups within the population (age, household composition, income);

\(^{28}\) Housing Demand in Greater Christchurch (November 2017) prepared by Livingston Associates.
b. Different household groups translates into demand for different housing typologies (stand-alone homes; multi-unit dwellings; and apartments);

c. Private owner occupier dwellings, private rented dwellings, and social housing (rented); and

d. Housing typologies as distributed across broad locations and price points.

[100] The report revealed common trends likely for Christchurch City, Selwyn District and Waimakariri District over the next 30 years. Officers addressed these trends in the Officers’ Report. They advised that while there is still strong demand for standalone, single storey dwellings in greenfield areas that must be supported, the Capacity Assessment clearly shows that there will be an increasing demand for smaller, more affordable dwellings that are more likely to be, although not exclusively, delivered through redevelopment and intensification of existing urban areas.

[101] In response to these trends, Officers advised that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that provides for current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years. In doing so, it identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing and adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on the current projections.

[102] We understand that the housing targets for Greater Christchurch over the medium and long term, together with the territorial authority apportionment of the targets over the medium term, are based on projected demands for housing identified in the Capacity Assessment. It is only the territorial apportionment of the targets over the medium term that represents a transitional approach.

[103] Officers advised that this approach to targets seeks to respond to projected changes over the long term, rather than constraining growth in the districts to benefit development prospects and outcomes in Christchurch City.

[104] We also understand that in accordance with the requirements of PC1 of the NPS-UDC, margins of 20% in the short and medium term and 15% in the long term have been included to provide flexibility to allow for situations when developments are not brought to the market.

[105] As a Panel we must be satisfied that Our Space demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in Greater Christchurch to meet demand over the medium and long term. A number of submitters do not consider that Our Space demonstrates this. Key reasons include:
a. Concerns in relation to the feasible development capacity underpinning Our Space, including the feasibility of developing geotechnically constrained land and more generally in relation to the feasibility analysis;

b. Housing choices are not sufficiently provided for and more land should be provided to increase supply and improve affordability;

c. The broad location, timing and sequencing of development is not sufficiently identified; and

d. Our Space will preclude the consideration of future changes to Chapter 6 of the CRPS and the rezoning of land.

[106] We also had submitters concerned about urban sprawl and its associated effects. We address these matters in the following sections of our report.

[107] Our Space identifies that the overall amount of feasible housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch is sufficient to meet demand over the medium term. However, there is insufficient development capacity in certain locations within Greater Christchurch in the medium term and overall when we consider the long term housing demand. At the territorial authority level, Our Space records that given the range of reported feasibility, capacity in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts may not be sufficient to meet demand over the medium term, while the significant capacity in Christchurch City is expected to be sufficient over the next 30 years, even with a higher share of growth apportioned to the City over the long term period.

[108] These projected shortfalls are proposed to be met through:

a. Redevelopment of existing urban areas in Christchurch City;

b. Existing greenfield areas in Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts; and

c. New greenfield and redevelopment areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts.

[109] A change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS is proposed to be progressed at the earliest opportunity to enable the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts the flexibility to respond to identified housing need. Details of this change are set out in the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2 of Our Space.

[110] Additional capacity is to be directed in the first instance to the key towns of Rolleston, Kaiapoi and Rangiora in support of the public enhancement opportunities mentioned in Our Space. This is proposed to occur in the future development areas identified in Figures 15 and 16 of Our Space. It is important to note that these areas are
located within the projected infrastructure boundaries identified on Map A of Chapter 6 of the CRPS and are totally consistent with the long term growth strategy in the UDS. We understand that these new areas will provide much of the capacity required over both the medium and long term. A 2019 change to the CRPS would ensure that land can be rezoned to meet medium term capacity needs, and the longer term will be further considered as part of a comprehensive review of the CRPS. We note for completeness that Policy PA1 does not require development capacity over the long term to be zoned, it need only be identified.

Feasibility analysis

[111] We received evidence from a number of submitters in relation to feasibility. Mr Adam Thompson, an urban economist, undertook a feasibility analysis for GFR Rhodes Estate & Larson Group\(^29\) and Suburban Estates, Doncaster Developments and Sovereign Palms.\(^30\) Mr Thompson assessed the feasibility of capacity in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. He concluded that there is an immediate need for additional land in Prebbleton and Rolleston and that for the long term there is insufficient capacity to meet the housing targets within Prebbleton, Rolleston and Lincoln. He considered that there is an immediate need for additional land in Rangiora and Kaiapoi and for the long term, out to 2048, there is insufficient capacity to meet the housing targets.

[112] CCC also raised concern in its submission that there was a misalignment in Our Space between the figures used for housing development capacity over the medium term and the need for intervention. This particularly relates to the figures included in Table 3 of Our Space for the Selwyn District. Officers addressed feasibility in the Officers’ Report and further in their Reply Report in response to questions from the Hearings Panel.

[113] Officers noted that the text associated with Table 3 highlights that the feasibility assessments undertaken for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts produced a wide range of results, and that further work to improve modelling tools was underway. Updated feasibility assessments were completed for the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts prior to the Our Space consultation, but too late to be incorporated into the Our Space document, so were included in the consultation as supporting material. Officers considered that to ensure alignment between the
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\(^{29}\) GFR Rhodes Estate & Larson Group (#60).

\(^{30}\) Suburban Estates Ltd, Doncaster Developments and Sovereign Palms Ltd (#51).
assessments of sufficient, feasible development capacity and any related proposals in Our Space, it is necessary for a final Our Space document to be based on the best available information.

[114] Officers noted that further and ongoing refinement of the feasibility tools for Greater Christchurch, as well as discussions with landowners and developers, is considered to be critical to supporting a sound understanding of feasible development capacity and should be incorporated as part of the next Capacity Assessment due in 2020.

[115] The Officers also noted the timing of the next Capacity Assessment and the potential opportunity for it to inform any changes to district plans to address shortfalls in development capacity. It is recommended that the proposed change to the CRPS should proceed to provide the policy mechanism to respond to any identified needs in the District Plan reviews. The findings of the next Capacity Assessment will inform the review of the CRPS and any subsequent changes to the district plans.

[116] In summary, Officers recommended the following changes:

a. Amended wording for Section 3.2, paragraph 3, p. 13 to identify the range of feasible development capacity figures produced for Selwyn and Waimakariri, as well as for Christchurch City, and the rationale for adopting a specific feasible development capacity figure for each territorial authority as the basis for determining sufficiency.

b. Retain the current proposal to change the CRPS to enable additional development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri to help address the identified capacity shortfalls over the medium term.

c. Additional wording in Section 3.2 that highlights that further and ongoing refinement of the feasibility tools will be undertaken by constituent partner councils and incorporated as part of the next capacity assessment due in 2020, and that this next capacity assessment should be used as the basis for making any zoning changes to address capacity shortfalls as part of the District Plan reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri.

[117] Officers advised that while the findings from Mr Thompson’s evidence differ from that reported in the Capacity Assessment and Our Space, the detailed methodology and assumptions included as part of Mr Thompson’s assessment were not provided. This has limited the ability for the Officers, and the Panel, to test the veracity of the findings.
Conversely, an economic expert engaged by the NPS-UDC team in the Ministry for the Environment when developing the NPS-UDC and associated guidance, has extensively reviewed the methodology, costings and assumptions that form part of the Capacity Assessment and considered the work robust and appropriate in informing the evidence base that is integral to Our Space.\textsuperscript{31} Like the Officers, we have weighed the evidence provided by submitters against the Capacity Assessment and findings of the peer review, and are satisfied that no further changes are required to Our Space.

We also note the legal advice provided to the Hearings Panel on the requirements of the NPS-UDC for assessing sufficiency and feasibility. We note from that advice that whilst the NPS-UDC lists matters that must be addressed when assessing demand, the weight to be given to each matter is at the discretion of the local authority.

Likewise, when assessing what is feasible, in order to assess whether or not something is commercially viable, a decision maker has the discretion to give the factors listed whatever weight it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

When assessing sufficiency, Policy PB3 of the NPS-UDC requires the consideration of relevant plans and proposed and operative regional policy statements, and Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies prepared under the Local Government Act 2002 as a minimum requirement, but goes on to list a number of other matters for consideration. Again, the list is not exhaustive and local authorities are able to determine whether other factors would assist in the estimate of sufficiency. The matters that are listed in Policy PB3 are illustrative not exclusive and although those matters should be considered by the local authority, the weight to be attributed to those matters is at the discretion of the local authority, as is the ability to consider other matters perceived to be relevant.

We agree that the decision as to the appropriate balance between the matters in Policy PB3 rests with the local authority. We also reiterate that the NPS-UDC anticipates that the evidence base used to inform planning decisions will be frequently updated.\textsuperscript{32}


\textsuperscript{32} NPS-UDC, Objective 081 seeks a robustly developed, comprehensive and frequently updated evidence base to inform planning decisions in urban environments.
[123] We also note that Mr Thompson’s assessments were narrow, based solely on supply within specific townships and did not consider a broader scale recognising the interconnected nature of the Greater Christchurch environment. We do not consider that the NPS-UDC anticipates such a narrow approach. We were encouraged and have chosen to take a broader, and more strategic view, and consider that it is appropriate to look wider across all of Greater Christchurch, noting that the policies in the NPS-UDC are not restricted to the boundaries of the Urban Area. It is only the Officers who have provided an analysis of the entire area.

[124] We consider that it is appropriate to consider Greater Christchurch as a whole housing market, albeit that there might be higher demand in some areas than others that will lead to price differences whether they are within the bounds of Christchurch City, or within the townships of the Waimakariri and Selwyn Districts. This properly reflects the co-ordinated approach that is strongly encouraged by the NPS-UDC. We do not agree with Mr Adam Thompson’s proposition that growth must be catered for in every location where there is demand, particularly when the demand for housing can be met by supply elsewhere. The NPS-UDC does not prescribe the level of detail at which ‘different locations’ is to be assessed. Nor does it direct where or how shortfalls of development capacity are to be met.

[125] We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from Officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports.

Geotechnical constraints

[126] A number of submitters raised the issue of feasible development not taking into account the geotechnical constraints on land. Another submitter addressed a requirement to improve land that was currently considered TC3 following the Canterbury earthquakes as part of subdivision and the costs associated with it


34 Mr Lloyd Bathurst (#1), Inovo Projects (#29), and Suburban Estates Ltd, Sovereign Palms Ltd and Doncaster Developments (#51).
meaning that some development was not economically feasible. Mr Lloyd Bathurst, a submitter on Our Space, further noted that matters relating to liquefaction had not been adequately identified on the hazard constraint maps.

[127] The Officers’ position was that geotechnical constraints on land had already been taken into account as part of the Capacity Assessment. They noted that this was outlined in the technical appendices of that assessment, for housing development capacity, and modelling incorporated high-level subdivision costs specific to Greater Christchurch and for each Greenfield Priority Area. The costs were provided by Harrison Grierson, an engineering company with significant local experience. The Harrison Grierson assessment included:

- Overall land preparation costs including excavation, filling and other ground preparation. The costs associated with site preparation recognised the variable nature of soils, the assumed TC rating, risk of contaminated soils and effects of (high) groundwater.
- The cost, per linear meter, for roads, waste water, local stormwater and water connections.
- The costs associated with any larger scale stormwater mitigation, such as retention basins and treatment reserves. Where appropriate this would be calculated as a Development Contribution discount (i.e. the cost would be captured).
- Costs and fees associated with connections to trunk infrastructure and the provision of other non-Council infrastructure and services (e.g. power and telecommunications).
- Costs and fees associated with consenting, including final sub-division consent, adjusted for the approach adopted by each Council to charging for such services.
- An estimate of lot yield which will be used to calculate likely development contributions payable (less discounts for infrastructure works).
- Costs associated with marketing and advertising of new subdivisions.
- Other professional fees and costs not captured elsewhere.

35 Gillman Wheelans (#19).
[128] The Officers advised that geotechnical considerations were also factored into the feasibility modelling for redevelopment capacity in existing urban areas of Christchurch City. That assessment was undertaken by quantity surveyors WT Partnership who, Officers advised, have extensive experience of advising on property redevelopment costs in the Christchurch market.

[129] We accept that the question of feasible development is appropriately assessed in relation to geotechnical constraints, and what is determined as 'feasible', and that the Capacity Assessment is fit for our purpose. In addition, we note that the economics relating to the ability to remediate or rehabilitate land will change over time, and could well depend on land market fluctuations, remediation techniques, the original purchase price of bare land, and holding costs. Monitoring undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Partnership will be able to better flesh this out over time, which will inform future Capacity Assessments and provide historical information as to uptake.

[130] In relation to the impact of geotechnical constraints on yield, we observe that net density for Greater Christchurch, as defined in the CRPS, specifically excludes areas that are geotechnically constrained from the requirements of net density policies as follows:

Net density means the number of lots or household units per hectare (whichever is the greater). The area (ha) includes land for:

- Residential purposes, including all open space and on-site parking associated with residential development;
- Local roads and road corridors, including pedestrian and cycle ways, but excluding State Highways and major arterial roads;
- Local (neighbourhood) reserves.

The area (ha) excludes land that is:

- Stormwater retention and treatment areas;
- Geotechnically constrained (such as land subject to subsidence or inundation); [our emphasis]
- Set aside to protect significant ecological, cultural, historic heritage or landscape values;
- Set aside for esplanade reserves or access strips that form part of a larger regional or sub-regional reserve network;
- For local community services and retail facilities, or for schools, hospitals or other district, regional or sub-regional facilities.
[131] Given the requirements to meet certain densities, this information will be included with any future rezoning proposals and outline development plans, so it is easily monitored.

[132] We are satisfied that the issue of geotechnically constrained land is adequately addressed in the assumptions behind the capacity assessment and CRPS, and no changes are recommended to Our Space in relation to these matters. We are satisfied that continued monitoring will help to develop a better picture of the impact of residential yield in greenfield priority areas and future development areas.

Management of densities in greenfield priority and future development areas

[133] We had a range of submissions,36 seeking higher densities, particularly in relation to the settlements of Rolleston, Kaiapoi and Rangiora while other submissions37 sought greater flexibility in the density requirements.

[134] Officers reconfirmed their view that the evidence base to support any change is not yet sufficient and that a specific and timely piece of work is required to establish a robust and agreed position on this matter. They noted that Policy 6.3.7 of Chapter 6 of the CRPS sets minimum net densities and does not foreclose the opportunity for higher densities in greenfield areas through collaborative discussions between councils and landowners/developers to reflect specific market conditions or other relevant circumstances. They told us that this approach is encouraged by Officers in the interim ahead of resolution of this matter.

[135] We have considered a wide range of submitter views and evidence on this matter, and carefully considered that in relation to Future Development Areas, there is the possibility of a policy ‘gap’ in terms of minimum densities. Christchurch City Council considered that a minimum of 15 households per hectare in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi would be appropriate. We heard from a number of developers who, in response to questions from the Hearings Panel, considered that 12 households per hectare was reasonably achievable, while others considered 10 households per hectare provided flexibility. We heard from others again who considered that lower densities might be required because of the presence of TC3 land.

36 Mr David Hawke (#10), Mr Andrew Long (#13), Mr Michael Steadman (#014), Spokes Canterbury (#41), Mr Brendon Harre (#70), Christchurch City Council (#74).

37 Mr Ivan Robertson, Mr Lindsay Blackmore and Mr Malcolm Main (#23), Gillman Wheelans (#19), Cathedral City Developments (#38), Mr David Tipple and Mr Barry Gallagher (#25), Inovo Projects (#29), Malc Dartnell (#81), Scarborough Hills Properties (#65).
[136] Officers recommended amendments to the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2 to signal a commitment to undertake an evaluation of minimum greenfield area densities and amendments in Section 5.3.

[137] In response to our request in Minute 3, the Chief Executives of the local authorities presented to us in relation to the density provisions that should apply to the future urban development areas in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. The Chief Executives of Environment Canterbury, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri Council recommended that Our Space direct an increase to the minimum density provisions in the Future Urban Development Areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri by 20 percent to 12 households per hectare as the basis for structure planning now being undertaken by those Councils and to be reflected in their respective District Plan Reviews due for notification in 2020. The Chief Executive for Christchurch City Council reiterated her Council’s position regarding the Christchurch City Council’s preference for 15 households per hectare.

[138] The Chief Executives recommended that the Greater Christchurch Partnership work collaboratively over the next year to review and agree appropriate future density settings across Greater Christchurch to inform not just the District Plan reviews, but to also provide guidance on how density matters should be progressed as part of the full CRPS review comparable to transition paths to higher densities evident in other high growth council contexts. This would include the Greater Christchurch Partnership agreeing to a consistent methodology being used by all Greater Christchurch local authorities when completing required capacity assessments. The Chief Executives provided proposed replacement actions to achieve this in Our Space.
[139] We also requested from Officers additional tables that would show scenarios should density be managed differently in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. This is included below:

Selwyn: Long term shortfall: 5,475

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical additional capacity enabled in existing urban areas*</th>
<th>Density 10 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 12 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 15 hh/ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>7,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>7,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>8,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>8,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>9,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waimakariri: Long term shortfall: 7,675

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical additional capacity enabled in existing urban areas*</th>
<th>Density 10 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 12 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 15 hh/ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>7,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>8,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>9,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Subject to enabling this additional capacity via the District Plan Review and using other mechanisms outside of the District Plan to encourage infill/intensification development. Whilst more theoretical capacity may be enabled through District Plan Reviews, robustly calculating feasibility is also limited by a lack of comparable development that provides data (e.g. house sales) within zoned areas.

^ This is derived from a total 'gross' hectare and does not take into account infrastructure requirements and structure planning that may reduce the developable area and total dwelling count.

[140] The figures are dependent on additional capacity being made available within existing urban areas via intensification. That might include up-zoning, provision of minor units, retirement village development, elderly persons housing, and subdivision.

[141] We are conscious that there is a potential for a policy gap for future development areas, as the current provisions of the CRPS only apply to greenfield priority areas, and that it is appropriate that we signal a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare for residually zoned land in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts falling
within the Greater Christchurch area. This is intended to be determinative until such
time as further evaluation and evidence is prepared as part of the full review of the
CRPS. We are comforted by the Chief Executives’ commitment to addressing these
issues and are satisfied that in the mix of evidence received during the hearing, such
a statement in Our Space, together with amendments to items in the Schedule of
Future Work are both necessary and appropriate.

[142] We also consider that the figures provided to us by Officers are useful, and that they
are included in Our Space at the end of Section 5, with an additional note that it is
expected that a minimum density of 12 households per hectare will be achieved for
new greenfield priority areas and future development areas as part of the district plan
reviews, until such time as the CRPS is reviewed.

[143] We recommend that along with the reference to minimum net densities in the areas
indicated above, the definition of net density in the CRPS is also referenced in Our
Space.

**Monitoring and review and how this relates to feasibility and uptake**

[144] We asked Officers to address monitoring and review, and how this impacts on
feasibility and uptake. They re-iterated that Section 6 of Our Space identifies the
preparation of a new Capacity Assessment and regular monitoring of urban
development indicators in the future work of the Greater Christchurch Partnership.
They advised that this is a specific obligation on local authorities as set out in the
objectives and policies of the NPS-UDC.

[145] Importantly, they noted that there are other existing monitoring processes already
committed to and undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Partnership and partner
agencies that will complement the specific NPS-UDC requirements. For example, a
comprehensive outcomes monitoring framework already exists for the UDS. That
framework reports progress towards strategic goals and outcomes tracked using a
series of urban, environmental, community and economic indicators. They noted
further examples such as the Canterbury Wellbeing Index, which brings together
information about community wellbeing in Christchurch, Selwyn and Waimakariri, and
the monitoring and review requirements of the CRPS and District Plans relevant to
aspects of Our Space.

[146] Officers recommended an amendment to Our Space section 6.4 Research and
monitoring, as follows:
The Partnership publishes quarterly monitoring reports to track a series of core urban development indicators for Greater Christchurch. To improve our understanding of local market trends, the scope of these monitoring reports will be reviewed and expanded where appropriate to incorporate additional indicators. Monitoring trends in Greater Christchurch’s residential, commercial and industrial markets are particularly important given the disruptions caused by the earthquakes, and the new normal that is being established as the recovery and regeneration effort progresses. It is important that this monitoring integrates with other monitoring processes at local and regional levels that will collectively help assess the achievement of the strategic goals of the UDS.

[147] We consider that this is an important aspect of addressing a number of submitters’ concerns regarding how feasibility and uptake is addressed through the implementation of Our Space. As time progresses, there will be continual improvement of Capacity Assessment methodology, which will increase the accuracy of forecasting and determining sufficiency of zoning/identification for future urban activities. We accept the Officers’ recommendations in relation to this.

Housing choices - Location and type of housing

[148] A number of submitters have raised concerns that Our Space does not sufficiently provide for choices that will meet the needs of people and on that basis Our Space does not meet the requirements of Policy PA3 of the NPS-UDC.

[149] Submitters have provided evidence that demand is not being met in particular locations, particularly in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts, and that large lot and rural residential choices are not being provided for. We have addressed the appropriateness of the Capacity Assessment methodology in relation to demand above and turn now to consider Policy PA3.

[150] It is necessary to consider Policy PA3 of the NPS-UDC as a whole. Policy PA3 provides:

When making planning decisions that affect the way and the rate at which development capacity is provided, decision-makers shall provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations, whilst having particular regard to:

a) Providing for choices that will meet the needs of people and communities and future generations for a range of dwelling types and locations, working environments and places to locate business;

b) Promoting the efficient use of urban land and development infrastructure and other infrastructure; and
c) Limiting as much as possible adverse impacts on the competitive operation of land and development markets.

[151] As a non-statutory document prepared under the LGA, Our Space will be a relevant consideration for decision makers on RMA documents including the CRPS and district plans and therefore will have some influence on the way and the rate at which development capacity is provided in those documents.

[152] First and foremost, Policy PA3 requires decision-makers to provide for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations. In doing so, decision-makers are required to have particular regard to the matters listed in clauses (a) to (c) of Policy PA3.

[153] We consider that Our Space seeks to ensure that housing needs and preferences for current and future residents are met. This is clearly set out in the approach to housing demand and minimum housing targets in the Capacity Assessment, Our Space and the Officers’ Report.

[154] Our Space also recognises that there are other key growth issues for Greater Christchurch, including recognising post-earthquake trends and anticipating future drivers, integrating land use and transport planning and promoting a sustainable urban form that protects the natural environment, rural character and versatile soils. These contribute to the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations.

[155] In addition to the number of submitters seeking the identification in Our Space of additional greenfield priority areas or future development areas, rural residential and large lot development, we also received a number of submissions opposing further greenfield development. The reasons for not wanting greenfield development included the contribution it can make to urban sprawl, impacts on versatile and high quality soils, impacts on intensification in the central city, contribution of trip distances and private vehicle use to climate change, and lower densities encouraging private vehicle usage rather than transport modal shifts to cycling.

[156] We consider that the Our Space approach strikes an appropriate balance between the matters listed in clauses (a) to (c) of Policy PA3 in order to achieve the overall wellbeing outcomes.

[157] Submitters have also referred us to the requirements of Policy PA4 which provides matters that decision-makers shall take into account when considering the effects of urban development. To the extent that this policy is relevant to our considerations as
part of Our Space, we consider that the costs and benefits of urban development as set out in Policy PA4 have been taken into account.

**Provision of social and affordable housing (Social and affordable housing action plan)**

[158] Social and affordable housing was an issue for a number of submitters\(^{38}\) we heard, as well as other submitters\(^{39}\) that were not heard. We address the individual submissions on these matters in Appendix 1, however we asked Officers about the social and affordable housing action plan, particularly in relation to the submission of Te Waipounamu Community Housing Network. We considered that more information and action around this matter would provide some relief to those submitters.

[159] Officers advised us that the action plan relates to Item 2 in the Schedule of Future Work outlined in Section 6.2 of Our Space. This states that the timeframe for developing the social and affordable housing action plan as being 2019-2020. Officers said the detail of the social and affordable housing action plan would become clear by implementing this action. However, should the Panel wish to provide additional clarity on this matter the following process steps and timeframes could be included as bullet points in Item 2:

- an MOU with the Greater Christchurch Partnership and the Network - July 2019
- A project plan and project lead resource - August 2019
- A good practice and/or barriers research component - October 2019
- A forum and or consultation component - December 2019
- A draft action plan - February 2020
- Integration and alignment with District Plan Reviews - April 2020
- Integration and alignment with Annual Plans - June 2020

[160] They noted that the development of this social and affordable housing action plan is not currently included in the 2019/20 Annual Plans of Partner Councils so the necessary staff and financial resources to undertake this work would need to be

\(^{38}\) Mr Lloyd Bathurst (#1), Drucilla Kingi-Patterson (#5), Mr David Hawke (#10), Te Waipounamu Community Housing Network (#16), Grassmere Residents (#54), Canterbury District Health Board (#58), GFR Rhodes Estate & Larson Group (#60), Martin Pinkham (#61), Brendon Harre (#70).

\(^{39}\) Peter Wells (#7), Pat McIntosh (#12), Andrew Long (#13), Christchurch City Council (#74), Wayne Phillips (#90).
confirmed as soon as possible. They said that given the subject matter Community Housing Aotearoa (CHA) could be approached to assist with resourcing and/or delivery of the development of the action plan.

[161] We agree that the wording submitted to us is appropriate for inclusion in Our Space.

**Identification of broad location, timing and sequencing of development**

[162] Our Space is required to identify the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity over the long term in future urban environments and intensification opportunities within existing urban environments.\(^40\) It needs to balance certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development.\(^41\)

[163] Some submitters considered that future development capacity is not sufficiently identified, suggesting that further areas should be mapped within Our Space.

[164] Figure 12 of Our Space sets out that housing demand will be met through redevelopment and greenfield areas. Figure 16 in Our Space identifies the Existing Urban Area together with existing Greenfield Priority Areas and Special Housing Areas. It also identifies the proposed locations of future development areas in Greater Christchurch.

[165] We asked Officers about the mapping notations under Figure 16 and for their opinion on the potential for confusion of this figure with Map A in the CRPS. We heard from a number of submitters who were concerned that Figure 16 would become Map A, with no flexibility for due consideration of merits for additional land as part of future RMA processes such as the review of the CRPS.

[166] Officers responded that they heard the concerns raised by submitters regarding the potential for confusion and misinterpretation due to similarities between Figure 16 and Map A.

[167] They told us that Figure 16 was intended to show the location of the future development areas identified in Our Space to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls for the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts, for the purposes of meeting the ‘broad location’ requirements of the NPS-UDC.

---

\(^{40}\) NPS-UDC, Policy PC13(a).

\(^{41}\) NPS-UDC, Policy PC13(b).
They said it was not intended that Figure 16 would ‘set in stone’ the extent of changes to Map A in the future or preclude the consideration of minor boundary adjustments and/or other changes to Map A through separate RMA processes. Our Space would be a relevant consideration for decision makers in subsequent RMA processes as a strategy prepared under other Acts (Sections 66(2)(c)(i) and 74(2)(b)(i) of the RMA respectively). Whilst it is intended that Our Space provides some direction to inform such processes, Figure 16 would not be determinative. In the light of concerns raised by submitters, Officers recommended amending the title of Figure 16 and the wording in Section 5.3 to clarify this.\footnote{Officer Reply Report, Question 12, page 17.} We agree with the intent of the Officers’ recommendation and consider that Figure 16 should be identified as being ‘indicative only’ and that corresponding amendments are made in Section 5.3.

As discussed above, the areas identified in Figure 16 are likely to address medium and long term shortfalls in capacity. The location of any additional areas required is to be considered as part of the full review of the CRPS and through district plans and structure planning. This is provided for in the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2.

We also heard from a number of submitters concerned with staging and release of their land for development. Some submitters considered that Our Space does not sufficiently identifying the timing and sequencing of development. In addition, several submitters sought that their land be released at the earliest opportunity or brought forward in time, including that land identified as proposed future development areas in Figures 15 and 16 of Our Space be included instead as Greenfield Priority Areas.

Officers addressed the sequencing and staging of development in the Officers’ Report. They set out that Our Space does provide some high-level sequencing for the quantum of development capacity over the medium and long term by stating that the housing targets represent the development capacity that each council will seek to enable over the medium and long term. Officers considered that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use if enabled to do so through a change to the CRPS. This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas.
[172] Officers recommended a number of amendments to Our Space to further clarify how sequencing is to be addressed.43

Amended wording for Section 5.5, p26

Future growth areas identified in Figure 15 and 16 will require more detailed planning, technical assessments and consultation with landowners to determine more specific staging of development. Existing policies in Chapter 6 of the CRPS already provide clear direction which these detailed planning processes must give effect to, particularly Policies 6.3.2 to 6.3.7. They ensure the staging of development considers how to support good urban design, align with infrastructure needs and integrate with existing urban areas.

Amended wording for Section 5.5, paragraph 3, p26

Associated policy wording is proposed to complement a change to the CRPS Map A. This will enable District Plan Reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to, over the medium term, zone and otherwise enable development capacity in accordance with meeting the medium term housing targets incorporated in the CRPS. Reviews of targets and the sufficiency of development capacity are part of periodic capacity assessments and enable the CRPS and district plans to remain responsive to demonstrated need.

We consider these amendments to be appropriate to meet the requirements of the NPS-UDC.

[173] Officers also provided further explanation to address what they considered to be some confusion amongst submitters and the view that future development areas in Our Space are only identified for the long term period. They confirmed that the term ‘Greenfield Priority Area’ is a product of the recovery timeframes associated with the Land Use Recovery Plan. Most Greenfield Priority Areas have already been zoned in district plans and it is intended that the change to the CRPS in 2019 will enable the Partner Councils to zone and otherwise enable a portion of future development area land necessary to address any sufficiency shortfall for the relevant medium term period identified through periodic collaboratively prepared Capacity Assessments.

[174] We are satisfied that this explanation appropriately addresses submitters concerns regarding the identification of their land as Greenfield Priority Areas.

Requests for additional land to be included for future residential development

[175] Many submissions sought to have additional areas identified for future residential development. These must be balanced against a number of submissions requesting that we limit expanding into new or additional greenfield areas.

[176] The key reason for suggesting additional greenfield priority areas or future development areas was that the methodology for determining capacity through the Capacity Assessment undertaken in 2018 was flawed and that it did not provide a suitable evidential base for our decisions. We have addressed the appropriateness of the Capacity Assessment earlier in this report.

[177] In addition to that, submitters considered that their individual circumstances had merit, given that their developments were serviceable, proposed on suitable land, could be master-planned because their sites were under single ownership or owned by a few, were contiguous with existing urban areas, that the targets in the NPS-UDC should not be considered minimums, and that non-inclusion of their land was an error. In addition, they said that provision of their land would increase supply, and therefore improve affordability. Ms Helen Broughton, a submitter on Our Space, also said that her preference was to provide greenfield development rather than intensification, as intensification would have an adverse impact on the character of her immediate area on the northern side of Riccarton Road.

[178] As set out above, the reasons for not wanting greenfield development included the contribution it makes to urban sprawl, impacts on versatile and high quality soils, impacts on intensification in the central city, contribution of trip distances and private vehicle use to climate change, and lower densities encouraging private vehicle usage rather than transport modal shifts to cycling.

---

44 Mr Lionel Green (#21), Mr David Tipple and Mr Barry Gallagher (#25), Cathedral City Developments (#38), Mr Ernst Frei (#50), Cashmere Park Trust (#15), Dalkeith Holdings Limited (#20), Scarborough Hills Properties (#65), Mrs Sue and Mr Grant Poutney (#50), Spark Family (#6), Bellgrove Family Trust (#6), Oderings Nursery (#50), Mr Kevin Williams and Ms Bonnie Williams (#72), CJFA Holdings Limited (#24), Ellis Darussette Limited (#26), GFR Rhodes Estate and Larson Group (#60), Suburban Estates Limited, Doncaster Developments Limited and Sovereign Palms Limited (#51), Gillman Wheelans (#19), Ms Sharon Jones (#22), Mr Ivan Robertson, Mr Lindsay Blackmore and Mr Malcolm Main (#23), Ms Victoria Foxton (#27), M Springer (#28), Red Spur Limited (#43), Mr Graeme Alan and Ms Joy Yvonne McVicar (#56), B. Welsh, S. McArthur, T. Kain (#57), Lincoln Developments Limited (#69).

45 Spokes Canterbury (#41), Mr Chris Morahan (#89), Mr David Hawke (#10), Mr Don Babe (#46), Mrs Cherry and Mr Lawrence McCallum (#36), Cashmere Park Trust (#15), Pat McIntosh (#12), Mr Olly Powell (#48), Mr Robert Fleming (#80), Mr Kieran Williamson (#86).

46 By way of note, the Independent Hearing Panel’s full decision is made at para [128] of Decision 10. It noted that given all these factors, they did not consider it appropriate to revisit the election the Council has made against further intensification in this locality at this time. If, and when, this should occur ought to be left to the Council to determine and initiate.
[179] What we need to be satisfied about, is that in terms of the NPS-UDC, Our Space demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term. This includes intensification opportunities, as well as greenfield development.

[180] We agree with the Officers’ recommendations that additional land proposed by submitters is not necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch.

[181] In addition, based on the evidence available to us, we do not consider that the additional land proposed by submitters is preferable to that identified in Our Space which has previously been considered by the Greater Christchurch Partnership and is consistent with the strategic directions of the UDS and CRPS to promote a consolidated urban form in Greater Christchurch, and aligns with infrastructure servicing arrangements outlined in Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies.

[182] We agree with Officers that additional land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including reviews of the CRPS and district plans, and relevant LGA processes, including structure planning. As set out earlier in our report, we have recommended amendments to ensure that Our Space does not preclude the consideration of further land that may be appropriate for future housing and business. We also agree that the key process steps in the review of Chapter 6 of the CRPS should be added to the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2.

[183] We also recognise that there are a number of proposals for extension to residential areas that may warrant closer inspection as part of the CRPS review. We consider this should be acknowledged by including a requirement in Section 6.2 that Environment Canterbury engages with those submitters on Our Space who have sought that their land be included, prior to the notification of the review of the CRPS, in relation to the appropriateness of including their land within Map A of Chapter 6, in light of the results of the next Capacity Assessment.

[184] We consider that these recommended amendments will ensure that the merits of the inclusion of additional land will be appropriately considered as part of the CRPS review.

[185] We consider that the approach in Our Space, including the actions identified in the further schedule of work, balances certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand.
In the light of the evaluation and reasons given above, and the responses provided to individual submissions, we are satisfied that Our Space appropriately implements the provisions of the NPS-UDC as it relates to development capacity for housing.

**Rural residential and large lot development**

We heard from a number of submitters who were interested in the matter of large lot development and rural residential development both inside and outside of the existing and proposed future urban development areas.\(^47\) They presented evidence noting the demand for such lots, and that such opportunities provided for better living opportunities and wellbeing.

Officers told us that the CRPS Chapter 6 defines rural residential activities as “residential units outside the identified Greenfield Priority Areas at an average density of between 1 and 2 households per hectare.” They said Policy 6.3.9(3) of the CRPS requires that rural residential subdivision and development “must be located so that it can be economically provided with a reticulated sewer and water supply integrated with a publicly owned system, and appropriate stormwater treatment and disposal”. They said that this requirement suggests a close link to the urban area and its associated urban infrastructure. They referred to rural activities being defined in the CRPS as including residential activity on lots of 4 hectares or more.

They said that irrespective of how Our Space incorporates rural residential living, the geographical area of focus and the relevant urban environment pertaining to Our Space are both considered to be the Greater Christchurch area, as shown in Figure 1 of Our Space. This area includes a portion of rural land significantly influenced by its proximity to nearby urban areas and although Our Space focuses predominantly on the urban aspects of Greater Christchurch it has considered rural residential and to a lesser extent rural living in its analyses.

We agree with the Officers’ position that it is appropriate to take into account rural residential land in terms of calculations on capacity, and they contribute to Greater Christchurch’s ability to cater for residents, as does rural land. We note the existing CRPS direction in Policy 6.3.9 that in the case of Christchurch City, no further rural residential development is to be provided for. Any further rural residential development in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts will be considered as part of the Council’s scheduled reviews of their respective rural residential development

---

\(^{47}\) Lionel Green (#21), Barry Gallagher and David Tippie (#25), Cathedral City Development Ltd (#38), Mr Kevin Williams and Ms Bonnie Williams (#72), Malc Dartnell (#81).
strategies. These reviews will inform District Plan reviews scheduled for notification in 2020.

[191] In relation to large lot sections, we agree with the Officers’ response in their Reply Report and accept that no further changes are required to Our Space.

**Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development**

[192] We heard from a number of submitters on the sufficiency of commercial and industrial land in specific high demand areas, in particular as they related to the rail and freight network. As part of this, we heard evidence on the increase in travel times across the City from the west to the Port of Lyttelton, and the impacts of removing heavy vehicles from strategic freight routes. We heard about the importance of straight rail sidings at Rolleston and the potential for these, both within the existing urban and future development areas, as well as potential for extensions to those areas. We also heard about the future need for industrial land in appropriate locations adjacent to Christchurch International Airport.

[193] Officers told us that while the effective and efficient functioning of the transport network is not the main focus of Our Space, it does recognise in Section 5.6 that projected housing and business growth will result in more trips on the network, leading to more congestion and longer journey times if travel behaviours do not change.

[194] They said that a priority for Our Space is to ensure that future development is appropriately aligned to and informs long term transport planning and investment in Greater Christchurch, primarily considered as part of other processes, to ensure that more people can reside in areas accessible to a mix of transport modes. Of particular importance is alignment with the directions in the Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan, which set out a vision for Greater Christchurch’s public transport system.

[195] Our Space already recognises in Section 5.6 that an “important part of managing the transport network is to ensure that freight can be moved efficiently to and through Greater Christchurch and this will require effective management of congestion on the main freight routes”. Officers noted that there are a number of other processes currently underway that will contribute to the effective and efficient operation of freight routes, including:
future public transport business cases
travel demand management business cases
completion of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and Christchurch Southern Motorway
business cases for the Brougham Street and Moorhouse Avenue area.

[196] In response to concerns from those submitters, Officers did make some suggestions for amendments by inclusion of additional wording as set out in the Officers’ Reply\(^49\) on pages 11 and 12. In addition to the text changes recommended, Officers also agreed with the submitters to better identify strategic infrastructure and networks in Greater Christchurch by way of amendments to Figure 18.

[197] To that extent, we accept the submitters concerns, and accept the changes proposed by Officers. We are satisfied that those changes are appropriate and accord with appropriate recognition of infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, in the Our Space document. In addition to the changes recommended by Officers, we also include changes to section 5.7 which provide context and recognise the need for significant investment for the funding of transport infrastructure.

Management of natural hazards

[198] We received a number of submissions generally in relation to Our Space on the potential for natural hazards to impact on land development. We asked Officers to provide a response in relation to the extent to which natural hazards information is covered in Our Space and included as part of assessing the proposed directions outlined within it.

[199] They responded that there are constraints on where new greenfield development can and should occur. Officers said that such constraints include coastal and flood hazard areas, groundwater aquifers, outstanding natural landscapes, versatile soils and airport noise contours. The extent of these constraints is shown in Figure 10 (p. 17) of Our Space, while wording proposed by Officers in the track changed version of Our Space seeks to further clarify the scope and purpose of that figure.

\(^{48}\) Christchurch International Airport Limited (#39), Cockburn Family Trust (#53), Lyttelton Port Company (#67), Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (#73), KiwiRail Holdings Limited (#79).

[200] In this context, they said that the future development areas proposed in Our Space have been subject to structure planning exercises by the Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils as part of considering future development within the projected infrastructure boundary. The appropriateness of these greenfield areas for development would be further assessed as part of any change to the CRPS, including that any hazard risks are sufficiently addressed.

[201] The possible impact of ground conditions on the feasibility of existing development capacity across Greater Christchurch was also considered as part of the Capacity Assessment, including the potentially higher costs of development within flood hazard areas where there is a requirement for higher finished floor levels and larger foundations. Where such costs resulted in development being deemed unfeasible, these areas were discounted from the equation of supply and demand. Officers said that this methodology is fully documented in the Capacity Assessment methodology technical document provided as part of the Our Space consultation.

[202] Our Space also recognises in Section 6.1 the need to respond to key drivers of change at the local, national and global level as part of future planning processes, including the:

   “Growing need to manage and adapt to the natural hazard risk facing our coastal communities given the anticipated sea level rise, and related coastal inundation and groundwater level effects, over the next 30 years and beyond.”

[203] Officers said that subsequent Capacity Assessments and any future revisions to Our Space will need to reflect any changes to policy directions related to managing and adapting to the natural hazard risks facing coastal communities. No changes to Our Space were recommended.

[204] We did not receive any additional closing response in relation to recognition of bird strike as a natural hazard as posed by CIAL. In relation to that matter, we are satisfied with the Officers’ recommendation in their report that bird strike hazard can be managed by appropriate location and design of some land uses and is not an absolute constraint on development. Officers consider that district plans are the appropriate planning document for managing bird strike hazard, noting that an appropriate set of rules is included in the Christchurch District Plan.

[205] We accept the Officers’ position on these matters, and in particular, do not consider that the matter of bird strike is such that it would limit future urban use and is relevant to decision-making in relation to Our Space.
Signalling matters needing to be addressed prior to full Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review

[206] We asked Officers how matters that have been addressed by us but not provided for specifically in Our Space will be approached and further detailed in any further investigation and resolution prior to the full review of the CRPS.

[207] They said that while the scope of the proposed change to the CRPS in 2019 detailed in the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2 of Our Space is specific to giving effect to the NPS-UDC, the review of Chapter 6 as part of the full review of the CRPS would provide an opportunity for the merits of any wider policy changes to Chapter 6 or additional amendments to Map A to be considered.

[208] Officers provided a potential list of steps and indicative timescales for the scheduled review of the CRPS. The review process would be initiated by Environment Canterbury in 2019/20 with the development of a project plan and agreed scope. Pre-notification engagement with the public and stakeholders would provide an opportunity for relevant matters that fall outside the scope of Our Space to be identified and further detailed.

[209] They noted that in order to provide greater clarity within Our Space, key process steps in the review of Chapter 6 as part of the CRPS full review could be added to the Schedule of Future Work in Section 6.2.

[210] Some submitters raised concerns that the proposals set out in Our Space would or could preclude the consideration of future changes to Chapter 6 Map A, in particular to provide for development in areas outside identified future development areas. As addressed above, while Our Space would provide some direction to inform future RMA processes, it is not intended to prevent the merits of such matters being considered through the full review of the CRPS.

[211] We have recommended that Figure 16 is identified as being indicative only, and consider that while it will not address the concerns of some submitters seeking that their individual developments be brought forward or fast-tracked, it does provide some opportunity for consideration of the merits of particular proposals without being precluded by Our Space.

Addressing climate change and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals

[212] We heard from a number of submitters who considered that the effects of climate change, and the achievement of sustainability and zero carbon goals, were not
sufficiently addressed by Our Space and that any proposed settlement pattern was integral to considering such matters.\(^{50}\)

[213] Officers considered that the proposals in Our Space reflect the UDS principles of consolidating urban development and integrating land use and transport planning. This supports the development of a more sustainable urban form, especially in terms of providing a larger share of the population with good access to a range of transport modes and reducing the reliance on private vehicles.

[214] They acknowledged that the coverage of climate change and sustainability and the implications of urban growth on these matters is limited in our Space and recommended that additional wording be included in Sections 4 and 5 to highlight these issues.

[215] We generally accept the Officers’ response. However, we consider that a further response with regard to addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals is required. We consider this issue merits its own new section under Section 4 in our Space, elevated to a higher priority, and amendments to section 5 of Our Space, with clearer and more aspirational wording.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

[216] We consider it appropriate to conclude with a response to the key questions posed to us by Officers in the Officers’ Report\(^{51}\) in light of our recommendations above. In summary:

a. We are satisfied that Our Space demonstrates that there will be sufficient feasible development capacity for housing in the medium and long term and that it sets out how the minimum targets will be met. The strategy sets out how the Partnership will respond to the shortfalls through future actions in Section 6, including through a change to the CRPS to enable the rezoning of future development areas identified in Figure 16 and the full review of the CRPS. We are satisfied, based on the evidence received, that those areas identified in Figure 16 are in the correct locations, on the basis of the current

\(^{50}\) Mr Dirk de Lu on behalf of Spokes Canterbury (#41), Mr Chris Morahan (#69), Mr Lawrence McCallum and Mrs Cherry McCallum (#36), Dr Anna Stevenson on behalf of Canterbury District Health Board (#58), Mr Don Babe (#46) and Mr John Peet on behalf of Sustainable Otautahi (#37).

\(^{51}\) Officers’ Report, Section 1, page 1.
planning framework. That includes a mixture of greenfield development and intensification.

b. In relation to industrial and commercial land, we are satisfied that the Strategy demonstrates that there will be sufficient feasible development capacity for business activity, noting the surplus industrial land can potentially absorb some of the predicted shortfall of commercial land in the medium to long terms. Further work around supply and monitoring around freight networks will inform whether or not there might be some locations where additional industrial land may be required. This can be undertaken to inform the full review of the CRPS.

c. We are satisfied that the proposed areas to be identified for future urban activities are appropriately within the projected infrastructure boundaries, which are reflected in the relevant Council Infrastructure Strategies. Councils will be able to determine the timing and funding of that infrastructure in accordance with the sequencing to be determined as part of their District Plan review processes.

d. We accept that under current planning frameworks, the methodology around feasibility is fit for our purposes, and gives effect to the NPS-UDC. We note this in the context of the ability to review and get consistent agreed methodologies between the Partner Councils so that this is incorporated into the next capacity assessment, as well as gathering and monitoring data to determine uptake, both through intensification as well as greenfield development. All of this will assist with informing capacity for the full review of the CRPS.

e. We are satisfied that the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity is identified at an appropriate scale in Our Space and that it is appropriate that this is addressed further as part of district plan processes, and in accordance with the policies and methods prescribed by the CRPS. That includes through the development of Outline Development Plans and structure planning processes.

f. We are satisfied that Our Space is appropriately informed by the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure strategies, and other relevant strategies, plans and documents. Our space is consistent with and builds on the vision and principles of the UDS and the direction of the CRPS by planning for
apportioned greenfield development and intensification, while maintaining a consolidated urban form, and integrating land use with infrastructure.

g. We accept that the methodology and evidence base is sufficiently robust, recognising that monitoring of markets, yield and uptake will continuously improve the ability to respond to changing circumstances including higher or lower growth scenarios.

h. In response to submitter concerns that Our Space will preclude the consideration of land for development in future RMA processes, we have made amendments to the strategy to note that Figure 16 is indicative only and that Environment Canterbury will engage with submitters requesting identification of additional land in Our Space prior to the notification of the CRPS review, in relation to the appropriateness of including that land in Map A and in light of the results of the next Capacity Assessment. This will ensure that the merits of those individual proposals can be legitimately considered as part of the CRPS review.

i. In addition, we have identified in response to individual submissions where we consider there is another appropriate avenue to address a submitter concerns, such as through transport plans or through annual plan and long term planning funding processes.

[217] We are satisfied that the Strategy as set out in Appendix 2 meets the requirements of the NPS-UDC and has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the LGA and those objectives and policies of the NPS-UDC that are relevant to the production of a future development strategy.

[218] We set out our further reasons and recommendations in response to individual submissions in Appendix 1.

[219] We recommend that the GCP Committee adopts our recommendations report and recommend to the individual Partners that they adopt, endorse, or otherwise support Our Space, being the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch.

[220] In addition to our recommendations on the Strategy, we make the following suggestions to the Partner Councils for actions outside of the Strategy process:
a. As part of future Capacity Assessments, consider the impact of different ownership and development models as part of industrial land sufficiency in future capacity assessments

b. As part of future Capacity Assessments, consider freight trends and demand in specific locations where there is a need to integrate land use and infrastructure

c. Explore options for funding the social and affordable housing action plan set out in Section 6.2 of Our Space

d. Christchurch City Council considers whether there are any options or alternatives available to facilitate, fund or enable infrastructure development at Cranford Basin, that was the subject of the Cranford Basin Regeneration Plan.

For the Hearing Panel:

Bill Wesley
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Gail Gordon
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Cr Sara Templeton
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Jim Harland  
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Jim Harland is a non-voting member of the Hearing panel. His signature acknowledges that he has participated in deliberations as a non-voting member of the Panel and supports the recommendations set out in this Report.
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APPENDIX 1 - Hearing Panel recommendations on submissions
This section provides the Hearing Panel’s recommendations on each of the 92 individual submissions received on Our Space.

We have adopted the summary of the officers’ submission points for ease of use but advise that each submission has been read by the Hearing Panel. Our recommendations on submission points below should be read in conjunction with our recommendations report.

Where we have accepted the recommendations of officers we have agreed with and adopted the reasoning of officers, unless otherwise expressly stated.

\textit{Lloyd Bathurst (001)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes there is significant housing development capacity available in Rolleston and would prefer a projections-led approach to housing targets to allow people to live where they want to live.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We are satisfied that the officers’ explanation in Section 4 of the report in relation to Themes 1 (accuracy and uncertainty of projected demands) and 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites in each district) addresses this matter.

We note that Table 3 sets out the sufficiency of housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch in each of the territorial authority areas. We consider it is appropriate to enable the territorial authorities to determine appropriate locations for development depending on their ability to provide and plan for infrastructure. This provides certainty for developers as to which land will be released, providing a clear signal as to where to allocate resources to provide for development. The ongoing capacity analysis cycle (undertaking capacity assessments every three years) provides for monitoring of uptake and development, and the ability to adjust capacity assessments and improve the capacity assessment methodology to ensure demand and uptake is understood.

We considered Mr Bathurst’s submission and presentation to us, in particular with reference to not identifying areas of land subject to earthquake hazard risk (such as liquefaction), which we address below. We recognise that the development of some types of land in the region will have an impact on insurance premiums, however we also acknowledge that in the development of vacant land, ground and foundation design can ameliorate the impacts of earthquakes and reduce risk. We do not consider that, at this stage, substantial additional land needs to be released to address a shortfall in greenfield land at Rolleston.

In relation to rural residential land, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement sets out a framework for consideration of these areas, and requires them to be included in a rural residential strategy in the case of Waimakariri or Selwyn District, or in the case of Christchurch City, no provision is made for further new rural residential land.

In summary, along with the matters we note above, we accept the officers’ position on this submission and no changes are recommended in relation to the submission for the reasons set out above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes that liquefaction and earthquake risk factors are not shown on the Natural Hazards map (Figure 10, p.17).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers addressed the extent to which natural hazards information is covered in Our Space in their Reply Report and recommend amendments to section 4.1 to clarify the scope and purpose of Figure 10.
No expert evidence was provided to us by the submitter regarding the constraints that land has in terms of its development or what the economic costs of that may be, apart from anecdotal evidence regarding the cost of insurance excesses for commercial property. As such, we do not consider that the presence of geotechnical constraints necessarily prevents land from being developed. We accept the officers’ position that only hazards that significantly influence decisions on where new urban development should locate are included. In particular, we note that the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement does not seek to avoid development in areas that may be subject to liquefaction, which is the case for new urban development in High Hazard Areas, for example.

We accept the officers’ recommendation to amend Section 4.1 to clarify the purpose and scope of the hazard constraints map.

_Floyd Rudolph (002)_

Promotes industrial hemp farming, particularly for Christchurch red zone areas, and community blockchain.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ comment that such matters are outside the scope of Our Space, and that the use of the Residential Red Zone is the subject of another planning process.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports bus lanes, and subsidised e-bikes, scooters and longboards that can go on buses for last kilometre travel.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We note the submitters point. Officers responded that the operation of the public transport network is outside the scope of Our Space, and we accept this response.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

_Scott Boyce (003)_

Unsure of the information available for the timing of the future development areas in Selwyn.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. In relation to this they recommend that sequencing is identified as part of structure planning processes and infrastructure servicing, which is best determined by the relevant territorial authorities. They noted that such processes would need to have regard to existing Canterbury Regional Policy Statement policy provisions, and recommended wording amendments to clarify this.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on these matters, and accept the submission in part to the extent that the changes outlined in Theme 5 of the officers’ report are made clarifying that sequencing will be addressed in the manner described.

_John Dryden (004)_

Queries why there is no discussion of the cultural aspirations of the majority of people who live in Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the vision, principles and strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy for Greater Christchurch which is still relevant, and are reflected in section 2.3 of Our Space.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are necessary. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that the intensification of residential areas will fail unless good urban design principles are enforced.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (*Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City*) in the officers’ report. This notes that Christchurch has many examples of high-quality residential intensification, and that these matters are best dealt with at a territorial authority level. We accept this and further note that Christchurch has recently been through a district plan review which addresses design matters comprehensively, and that Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils are about to embark on their reviews.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are necessary. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Drucilla Kingi-Patterson (005)**

Identifies upcoming and proposed events across New Zealand and considers that hosting such major events could affect how Greater Christchurch should develop.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Ms Kingi-Patterson on these matters.

We accept the officers’ position that such matters are outside the scope of Our Space, the purpose of which is to ensure there is sufficient land available to support future housing and business demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. We accept the NPS-UDC does not require local authorities to consider the implications of major events on the approach to urban development.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Concerned that new development will affect civil defence zones and food producing farmland.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the recommendations in the officers’ report in Section 4 in relation to Theme 3 (*Protecting productive, agricultural and high quality soils from urban expansion*). They note that the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans may need to consider the implications of a new National Policy Statement on Versatile Soils, which is being planned. There will be some existing areas that are already identified for development on versatile soils in the Greenfield Priority Areas of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

In relation to evacuation zones in Greater Christchurch, officers noted that specific civil defence matters are the responsibility of the Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group and are therefore out of scope for Our Space.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are necessary, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Highlights the need for elderly care developments and suitable accommodation for people with disabilities, as well as affordable housing for people affected by shifting employment and workforce dynamics.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) of the officers’ report. They noted that Our Space highlights how changing demographics and affordability will likely impact the range of housing types demanded. They said that Our Space does not limit the potential for appropriate innovative housing options, and that these matters can be addressed through district plan reviews.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are necessary, and no changes are recommended as in response to this submission point.

Notes the need for light rail between Amberley and Ashburton, and Lincoln and the Central City.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Officers referred to the recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport) in the officers’ report. They note that the option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Robert and Margaret Spark, and Richard and Dawn Spark, Spark Bros Ltd (006)**

Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rangiora for future development.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

We heard from Mr Geoff Spark in relation to this submission. He noted some features of the additional land he was seeking to have included as a greenfield priority area, including that it was close to proposed light rail, the town centre, the Southbrook Industrial Area and road links to Christchurch. Officers referred to their recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers’ report. Officers concluded that they do not consider that additional land proposed by submitters is preferable to that identified in Our Space or necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch.

We note that in relation to other submissions seeking extensions to the urban area, the officers considered that the land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans, and relevant LGA process, including structure planning. We consider this is an appropriate consideration in respect of this submission.

We acknowledge support for the existing identified Greenfield Priority Areas on the land, but make no changes to those other areas identified by the submitter.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Peter Wells (007)**

Concerned about the impacts of greenfield development on arable and ecologically valuable land, the cost of extending infrastructure, the increased social isolation and the ability to achieve zero carbon goals.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts), 3 (Protecting productive, agricultural and high quality soils from urban expansion), 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure, and integration with development) and 11 (Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals) in the officers’ reports.
We generally accept the officers’ position on those matters, however we consider a further response addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals is required. We consider this issue merits its own new section under Section 4 in Our Space, elevated to a higher priority, and amendments to Section 5 of Our Space, with tighter, clearer and more aspirational wording. We accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.

Supports new forms of housing that help build closer communities and introduce more sustainable solutions.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) and 11 (Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals) of the officers’ report. As above, we recommend changes to give a greater focus on sustainability in Sections 4 and 5 of Our Space.

Considers that commercial developments should be focused in existing centres and should help to create quality, adaptable and liveable urban environments.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) of the officers’ report. This acknowledges that the explanation of, and policy intent behind, Key Activity Centres is limited in Our Space, and officers recommend the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept should be clarified in Our Space through additional wording in Section 5.

We accept the officers’ recommendation on this and to that extent, accept the submission point in part.

Notes support for rail services, and the opportunities this would offer for urban regeneration and revitalisation.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport).

The submission point is noted. The option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that the existing three waters systems is already at capacity and susceptible to disruption, especially in the face of climate change, and that new innovative infrastructure systems could be explored.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure, and integration with development) and 11 (Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals). They noted that while Our Space does not preclude opportunities to explore the use of innovative infrastructure systems, this is most appropriately considered by councils at the individual territorial authority level.

We accept the officers’ position, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**John Ascroft (008)**

Supports more emphasis on cycling and walking, and less on cars and buses, especially in the Central City.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport). They noted that Our Space is principally
focussed on the land use component of settlement planning, and that transport matters are addressed in other plans such as the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan.

We accept the officers’ position, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Bellgrove Family Trust (009)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rangiora for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We heard from Ms Rachel Murdoch, counsel for Bellgrove Family Trust, in relation to this submission. The trustees support the identification of their land as a Future Development Area in Our Space (considered to be the logical next step for development of the land) which is located east of Rangiora High School and is land that could be serviced. The trustees also seek identification as a Greenfield Priority Area as it can be reasonably anticipated that the medium term, through to 2028, will have well progressed before any zoning is determined. It was submitted that if the Panel determined that the land remain as a Future Development Area, amendments are required to the wording of Section 9 Action 8 which relates to changes proposed for the CRPS. In response to questions, Ms Murdoch recognised that the streamlined process, having not identified any particular issues or likely opposition to the zoning of the land, could potentially happen quite quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trustees also seek a change to the Projected Infrastructure Boundary to follow cadastral boundaries on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) of the officers report. Officers concluded that they do not consider additional land proposed by the submitter is preferable to that identified in Our Space or necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers have generally recommended that additional land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans, and relevant LGA process, including structure planning. It is proposed that a change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement be progressed using the streamlined planning process under the RMA, to ensure that future development areas necessary to meet development capacity needs can be rezoned as part of the upcoming district plan reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We note that only those areas that are already identified in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement as Greenfield Priority Areas are identified as such in the Our Space document. Officers provided an explanation on this as party of their Reply. We accept those reasons and agree that it is not appropriate to change areas that are identified as Future Development Areas to Greenfield Priority Areas in Our Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) of the officers’ report. We accept the officers’ position and again note that the proposed change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement will enable future development areas necessary to meet development capacity needs, to be rezoned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that a high growth projection scenario could be more appropriate for Waimakariri given recent trends.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) of the officers’ report. At present, they consider there are significant uncertainties regarding future demand, which is why monitoring and refinement of Capacity Assessments will take place over time.

We accept the officers’ positions that the projections and targets are appropriate, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**David Hawke (010)**

Supports the focus on redevelopment in Christchurch and highlights the negative externalities of recent greenfield expansion in Halswell, including the loss of versatile soils, diminished liveability and increased traffic congestion.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Mr David Hawke in relation to his comprehensive submission.

Mr Hawke told us he bikes to work, and has appreciated some of the changes the Accessible City has brought, and is an example of some of the sustainability outcomes that Our Space is intended to bring. He said the default is endless spreading, increasing costs, and social inequality. He strongly supports central city development, a tightly controlled outer limit, and a focus on versatile soils.

He asked the Panel to stay strong in relation to requests to extend the urban boundary. The reason for this is related to his experience in Halswell, where development has spread on to high quality land. The layout in Halswell relies on cars to get around, with difficulties getting buses through the suburb. Even so, Halswell still probably meets the ‘10 minute neighbourhood’ concept. He noted that Knight’s Stream has a higher density than would normally take place, and that it is working with a steady building of community.

He said that Our Space is a good opportunity to include guidelines to fulfill the vision of the strategy. He reiterated how the 10-minute neighbourhood is not necessarily a pleasant experience and accessible to all, and that this needs to be fleshed out. He discussed the idea of being 8-80 accessible, and that this would also achieve transport outcomes. He considered exemplars would also be beneficial.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) of the officers’ report.

In relation to Mr Hawke’s submission and presentation, we note the submitter’s references to the negative externalities of recent greenfield development. We consider that with the amendments recommended by officers, Our Space addresses these concerns.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

Supports the focus on greenfield development in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi, but considers that this land should be developed at a significantly higher density than currently achieved.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Mr Hawke said that that provision of greenfield land around Rolleston and Rangiora rather than Christchurch was acceptable, but that more guidance was needed on how that development should take place. In relation to the new bits of Rolleston, it is his view that it looked like urban sprawl again.

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) and 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) of the officers’ report. Officers did not support referencing a new minimum density for these areas in Our Space, but did consider that further work should be signalled regarding minimum densities for the 2022 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review.

We have considered a wide range of submitter views on this matter, and carefully considered that in relation to Future Development Areas, there is the possibility of a policy ‘gap’ in terms of minimum densities. Christchurch City Council considered that a minimum of 15 households per hectare in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi would be appropriate. We heard from a number of developers who considered that 12 households per hectare was reasonably achievable, while others considered 10 households per hectare provided flexibility. We heard from others again who considered that lower densities might be required because of the presence of TC3 land.

We consider that it is appropriate that we signal a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare for residentially zoned land in those parts of the Selwyn and Waimakariri districts falling within the Greater Christchurch area, noting that further evaluation will occur as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. We are satisfied that given the mix of evidence received during the hearing, such a statement is both necessary and appropriate.

To this extent, the submission is accepted.

Notes the need for mixed developments that provide a range of social, affordable and market housing types.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) of the officers’ report.

The submitters point is noted; no changes are recommended in response to the submission point.

Considers that commercial developments need to be aligned with sustainable transport options and that there is sufficient industrial land, particularly in Hornby and Rolleston, to support future growth.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport) and 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) of the officers’ report. This was also addressed in the reporting officers’ reply report (question 9). They noted the Capacity Assessment identified a significant over-supply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand. Section 3.3 of Our Space outlines these findings. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Randal Inch (011)**

Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rangiora for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) of the officers’ report. Officers concluded that they do not consider that additional land proposed by submitters is preferable to that
identified in Our Space or necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch.

We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that deferring decisions on when the identified future development areas may be developed until the District Plan Review stage could risk adding delays and uncertainties.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Officers have generally recommended that additional land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans, and relevant LGA process, including structure planning. We note that the proposed change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement will enable future development areas necessary to meet development capacity needs to be rezoned.

We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that a high growth projection scenario would be more appropriate for Waimakariri given recent trends.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Officers referred to their recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands). In summary, they said that there are significant uncertainties in determining future demand. This is reflected in the NPS-UDC requirements for ongoing monitoring and review of projections and targets as part of periodic capacity assessments. Officers said that subsequent capacity assessments will benefit from new data and information, for example, the results of the 2018 Census and the anticipated release of new sub-regional and territorial authority household projections by Statistics NZ in 2020.

We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Pat McIntosh (012)

Highlights the need to plan for sustainability and improved environments, and not allowing urban sprawl that encroaches on productive farmland, creates higher travel costs and reduces the sense of community.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Officers referred to recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts), 3 (Protecting productive, agricultural and high quality soils from urban expansion), 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport) and 11 (Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals) in the officers’ report.

Officers noted that the role of Our Space is to ensure there is sufficient land available to support future housing and business demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the wider strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. Section 2.3 of Our Space highlights these strategic directions, and the theme of ‘integrated and managed urban development’ for the purposes of this document.

While some areas within Future Development Areas contained versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.
We accept the officers’ position on these matters, which includes additional wording in Sections 4 and 5 to highlight the implications of urban growth on sustainability, and to this extent, we accept the submission in part.

Identifies rent-to-buy schemes, shared equity and building higher density housing on brownfield sites as potential elements of a social and affordable housing action plan.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) of the officers’ report.

They did not recommend additional changes in the officers’ report, but as part of their reply, they included a timeframe for the development of the action plan. The matters addressed above will explore a number of different options in terms of providing for social and affordable housing.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point, however noting the officers’ recommendations to include a timeframe for an action plan in Action 2 of Section 2.6

Considers that the projected growth is mostly related to immigration, which is politically controlled and unlikely to continue at the current rate, and that this approach is responsive rather than value-led.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands).

They noted that Statistics NZ incorporate immigration forecasts in the population projections and this remains the most robust information available to predict future population changes. The NPS-UDC requires a new capacity assessment every three years to ensure planning is responsive to such changing trends. Officers said that the approach to setting housing targets in Our Space, as outlined in Section 3.2 is also considered to represent a principles-based approach rather than following a purely projections-led approach.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Andrew Long (013)**

Disagrees with housing growth in the towns as they have an insufficient business and employment base to support such populations, meaning growth will lead to more commuter car trips and reduced sustainability outcomes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts), 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport) and 11 (Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals).

The Capacity Assessment identifies sufficient provision in the Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans to meet the demand for industrial land over the long term, and for the most part, commercial space over the medium term. Section 3.3 of Our Space outlines these findings. Whilst acknowledging there will always be commuting between the towns and major employment areas in Christchurch City, Section 5.3 and Section 6.4 notes that improving the self-sufficiency of relevant towns is a key consideration of the district councils.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.
Coniders that social and affordable housing should be located close to shops and services, and spread across Greater Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 *(Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types)* of the officers’ report.

The purpose of a social and affordable housing action plan would be to enable social and affordable housing across Greater Christchurch. This action plan is covered in Section 5.1 and Section 6.2 of Our Space.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Coniders that office space at the airport should be capped to encourage development in the Central City.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 *(Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ’10-minute neighbourhood’)*. In addition, we note that this is a matter that could be addressed as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. The Christchurch District Plan gives effect to Policy 6.3.8 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which aims to limit impacts on Key Activity Centres and the Central City.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Concerned that the costs associated with delivering rapid transit would disproportionately fall on Christchurch City Council ratepayers and that the phasing of traffic signals in Christchurch disrupts and slows traffic.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers told us that such matters are out of scope for Our Space. The Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case will investigate the opportunity for rapid transit corridors in Greater Christchurch, including any appropriate delivery and funding arrangements. Traffic management issues in Christchurch City are the responsibility of the Christchurch City Council, and addressed through other processes and mechanisms.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Notes that few hazards are identified in Selwyn and Waimakariri on the Natural Hazards map (Figure 10, p. 17).

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers acknowledged that the purpose and scope of this map, as well as other constraints maps in Figure 10, could be clarified in Our Space. We accept the officers’ recommendation to amend Section 4.1 to address the submission to clarify the purpose and the scope of the natural hazard mapping.

---

**Michael Steadman (014)**

Highlights the need to protect high quality soils to retain the ability for low-carbon, self-sustaining food production.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 3 *(Protecting productive, agricultural and high quality soils from urban expansion)* and 11 *(Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals)* in the officers’ report.
While some areas within Future Development Areas contained versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.

We accept the officers’ position on these matters, which includes additional wording in Sections 4 and 5 to highlight the implications of urban growth on sustainability, and to this extent, we accept the submission in part.

Supports higher density housing developments along transport corridors and considers that growth in the towns should only occur once rapid transit is in place.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) and 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport). They said that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2019 as a result of Our Space).

We accept officers’ recommendations to include wording in Our Space (Section 5.5 and Section 6 Action) to make it clear that detailed structure planning to determine the sequencing of future development areas will need to have regard to existing Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provisions to ensure a consolidated urban form, proximity to key activity centres, efficient infrastructure, and cohesion of new development with existing communities.

We also accept officers’ recommendations to include wording in Our Space (Section 5.5 and Section 6 Action 8) to outline the intent of draft policy provisions to be considered in the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to demonstrate how future development areas are sequenced by territorial authorities in accordance with housing targets incorporated in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and sufficiency conclusions agreed as part of periodic capacity assessments.

**Cashmere Park Trust (015)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (within the PIB) on Leistrelle Rd, Christchurch for future development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Mr Warren Lewis, an engineer, but appear on his own behalf, presented to us in relation to the submission of Cashmere Park Trust1, for whom he is a trustee. Mr Lewis described the land as the closest rural land to the city centre, surrounded by zoned land which provides for 15 households per hectare, however the Trust’s land is constrained to 4 hectare sites. The land forms part of the Henderson’s Basin. Mr Lewis advised that only 20% of the land has ever been flooded, and that which was flooded was due to a blocked culvert. He described the Trust’s desire to subdivide the land, through compensatory storage within Henderson’s Basin. Mr Lewis was concerned that flood modelling by the CCC after the earthquake did not align with the changes in ground levels post-earthquake. He emphasised the presence of infrastructure, and that the site was not affected by climate change due to its elevation.

Officers do not support the inclusion of additional development in the Hendersons Basin area, on the basis that there is sufficient land available within the existing Christchurch area to cater for greenfield growth. We have considered the submitters request, and note that in relation to the land, we have not received expert evidence on the matter of flooding and flood heights, either from the submitter, or the Christchurch City Council. We do note that the Christchurch City Council, in the additional information it provided to us, did not consider that the site sought to be included by the submitter fulfilled its criteria for small, site

---

1 Cashmere Park Trust (#15)
specific additions to future development areas.\textsuperscript{2} We were not able to discuss or test the conclusions with the authors of that report. We must take a precautionary approach to that information, but it is relevant information for us to take it into account.

However, we do consider that the conclusion of the reporting officers in this situation is sound. That is, they do not consider that additional land proposed by submitters is preferable to that identified in Our Space or necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch. The land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans, and relevant LGA process, including structure planning.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Considers that restricting the supply of new housing sections in Christchurch will push up prices and force people out to the towns, and that the limited demand for intensive developments won’t change as fast as anticipated.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We have addressed the matter of supply of greenfield land above, noting that there is significant supply in the Christchurch area. When responding to this submission, officers referred also to Theme 9 of the officers’ report regarding provision of social and affordable housing and having a range of housing types. They noted that Section 3.2 of Our Space highlights how changing demographics and affordability will likely impact the range of housing types demanded, increasing the need for smaller and multi-unit dwellings over time to complement the existing housing stock dominated by larger standalone houses.

We accept the officers’ position on this. Monitoring and ongoing capacity assessments will continue to refine the predicted demand for housing types.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Notes that commercial developments in suburban locations should not be forgotten or disadvantaged by the planning framework.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to Theme 8 (‘Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’’) in the officers’ report, and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 9) with respect to the 10-minute neighbourhood concept. Officers did consider that better linkages could be made in Our Space as to the policy intent behind Key Activity Centres and the relationship with 10-minute neighbourhoods, and recommended changes to Section 5 of the Strategy. We did not hear from Mr Lewis in relation to this submission point at the hearing.

To that extent, we accept the changes recommended to us by officers, which address some of the submitter’s concerns, by way of amendment. As a consequence, we accept the submission in part.

Considers that there is insufficient industrial land available as much of the land is owned by a few people who restrict development to maintain higher industrial land prices.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We did not hear from Mr Lewis in relation to this submission point at the hearing. We are satisfied with officers’ response that there is a significant over-supply of industrial land across Christchurch to meet demand over the long term.

\textsuperscript{2} Appendix E, Supplementary technical advice in support of the Christchurch City Council’s submission, dated 15 February 2019, by Mr David Falconer, Ms Sarah Oliver and Ms Adele Radburn
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Highlights factors that cause land shortages and development delays, including planning processes, delays from zoning, subdivision approvals and consenting, and limiting infrastructure through a rigid planning approach.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Mr Lewis did not present to us specifically on this submission point. Officers referred us to comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure, and integration with development). They noted that the Capacity Assessment identified sufficient development capacity in Christchurch City to meet long term housing demand, even after adding margins to the projected demand to allow for situations when developments are either delayed or not brought to the market at all. Section 3.2 of Our Space outlines these findings. We accept the officers’ response in relation to this matter.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Notes that little account has been given to the future with autonomous vehicles and changing work practices.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We did not hear from Mr Lewis on this submission point. Officers recommended that regular monitoring of market indicators and trends will inform subsequent capacity assessments, which the NPS-UDC requires to be undertaken every three years. They advised that such assessments will enable councils to respond to any changing travel and workplace behaviours.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Notes that there is reference to Map A in Section 5.7 (p. 31) but that no map is provided.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers have recommended amending Section 5.7 in relation to this submission point, and consequential references are also amended.

We recommend that this submission point is accepted and corrections made.

---

**Te Waipounamu Community Housing Network (016)**

Supports the commitment to develop a social and affordable housing action plan and considers that the provision of community facilities and infrastructure should also be considered as part of such a plan.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Ms Jill Hawkey and Mr Peter Taylor for Te Waipounamu Community Housing Network. They expanded on their submission, providing examples of inclusionary housing in Queenstown, and wanting more definite information around the timing for the social and affordable housing action plan. They described concerns that affordable housing needs to be in reach of public transport, and advocated access to community facilities so that density is provided where there are services.

We sought further information in relation to this from officers in Minute 2. They amended their response and provided greater detail around the timing for the action plan. We accept the officers’ recommendation that this information is included in Our Space. It is noted that the action plan is not currently identified in Annual Plans, and so we also recommended that this is considered as an action outside of the Our Space document.

---

**Steve Holland (017)**
Considers that social housing should be spread across Greater Christchurch and not grouped into any one area.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) in the officers’ report.

The purpose of a social and affordable housing action plan would be to enable social and affordable housing across Greater Christchurch. This action plan is covered in Section 5.1 and Section 6.2 of Our Space (as recommended to be revised above in in the body of our report).

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any further changes in response to this submission point, however noting the recommended changes to Section 6.2 to include a timeframe for the Action Plan.

Supports the protection of transport corridors, development of more public transport options, such as rail, and promotion of electric transport modes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport). They said the option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

*Suzanne Vallance (018)*

Highlights issues related to poorly managed intensification, including the limited control over how these urban environments develop and the need for more place-making and participatory planning processes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City) in the officers’ report.

They said that Our Space is a high level, strategic document that seeks to ensure there is sufficient land available to meet future housing and business demand across Greater Christchurch. The strategic planning directions set in this document will then be implemented through local planning processes, such as district plan reviews and structure planning, which will provide further opportunities for local consultation and input to place-making discussions.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Notes the need to consider the potential implications of new Government policy on versatile soils and suggests using the Copenhagen model of the ‘hand’ rather than concentric circles to support an integrated urban form.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 3 (Protecting productive, agricultural and high quality soils from urban expansion) and 11 (Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals) in the officers’ report.

They said that the urban form promoted in Our Space is consistent with the existing strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Any broader considerations of
Greater Christchurch’s urban form would be best considered during the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 of Our Space in the schedule of future work.

We note that while some areas within Future Development Areas contain versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.

We accept the officers’ position on these matters, which includes additional wording in Sections 4 and 5 to highlight the implications of urban growth on sustainability, and to this extent, we accept the submission in part.

Notes that a resilient city has suitable redundancy, diversity, modularity and distribution of commercial activity.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) in the officers’ report.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Suggests solutions for housing an ageing population, including partitioning and building adaptable homes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types). They noted that Our Space does not limit the potential for appropriate innovative housing options, such as tiny houses or adaptable new builds, nor mechanisms that enable partitioning of existing larger houses to create two households. Territorial authorities already have some planning provisions in this regard and can consider this further through district plan reviews and changes.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Supports the ‘10-minute neighbourhood’ concept and considers that councils should have contingent funding to enable such ideas that surface as part of consultations.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) in the officers’ report. Officers also addressed this further in their Reply Report (question 9) with respect to the 10-minute neighbourhood concept.

Officers recommend amendments to section 5.7 to clarify the policy intent behind key activity centres and the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood conceptual diagram in Figure 19.

The allocation of funding in councils’ Long Term Plans is out of scope for Our Space.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, including the recommended changes to section 5.7. We do not recommend any further changes in response to this submission point.

*Gillman Wheelans (019)*
Considers that the availability of feasible development land in Christchurch is becoming constrained and that the expansion of such towns as West Melton, Prebbleton and Woodend could support capacity shortfalls.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

They said that the Capacity Assessment identified sufficient development capacity in Christchurch City to meet long term housing demand, even after discounting areas that were assessed to be commercially unfeasible to develop. Section 3.2 of Our Space outlines the findings on the sufficiency of housing development capacity.

We were told that Our Space proposes future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls in Selwyn and Waimakariri. These future development areas align with the strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Officers considered that the appropriate process to consider the potential growth of other towns in Greater Christchurch is during the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 of Our Space in the schedule of future work.

We heard from Mr Hamish Wheelans in relation to his submission, who provided us with an overview of some of the costs and constraints in relation to dealing with TC3 land.

He noted the housing booms, when markets were strong, there was a greater desire for larger sections, whereas when the market was weaker, higher density development prevailed. He described the Delamane development at Yaldhurst which was developed at around 13.4 households per hectare. When the global financial crisis hit in 2006, that higher density development stopped as builders were not able to get finance. This was an example of how the development market changes. The increase in density requires more roadings, and that change gets exponentially harder. In addition, costs are involved with remediation of TC3 land, either through the land itself or through foundation design. He did not agree that an urban limit is appropriate, in particular at West Melton.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Wheelans acknowledged that higher density living was growing, but that did not cater for everyone. He considered that this type of living was location based, and appropriate in the inner city, but not in the outlying suburbs. In terms of land cost, the difference between a unit in a greenfield site and a house on a single lot was not that great, and so the demand is much higher for those stand-alone houses. This compares to the city where the land is much more expensive, which creates a greater gap between standalone houses and apartments. He highlighted that land that was constrained by TC3 land would struggle to develop at an appropriate cost. He indicated that approximate costs for development of TC3 land could be between $50-60,000, which would make it uneconomic to develop. He had not seen any examples of cheap foundations for TC3 land.

We agree with the position put forward by the officers. Updated capacity assessments will continually inform areas for development. This will lead to future planning and identification of land as part of future changes. The appropriate time to consider those additional areas is as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. We note that although Our Space does not discount the possibility that other land may be appropriate for future housing and business uses, it is important that any land identified for urban development is consistent with the strategic directions from the Urban Development Strategy and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement that seek to promote a consolidated urban form in Greater Christchurch, and that it aligns with the infrastructure servicing arrangements outlined in Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Considers that the demand for multi-unit developments is overstated and that constraining land supply for greenfield subdivisions in Christchurch will increase costs and prices for housing.
Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) and 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types). They said that the primary purpose of Our Space is to demonstrate there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in Greater Christchurch to meet demand over the medium and long term, and that this demand is provided in a way that aligns with the strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. This is achieved by assessing the development capacity of currently zoned areas and identifying new future development areas where there are projected capacity shortfalls, as is the case in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts that are consistent with the Urban Development Strategy, district development strategies (Selwyn 2031 and Our District, Our Future for Waimakariri) and Long Term Plans.

We do not consider that demand for multi-unit development is overstated. Planned development will provide for a range of housing typologies, and demand changes over time.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Notes that private developers are unlikely to consider affordable housing without Government subsidisation.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types). Officers said that Christchurch City Council, working in partnership with the Ōtāutahi Community Housing Trust, has a substantial social housing stock, while Selwyn District Council has recently agreed a policy approach that fosters social and affordable housing but does not entail any direct provision. Nationally, they noted new Government initiatives such as KiwiBuild can complement and support the work locally undertaken by housing providers. We were also told of the use of incentives in Queenstown regarding inclusionary housing in relation to the submission of Te Waipounamu Affordable Housing Network. An action plan to look at social and affordable housing is included in Our Space.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Considers that requiring commercial activity to locate in existing centres contradicts having shops and services that are accessible without the use of transport modes, and that there should be allowances for new centres.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) in the officers’ report. Reporting officers also addressed this in their reply report in response to Question 9. They said that Our Space reflects the current Canterbury Regional Policy Statement policy direction that the Central City and Key Activity Centres are the focus for commercial activity (office and retail), not just shopping malls, but also other public and community facilities such as education, health and leisure services. These centres integrate high quality public realm spaces and are well-connected by public transport services and safe cycle networks. Medium density housing in and around such centres support their vitality and viability.

Officers recommend amendments to section 5.7 to clarify the policy intent behind key activity centres and the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood conceptual diagram in Figure 19.

We further note provision for neighbourhood centres in the district plans, which are smaller centres providing for smaller scale commercial activities. These are also an important factor when considering 10-minute neighbourhoods.
We accept the officers’ recommendations, and do not recommend any further changes in response to this submission point.

Considers that the projected growth for Selwyn is understated, and that growth is dynamic so ring-fencing the growth of towns based on currently known factors will result in inflexibilities.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report. They noted that in July 2018, MFE and MBIE published a report that evaluated capacity assessments undertaken for the high growth urban areas. This report stated that most high growth urban areas used an alternative to Statistics NZ’s medium projections, and in general, the choice to use a different projection could be clearly explained and justified with recent trends. The report considered the demand assessment for Greater Christchurch to be best practice amongst high growth urban areas.

They noted that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in Our Space reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances and may not align with the strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy to increasingly enable growth through redevelopment. The approach to territorial authority housing targets in Our Space allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. Greater Christchurch targets still provide for projected demand over the long term. It is in the apportionment by territorial authority that Our Space differs from current projections.

We are satisfied with the officers’ response. In addition, we note there are a number of other considerations such as ability to service, maintenance of a compact urban form, and presence of natural hazards which will all contribute to whether it is appropriate to develop in a particular location.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Questions whether privately supplied infrastructure to encourage growth would be appropriate if it meant the population could have greater say in where and what form of housing they chose to reside.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure, and integration with development). They also noted that the evidence base associated with Our Space demonstrates there is sufficient capacity planned for other infrastructure to support the projected growth in Greater Christchurch. Our Space will need to monitor and review the effect of future growth on this infrastructure provision as part of subsequent capacity assessments, which includes engaging closely with infrastructure providers and operators.

We note that the request by the submitter is inconsistent with the Urban Development Strategy. We also note that the Council is usually vested with infrastructure and becomes responsible for that infrastructure. We are satisfied that the current approach to infrastructure, including the planning for it, is appropriately provided for in LGA infrastructure plans.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

*Dalkeith Holdings Limited (020)*
Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rangiora for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Fiona Aston, a planning consultant, in relation to the Dalkeith submission. She sought that the land be identified as a Greenfield Priority Area. It is currently located within the projected infrastructure boundary at Rangiora and has just 3 landowners. The site is within the projected infrastructure boundary (identified as the ‘urban limit’) in the first version of Proposed Change 1 (PC1) to the CRPS, which indicated the possibility of development from 2028 to 2041.

Ms Aston considered that the Dalkeith land should be identified for development before any other land outside of the projected infrastructure boundary. She sought that if sequencing were to take place, provision should be made to develop this land.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

We are satisfied that the proposed Change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS to enable the development of future development areas, the subsequent district plan review and the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022 provide adequate timing for development.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Queries why the future development areas have not been identified as Greenfield Priority Areas and considers that deferring decisions on when these areas are developed until the District Plan Review stage could risk adding delays and uncertainties.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the CRPS Map A proposed in Our Space for 2019). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Considers that a high growth projection scenario could be more appropriate for Waimakariri given recent trends.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands). In summary, they said that there are uncertainties in determining future demand. This is reflected in the NPS-UDC requirements for ongoing monitoring and review of projections and targets as part of periodic capacity assessments. Officers said that subsequent capacity assessments will benefit from new data and information, for example, the results of the 2018 Census and the anticipated release of new sub-regional and territorial authority household projections by Statistics NZ in 2020.
We accept the officers’ position on this, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Lionel Green (021)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) on Marshlands Rd, Christchurch for development through changes to the CRPS that provide flexibility to respond to minor zoning anomalies or development proposals.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Mr Green seeks to subdivide his land into two approximately two hectare lots. We heard from Ms Aston in relation to the request for flexibility around the urban edge. Ms Aston considered that development under 4 hectares could be considered on the ‘urban continuum’, and should be provided for in Our Space. Ms Aston referred us to the definition of urban environment in the NPS-UDC.

Ms Aston could only provide anecdotal evidence that there is a lack of supply of rural residential land. Officers provided a further explanation in relation to rural residential and large lot development in their reply.

We are satisfied with and accept the officers’ recommendation that in terms of changes to existing policy this is properly left for the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Sharon Jones (022)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) in Rolleston for future development, noting the imminent changes to the airport noise contours, and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Aston and Mr Phillip Kennard describe in relation to the submission of Ms Sharon Jones.

The combined area subject to the submission is just under 42 hectares adjoining existing Greenfield Priority Areas, and is located under the noise contours for Christchurch Airport. Ms Aston noted that Mr Matthew Bonis said that it was likely that the noise contours would be reduced at Rolleston and Kaiapoi. As such, they would like to identify that land in advance as Greenfield Priority Area. Ms Aston noted that the Future Development Area at Kaiapoi includes land that is located within the contour at Kaiapoi. In terms of the suitability of the land, it was defensible and created a consolidated urban form. She said it was close to the town centre, and could be serviced, even it is wasn’t in the Projected Infrastructure Boundary.

Mr Kennard said that the land met all of the criteria under the NPS-UDC for zoning urban land except for the airport noise contour. In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Kennard said that it would lend itself well to medium to high density development, as well as rest home type activities.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district), and reporting officers’ reply report (question 13) regarding further investigation ahead of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. They acknowledged the work being undertaken by Christchurch International Airport to trial alternative flight paths. The most appropriate process to consider the impacts on zoning from any changes to the airport noise contour is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. They noted the review is identified in Section 6.2 of Our Space in the schedule of future work.
We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Requests that the status of future development areas, as amended to include the submitter’s land, are changed to Greenfield Priority Areas to enable zoning and development to proceed.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the CRPS Map A proposed in Our Space for 2019). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Seeks changes to the CRPS that provide flexibility to accommodate meritorious proposals for urban development and zoning, and facilitate a more responsive planning approach to urban growth management.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. By way of observation, we note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop, and increases the likelihood of fragmentation of that land, potentially resulting in less ability to properly structure plan and develop that land for urban activities at a later date.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Notes that no further capacity is provided in Selwyn for the medium term and only in Rolleston for the long term.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers said that the proposed change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to identify future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary will seek to ensure there is sufficient capacity to meet the demands for housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the medium and long term. Section 5.3 of Our Space outlines the proposed planning response in greater detail.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

*Ivan Robertson, Lindsay and Judith Blackmore, and Malcolm Main (023)*

Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rolleston for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Aston in relation to the Robertson, Blackmore and Main submission. She sought that the land be identified as a Greenfield Priority Area. It is currently located within the projected infrastructure boundary at Rolleston. She sought that if sequencing were to take place, provision should be made to develop this land.
In relation to higher densities sought by CCC, she noted that Rolleston had been very successful without that requirement, and that it operated a high frequency bus service.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

We are satisfied that the district plan reviews and the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provides adequate timing for development.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

Requests that the status of future development areas are amended to Greenfield Priority Areas to enable zoning and development to proceed.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the CRPS Map A proposed in Our Space for 2019). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

Seeks changes to the CRPS that provide flexibility to accommodate meritorious proposals for urban development and zoning, and facilitate a more responsive planning approach to urban growth management.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. By way of observation, we note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop, and increases the likelihood of fragmentation of that land, potentially resulting in less ability to properly structure plan and develop that land for urban activities at a later date.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

Notes that no further capacity is provided in Selwyn for the medium term and only in Rolleston for the long term.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers said that the proposed change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to identify future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaipara that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary will seek to ensure there is sufficient capacity to meet the demands for housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the medium and long term. Section 5.3 of Our Space outlines the proposed planning response.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

*CIFA Holdings Ltd - South Rolleston (024)*
Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rolleston for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We heard from Ms Aston and Mr Bob Patton in relation to the CJFA Holdings Limited Land, a 16 ha block adjoining Farringdon. Ms Aston sought that the land be identified as a Greenfield Priority Area. It is currently located within the projected infrastructure boundary at Rolleston. She sought that if sequencing were to take place, provision should be made to develop this land.

Mr Patton said it was important to get affordable housing with a variety of house sizes noting that terrace housing was a potentially good outcome. Mr Patton said his client was happy to develop up to 15 households per hectare.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

We are satisfied that the district plan reviews and the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provides adequate timing for development.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

Requests that the status of future development areas are amended to Greenfield Priority Areas to enable zoning and development to proceed.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

Seeks changes to the CRPS that provide flexibility to accommodate meritorious proposals for urban development and zoning, and facilitate a more responsive planning approach to urban growth management.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. By way of observation, we note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop, and increases the likelihood of fragmentation of that land, potentially resulting in less ability to properly structure plan and develop that land for urban activities at a later date.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

Notes that no further capacity is provided in Selwyn for the medium term and only in Rolleston for the long term.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers said that the proposed change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to identify future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary will seek to ensure there is sufficient capacity to meet the demands for housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the medium and long term. Section 5.3 of Our Space outlines the proposed planning response.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes as a result of this submission point.

**Barry Gallagher and David Tipple (025)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) in north-east Christchurch for future development as a Greenfield Priority Area that provides for large lot residential subdivision, and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from both Ms Aston and Mr David Tipple in relation to the submission from Barry Gallagher and David Tipple, seeking large lot development. We note that the net density for development under the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement excludes areas that are subject to geotechnical constraints, which can give rise to larger lot sizes. In addition to this, no information was provided in relation to quantification of, or supply or demand for larger lots, or the impact of this on the efficient use of the land resource. Mr Tipple provided us with his opinion about the need to provide larger lots for development. We do not consider that the densities recommended by us preclude provision for social development of children for the types of activities indicated by Mr Tipple. No information was provided to us that provision of further greenfield land was required due to a shortfall in capability to provide for housing in Christchurch City. We note the significant supply in the short term that is provided for in Table 3 of Our Space.

We accept the officers’ recommendations that consideration of large lot or rural residential development outside of the urban area can be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Seeks changes to the CRPS that provide flexibility to accommodate meritorious proposals for urban development and zoning, and facilitate a more responsive planning approach to urban growth management.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept that officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. By way of observation, we note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop, and increases the likelihood of fragmentation of that land, potentially resulting in less ability to properly structure plan and develop that land for urban activities at a later date.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Ellis Darusset Ltd (026)**

Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rolleston for future development and seeks expedited plan changes to enable timely development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Ms Aston and Ms Jeanette Ellis in support of the submission for Ellis Darussette. Ms Aston described how Ellis Darussette land was excluded from the Housing Accord Special Housing Area (HSA) over the neighbouring land. There is subdivision being undertaken on that land. No opportunity was given to join the SHA. The owners have been advised that because the land is not included in Map A of the CRPS, they are unlikely to get consent. She sought that the land be identified as a Greenfield Priority Area. It is
currently located within the projected infrastructure boundary at Rolleston. She sought that if sequencing were to take place, provision should be made to develop this land.

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

We are satisfied that the district plan reviews and the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provides adequate timing for development.

We accept in part the submitters request, to the extent that we have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Requests that the status of future development areas are amended to Greenfield Priority Areas to enable zoning and development to proceed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the CRPS Map A proposed in Our Space). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

| Seeks changes to the CRPS that provide flexibility to accommodate meritorious proposals for urban development and zoning, and facilitate a more responsive planning approach to urban growth management. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. By way of observation, we note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop, and increases the likelihood of fragmentation of that land, potentially resulting in less ability to properly structure plan and develop that land for urban activities at a later date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

| Considers that it is appropriate to provide additional Greenfield Priority Areas in both Selwyn and Waimakariri to provide for demand over the medium term given the uncertainties associated with the assessments. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers said that the proposed change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to identify future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary will seek to ensure there is sufficient capacity to meet the demands for housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the medium and long term. Section 5.3 of Our Space outlines the proposed planning response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Requests that Figure 16 (p. 25) is amended to identify the submitter’s land as a Greenfield Priority Area and show that it is not located within the Special Housing Area.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We agree that the submitter’s land should not be identified as a Special Housing Area on Figures 15 and 16. We do not accept that the submitter’s land should be included as a greenfield priority area for the reasons set out in response to the above submission points. We accept the submission point in part and recommend amending Figures 15 and 16 so that the submitter’s land is not identified as a Special Housing Area.

---

**Victoria Foxton (027)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) on Port Hills Rd/Scruttons Rd, Christchurch for future development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the assessment in the officers’ report which is set out in Section 4 Theme 4. Demand can be met for future housing needs through appropriate densities both within the Christchurch City area, and Greater Christchurch. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We accept in part the submitter’s request, to the extent that we have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Considers that there are plenty of potential greenfield areas available in and around Christchurch for development, and that areas being encouraged for redevelopment and higher densities have had negative outcomes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 *(Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City)* in the officers’ report. This notes that Christchurch has many examples of high quality residential intensification, and that these matters are best dealt with at a territorial authority level. We accept this and further note that Christchurch has recently been through a district plan review which addresses design matters comprehensively, and that Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils are about to embark on their reviews.

We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Questions the role of Christchurch City Council in providing and funding social and affordable housing.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to the officers’ comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 *(Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types).*

The purpose of a social and affordable housing action plan would be to enable social and affordable housing across Greater Christchurch. However, specific details of such an action plan have yet to be determined. The action plan is discussed in Section 5.1 and Section 6.2 of Our Space.

We additionally note that submissions on matters such as provision and funding of social and affordable housing is also a matter for annual plan and long term planning processes.
We accept the officers’ position that no changes are necessary, and as a result, no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that commercial developments in suburban areas should not be disregarded as not all people want to shop in a mall or the Central City, and it is important that suburban communities are allowed to grow.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**  
Officers referred to Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) of the officers’ report. This acknowledges that the explanation of, and policy intent behind, Key Activity Centres is limited in Our Space, and officers recommend the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept should be clarified in Our Space through additional wording in Section 5.

We accept the officers’ recommendation and accept the submission point in part.

Questions why more industrial land shouldn’t be made available instead of having enough to just meet demand.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**  
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport) and 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) of the officers’ report. They noted the Capacity Assessment identified a significant over-supply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand. Section 3.3 of Our Space outlines these findings.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports the proposals for rapid transport corridors.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**  
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport) in the officers’ report. We note support for rapid transport corridors.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**M. Springer (028)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) in Prebbleton for future development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**  
We accept the officers’ recommendation in the officers’ report which is set out in Section 4 Theme 4. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and Greater Christchurch. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of areas outside the Projected Infrastructure Boundary should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We accept in part the submitters request, to the extent that we have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

---

**Inovo Projects (029)**
Considers that additional greenfield land may be necessary in Christchurch as some identified greenfield areas will be unsuitable for development from a geotechnical perspective.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers’ report.

They said that the Capacity Assessment identified sufficient development capacity in Christchurch City to meet long term housing demand, even after discounting areas that were assessed to be commercially unfeasible to develop. The feasibility test considered geotechnical conditions. Section 3.2 of Our Space outlines the findings on the sufficiency of housing development capacity.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Notes that additional greenfield land may be required to meet demand in other towns, such as West Melton.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district), and reporting officers’ reply report (question 13) regarding further investigation ahead of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

They said that the Capacity Assessment identified sufficient development capacity in Christchurch City to meet long term housing demand, even after discounting areas that were assessed to be commercially unfeasible to develop. Section 3.2 of Our Space outlines the findings on the sufficiency of housing development capacity.

We were told that Our Space proposes future development areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. These future development areas align with the strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Officers considered that the appropriate process to consider the potential growth of other towns in Greater Christchurch is during the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 of Our Space in the schedule of future work.

We agree with the position put forward by officers. Uptake and capacity assessments will continually inform constraints on existing areas identified for development. This will lead to future planning and identification of land as part of future changes. The appropriate time to consider those additional areas is as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022, noting although Our Space does not discount the possibility that other land may be appropriate for future housing and business uses, it is important that any land identified for urban development is consistent with the strategic directions from the Urban Development Strategy and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which seek to promote a consolidated urban form in Greater Christchurch, and that it aligns with the infrastructure servicing arrangements outlined in relevant Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Supports the approach of requiring a diverse range of housing but considers that the 15 households per hectare requirement for greenfield areas in Christchurch inhibits the delivery of housing diversity.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) and 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) in the hearing reports. They considered the evidence base associated with Our Space demonstrates the need to enable a range of
housing types and identifies the matters that are likely to impact demand for different housing types over time. Our Space will need to monitor and review the anticipated scale and pace of changes to housing demand as part of subsequent capacity assessments.

We consider that in Christchurch city, provision for higher densities is required to avoid sprawl, as well as create a good environment that supports public transport patronage.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Supports commercial activities in the main town centres but considers that some activities may be better located outside these areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space reflects the current Canterbury Regional Policy Statement direction that the Central City and Key Activity Centres are the focus for commercial activity (office and retail), not just shopping malls, but also other public and community facilities such as education, health and leisure services. These centres integrate high quality public realm spaces and are well-connected by public transport services and safe cycle networks. Medium density housing in and around such centres support their vitality and viability.

We further note provision for neighbourhood centres in the district plans, which are smaller centres providing for smaller scale commercial activities. These are also an important factor when considering 10 minute neighbourhoods.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Highlights the uncertainties with the projected demands and the impacts of uncontrollable events.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers report. They noted that in July 2018, MfE and MBIE published a report that evaluated capacity assessments undertaken for the high growth urban areas. This report stated that most high growth urban areas used an alternative to Statistics NZ’s medium projections, and in general, the choice to use a different projection could be clearly explained and justified with recent trends. The report considered the demand assessment for Greater Christchurch to be best practice amongst high growth urban areas.

They noted that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in Our Space reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances and may not align with the strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy to increasingly enable growth through redevelopment. Hence the adoption of the transitional approach to territorial authority housing targets in Our Space that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. Greater Christchurch targets still provide for projected demand over the long term. It is in the apportionment by territorial authority that Our Space differs from current projections.

We are satisfied with the officers’ response. In addition, we note there are a number of other considerations such as ability to service, maintenance of a compact urban form, and presence of natural hazard which will all contribute to whether it is appropriate to develop in a particular location.
We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Oderings Nurseries Limited (030)**

Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PIB) on Cashmere Rd, Christchurch for future development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Mr Julian Ordering, Director Shareholder and Property Manager, and Mr Lewis in relation to the submission of Oderings Nurseries Limited. Mr Ordering confirmed that he wanted the Panel to enable him to develop his land through rezoning of both their Cashmere Road and Philipotts Road properties.

Officers do not support the inclusion of additional development in the Hendersons Basin/Cashmere flood plain area, on the basis that there is sufficient land available within the existing Christchurch area to cater for greenfield growth. We have considered the submitters request, and note that in relation to the land, we have not received expert evidence on the matter of flooding and flood heights, either from the submitter, or the Christchurch City Council. We do note that the Christchurch City Council, in the additional information it provided to us, did not consider that the site sought to be included by the submitter fulfilled its criteria for small, site specific additions to future development areas. We were not able to discuss or test the conclusions with the authors of that report. We must take a precautionary approach to that information, but it is relevant information for us to take it into account.

We agree with the officers, who do not consider that the additional land proposed by the submitter is preferable to the land identified in Our Space, or is necessary to demonstrate sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term for Greater Christchurch. The inclusion of additional land is best considered as part of subsequent RMA planning processes, including review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans, and relevant LGA process, including structure planning.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Identifies RMA processes, council charges and health and safety requisites as barriers to affordable housing.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types). Officers said that Christchurch City Council, working in partnership with the Ōtāutahi Community Housing Trust, has a substantial social housing stock, while Selwyn District Council has recently agreed a policy approach that fosters social and affordable housing but does not entail any direct provision. Nationally, they noted new Government initiatives such as KiwiBuild can complement and support the work locally undertaken by housing providers. We were also told of the use of incentives in Queenstown regarding inclusionary housing in relation to the submission of Te Waipounamu Affordable Housing Network. An action plan to look at social and affordable housing is included in Our Space. As such, we consider that there are pathways to enabling affordable housing.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

---

3 Appendix E, Supplementary technical advice in support of the Christchurch City Council’s submission, dated 15 February 2019, by Mr David Falconer, Ms Sarah Oliver and Ms Adele Radburn
Considers that public transport and cycling are unattractive modes of transport, and supports commercial developments in the suburbs and towns as they are more accessible by car than the Central City.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport) and 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a '10-minute neighbourhood') in the officers’ report, and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 9) with respect to the 10-minute neighbourhood concept.

They noted that higher densities provide for modal choice, and if more people cycle or use public transport, this will reduce congestion.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Notes that greenfield developments located near existing infrastructure is advantageous for councils and residents.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure, and integration with development). The submission point is noted.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Car Distribution Group Limited (031)**

Landowner supports the identification of land (within the PIB) on Johns Rd, Christchurch as a Greenfield Priority Area for business.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that this land is identified as a Greenfield Priority Area for business on Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. However, the recent Christchurch District Plan Review concluded that this land could not be rezoned at that time. We are advised that further consideration of this matter is proceeding between the landowner and Christchurch City Council.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Infinity Investment Group Holdings Limited (032)**

Developer with mixed-use developments (within the PIB) at Yaldhurst Park, Christchurch and Ravenswood, Woodend requests a projections-led approach to targets to ensure housing is not under-supplied in Waimakariri.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) and theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers’ report.

They noted that Statistics NZ incorporate immigration forecasts in the population projections and this remains the most robust information available to predict future population changes. The NPS-UDC requires a new capacity assessment every three years to ensure planning is responsive to such changing trends.
Officers said that the approach to setting housing targets in Our Space, as outlined in Section 3.2 is also considered to represent a principles-based approach rather than following a purely projections-led approach.

Our Space also outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and Greater Christchurch. As discussed below, the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022 is the appropriate time to consider identification of further areas.

We accept officers’ position. We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

**Majority Beneficiaries of the Bellgrove Family Trust; Gary Inch, Devin Inch, Sharlene Inch and Courtney Inch (033)**

Landowner supports the inclusion of land (within the PIB) in Rangiora for future development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Mr Courtney Inch on behalf of the Beneficiaries of the Bellgrove Family Trust, which supported the identification of its land for future development. Officers continue to support the current identification of the site.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Geoff Marks (034)**

Notes the need to consider the development of tiny house communities as a new form of affordable housing.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers refer us to comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space does not limit the potential for appropriate innovative housing options, such as tiny houses or adaptable new builds, nor mechanisms that enable partitioning of existing larger houses to create two households. Territorial authorities already have planning provisions in this regard, and further consideration may be appropriate through district plan reviews.

We understand from officers that Christchurch City Council is currently working with the Canterbury Tiny House Society on its proposal for a temporary land use in the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Regeneration Area.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**RJ Civil Construction (035)**
Landowner seeks the inclusion of land (outside the PiB) on Sawyers Arm Rd, Christchurch for future development as a Greenfield Priority Area for business, thereby reflecting the current use of the site as a contractor’s yard.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

We heard from Mr Fitzgerald in relation to the submission from R J Civil Construction. The site at 510 Sawyers Arms Road is currently operating as a contractors yard, operating under a temporary resource consent for business activities following the earthquakes. Mr Fitzgerald told us that the site has significant access advantages to arterial roads, which suited the civil engineering contracting business operating on the site. Including the site as an urban area would reflect the existing use on the site for vehicle storage. Officers referred to their general assessment regarding the need for further greenfield areas in Christchurch City.

We are cognisant of the role that the identified greenfield priority areas and future development area land has in providing a reasonable amount of certainty for rural amenity, particularly given that the projected supply of land for industrial and commercial purposes is considered to be sufficient for the next 30 years. We also note the temporary nature of the activity which is directly related to the earthquakes.

Given the above, we do not consider that expansion of the future development area for business land to incorporate the submitter’s land to be appropriate. In this respect, we accept the recommendations as set out in Section 4 Theme 4 of the officers’ report.

We accept the officers’ position in relation to this submission and have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Concerned that Figure 16 (p. 25) does not reflect recent developments and existing land use activities.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

We accept the officers’ position that the Map at Figure 16 is not developed at that scale and it is not appropriate to identify such detail. In addition, we note that there are various business type activities through the rural area that operate by way of consent, such as that at the submitter’s location.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Lawrence and Cherry McCallum (036)**

Considers that recent growth has represented controlled urban sprawl, which is a distortion of the UDS strategic direction and at the expense of providing well-designed medium density living in the central core.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

We heard from Mrs Cherry and Mr Lawrie McCallum in relation to their submission.

Mr McCallum said that a disproportionate amount of growth has gone to Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts, when it should have gone to the key activity and central cities and intensification. He hoped that the Partnership was a true Partnership, and that perhaps this was reflected in the different reports and submissions from Christchurch City Council.

Mr McCallum considered that more development should be going to the city, rather than to Waimakariri and Selwyn. More medium density was required in the central city for aging people that can walk to cafes, and that there needed a reboot of the public transport system. He did not consider buses would do it on their own, and there is a need to move to light rail. There is a need to integrate exercise to address the
obesity epidemic, and climate change needs to be addressed. He said this all points towards more medium density in the central city and better public transport. He said that we need to live in a climate friendly way. Mrs McCallum agreed and that investment in light rail needed to be made now, including separation between scooters, bikes and pedestrians.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr McCallum did not want more effort put into getting people between Rolleston and Rangiora and the City, but did want to see more effort put into getting people from within Christchurch moving around, particular from the eastern Christchurch into the city. He said that aggregation of land would lead to better design.

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) and 7 (Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City). Officers noted that Our Space seeks to ensure there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in Greater Christchurch to meet demand over the medium and long term, and that this demand is met in a way that aligns with the strategic directions from the Urban Development Strategy. With this in mind, over 80% of the development capacity identified in Our Space is already zoned in district plans, either in existing urban area zonings that enable redevelopment at higher densities (45%) or in undeveloped greenfield areas (36%).

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports providing a range of new housing types and developing a social and affordable housing action plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types) of the officers’ report.

They did not recommend additional changes in the officers’ report, but as part of their reply, they included a timeframe for the development of the action plan. The matters addressed above will explore a number of different options in terms of providing for social and affordable housing.

We accept the officers’ position noting the recommendation to include a timeframe for the development of the action plan.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seeks more urgent provision for high frequency public transport and active transport modes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred us to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport). They said the option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotes putting power and telephone lines underground to improve the amenity of existing residential areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted this. The said that this matter is more appropriately addressed through more detailed planning and development processes at a local authority level.
We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Seeks the retention of noise sensitive development policies surrounding the airport, protection of the unconfined aquifer from quarrying and development, and no development in floodplains and coastal hazard zones.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted this. No changes are proposed to the matters set out in the submission point.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Sustainable Ōtautahi Christchurch (037)**

Considers that planning for future growth needs must be firmly redirected towards the ‘big picture’ issues, such as zero carbon aspirations, with the risks of continuing along a path of market-led growth likely to become very clear within a generation.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Mr John Peet for Sustainable Ōtautahi Christchurch. He said that changes from raw economic growth to wellbeing over the last few years had changed. He said that world-wide, there is a gathering storm of high level risks, which are outlined in the submission, including climate change, sea level rise, and depletion of high quality resources. The assumptions behind the study assume a linear environment, rather than one that will radically change. This requires an overarching risk-based philosophy to be adopted for the strategy. He argued that it needs to be flexible, adaptable and evolutionary approach that is solutions-based, and it was his opinion is that the strategy would not deliver this, even though it is looking 30 years into the future.

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 11 *(Addressing climate change, and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals)*.
They said that Our Space seeks to balance the projected future demands of housing and business markets with the urban form that will best enable sustainable growth. This is reflected in the approach to setting housing targets, as outlined in Section 3.2, which is projections-led over the medium term and principles-based over the long term. They said that the proposed development of a social and affordable housing action plan also responds to the need for intervention. This action plan is covered in Section 5.1 and Section 6.2.

We consider the response with regard to addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals merits its own new section under Section 4 in Our Space, elevated to a higher priority, and amendments to Section 5 of the report, with tighter, clearer and more aspirational wording. As a result, we accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.

To that extent, the submission is accepted in part, to better recognise those matters as set out above.

Notes that the consultation processes currently followed by government are seldom put forward in a way that encourages response for meaningful input from third sector organisations.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers consider that the role of Third Sector Organisations as collaborative partners could be referred to more explicitly in Our Space. They recommend adding a reference to third sector organisations in the second para of section 6.3 beginning “Although the implementation...”.

We accept Officers’ position on this and recommend that it is amended accordingly.
Cathedral City Development Ltd (038)

| Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Port Hills land, Christchurch. |
| Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation: |
| We heard from Ms Fiona Aston (planning) and Mr David Fox (surveying and land development) regarding the submission from Cathedral City Development Limited in relation to its land on Harry Ell Drive in Cashmere. It was submitted that large lot residential would be the most efficient use of the land which is served by public transport and provided for walking linkages. It was considered that the addition of 10 lots is very minor in the scale of the capacity figures in Our Space and it would be better to provide for development now, rather than waiting for it. Apart from anecdotal evidence, no information or analysis was provided to us on the market for large lot development land. We note that large lot development can be achieved anywhere throughout the city by way of amalgamation and/or purchase of adjacent titles at market rates. |
| We accept the officers’ comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district). This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. |
| No changes are recommended in response to this submission point. |
| Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology. |
| Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation: |
| No recommendations were made by the submitter as to how this should be addressed in the housing capacity methodology. We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered. |
| No changes are recommended in response to this submission point. |
| Suggests that some existing zoned hill areas will not be practical, economic or feasible to develop. |
| Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation: |
| We acknowledge that there may be examples where some hill development will not necessarily be feasible to develop to its full potential, however we accept the officers’ position that capacity for both Christchurch and over the Greater Christchurch area is catered for in the medium term, and that those estimates build in an additional capacity margin to address this situation. |
| No changes are recommended in response to this submission point. |
| Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met. |
| Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation: |
| We accept officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop. |

---

*Page 8 National Policy Statement of Urban Development Capacity – Summary evaluation report of Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessments for high-growth urban areas, published July 2018*
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Christchurch International Airport Limited (039)**

Advises that noise contours are currently being re-modelled with revised contours available in early 2019.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Ms Jo Appleyard (legal counsel), Mr Rhys Boswell (CIAL operations and landholdings), Mr Greg Akehurst (economics), Mr Anthony Penny (transport) and Mr Matthew Bonis (planning) in relation to the submission and evidence presented on behalf of Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL). They described how the revised noise contours would be approximately 6 months away. Indications at present were that they would not be extended into areas of future development identified in Our Space.

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 *(Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development)*. They noted the comment from CIAL and said that this matter can be addressed as part of subsequent RMA processes, including the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Considers airport should be recognised as a Key Employment, Commercial and Transport Node and assists in providing for medium to long-term commercial needs.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
CIAL seeks that the Projected Infrastructure Boundary is expanded, to identify a Future Development Area which will provide access (adjacent to the runway) to CIAL for logistics and freight in the next 10-30 years. Not providing for this use will lead to lower GDP contribution from Christchurch if the activities such as courier and manufacturing industries (which is then transported by air) cannot locate there, and business will be lost to other cities. CIAL considers that it is important not to preclude the ability of surplus land to become general industrial into the future.

Mr Rhys Boswell, General Manager of Strategy and Sustainability for CIAL, provided examples of activities that required easy access to runways. He described how land north of Memorial Avenue is not well set up and is spatially constrained, and how CIAL has tried to separate heavy vehicle movements from passenger movements. This has meant that rental vehicle activities are focussed in the north, with freight in the south at Dakota Park.

Mr Anthony Penny, a traffic engineer, presented to us on traffic matters. He noted that extensions to Dakota Park are feasible from a traffic perspective, including links to bypass Hornby via Pound Road. Identifying Memorial Road as a potential rapid transit route, or at least a key bus route would help with assisting for upgrades, including provisions for cyclists and road widening.

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 *(Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’)* in the officers’ report.

Officers do not consider it appropriate to promote the airport as a location for a broad range of commercial uses; the primary objective of the Airport Zone is the efficient use and development of the land, infrastructure and operational facilities of the airport. Such use and development must also be undertaken
in a way that is consistent with the overall urban form of Christchurch City, including the centres based commercial strategy. Commercial and industrial zones provide for this wider range of employment sectors. While officers agree that the airport provides significant employment, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to introduce a specific new designation.

We accept the officers reasoning regarding this. In addition, we note that the airport already has special consideration and a framework around its operation as significant infrastructure. That term properly describes its function.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Suggests some airport land would be appropriate to meet identified shortfall of commercial land in the NW of Christchurch.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas (including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers’ report.

They said that the Business Capacity Assessment identifies a localised shortfall of commercial land in the northern quadrant of Christchurch City, and this (10ha) shortfall is not forecast to occur until near the end of the long-term planning horizon (i.e. 2044). Provision of capacity to meet longer term needs by expanding the urban boundary or otherwise enabling greater commercial floorspace at the airport is not supported by officers at this time because:
- there is sufficient inner-city industrial land available to transition to commercial use to meet longer term needs
- future monitoring will identify the extent of any shortfalls
- there are other methods available to meet more localised demands in the northern quadrant without needing to expand the urban boundary. These will be explored as part of subsequent capacity assessments and district plan reviews.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Seeks extension of the airport designation towards Ryans Road to accommodate air freight related distribution and warehouse activities.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted that Our Space identifies a significant oversupply of industrial land across Greater Christchurch. If the submitter considers additional land is needed for designated purposes the appropriate process is for the requiring authority to pursue an alteration to the existing designation either through a new Notice of Requirement or an alteration to the existing designation as provided for under Part B of the RMA. That designation can be considered on its merits and if appropriate inserted into the relevant district plan.

Officers also addressed the evidence of Mr Gregory Akehurst (economics) in their reply. They noted that the evidence provided by CIAL suggests there will be a long term shortfall of industrial land within the Special Purpose (Airport) Zone (SPAZ) appropriate for logistics, distribution and freight activities that rely on proximity to the airport. The evidence of Mr Akehurst states there is currently approximately 120ha of vacant land immediately surrounding the airport. More detailed analysis of demand, take-up, related locational preferences and reported capacity constraints was not provided. Nevertheless, CIAL has sought additional land be identified for industrial purposes by Our Space outside the current SPAZ adjacent to the SPAZ and Ryans Road.

Officers noted that in recent years some airport land has been used for non-airport industrial uses, albeit permitted within the zone rules, such as commercial activities and development for trade-based activities (i.e. Bunnings). They said that while this may be considered necessary and appropriate to ensure the airport
has a reliable revenue stream and runs as a profitable business, it reduces the capacity for industrial use on existing SPAZ land. Officers do not support any changes to Our Space.

We accept the officers’ recommendations in this regard, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 <em>Transport needs and implications, including public transport</em>. They noted that the Future Public Transport Business Case has identified the North and South-West Corridors as future rapid transit routes as they have future demand projections over the next 30 years that could support investment in rapid transit. They also have potential for land use growth. Demand and potential for growth on the Airport to Central City corridor is much lower. It is identified as a core high frequency bus route. Our Space (Section 5.2) does however identify that over time other corridors such as to the airport, to Linwood and Cashmere could be considered for rapid transit to stimulate redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seeks identification of SH1 (Johns Road/Russley Road) as a strategic freight route and acknowledgement of the need for significant upgrades along that route, in particular the grade separation at Sawyers Arms Road.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 <em>Transport needs and implications, including public transport</em> in the officers’ report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They said that the strategic freight routes were not identified in Our Space, as they are identified in other documents (such as the Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan). Instead SH1 (Johns Road/Russley Road) is identified as a State Highway on Figure 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers noted that the NZTA has completed a Programme Business Case which outlines future upgrades of Russley Road; e.g. the upgrade of Sawyers Arms intersection, and reshape of Harewood intersection. It would not be appropriate to include the level of detail sought by the submitter, in terms of the specifics of upgrades to roads or intersections, in Our Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In their reply, officers recommended:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amended wording for Section 5.6, paragraph 7 to make it clear that Our Space recognises that other processes are underway that will address specific transport-related matters, such as potential impacts arising from anticipated future growth in Greater Christchurch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amended wording for Section 5.6, paragraph 9 that acknowledges the need to protect strategic infrastructure and networks in Greater Christchurch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amending Figure 18 to better identify strategic infrastructure and networks in Greater Christchurch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result, we accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood hazard map should show full extent associated with a breakout of the Waimakariri River.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers said that the level of hazard to the Christchurch urban area and to the airport from a breakout from the Waimakariri River has been reduced to insignificant because of the construction of the secondary stop bank. However, they said that within the secondary stop bank floodplain there are high hazard flooding areas which could be shown on the map, to be consistent with this notation for the rest of the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a result, we accept the submission and amend Figure 10 to depict the full extent of high hazard flooding areas.

Bird strike should be an identified hazard.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers noted that bird strike hazard can be managed by appropriate location and design of some land uses and is not an absolute constraint to development. Officers consider that district plans are the appropriate planning document for managing bird strike hazard; and that an appropriate set of rules is included in the Christchurch District Plan.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

---

**Ben and Sally Tothill (040)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Marshs/Shands Road by CSM2 in Selwyn.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Ms Nicola Rykers (planning consultant) and Mr Tothill in relation to this submission. The site is crossed by two arms of the CSM2 motorway leaving three distinct land areas that are contained on the same title. Parts of the site are now effectively landlocked, including by the motorway and other industrial land, and it is not economic to use. The Panel sought clarification as to any previous business activities on the site. Mr Tothill described the land, operated by PGG Wrightson, contained buildings with quite a strong industrial form. As a consequence of the zoning rules, the Tothills are not able to subdivide the land, which is separated by the motorway.

The officers’ position is that the best time for consideration of what the future use of the land will be is as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. Generally, officers consider that given the over-supply of industrial land that provision of further industrial land as part of a future development area is not appropriate at this stage.

Having considered the evidence, we are satisfied that the Tothill’s land presents a unique situation. However, we also consider that further information would be required as to rezoning of land or identification of it for urban development, given the buffer that is provided between industrial land and smaller block rural land to the south west. Detailed consideration should be given to the function and form of the land in the immediate area as part of the district plan review, and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review.

We accept the officers’ comment in this regard and we recommend amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Some land is now dissected by location and construction of CSM2 and more appropriate for industrial use.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We refer to the above submission point.

The officers’ position is that no new industrial areas are proposed, given the significant oversupply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand identified in the Capacity Assessment. They noted that while there may be reasons other than land supply which weigh in favour of enabling the rezoning of this land, the appropriate process to consider the merits of any expansion of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and/or other enabling policy changes is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work.
We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Spokes Canterbury (041)**

Suggests links are included to relevant documents – e.g. public transport routes, airport noise zone restrictions, urban boundaries, water shed protection areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that Figure 6 of Our Space identifies relevant plans, strategies and programmes, including the Regional Public Transport Plan, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and District Plans.

We accept officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that where a proposal is not directly committed to by other documents (e.g. 10 minute neighbourhood, complete cycle networks), make this clear and call for support; make clear what has the legislative and policy backing to be implemented and what still needs to be done.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that the proposals will inform the review of other documents and the ongoing work as outlined in Section 6.2 which seek to progress the proposals in Our Space.

We accept officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports building higher density housing and commercial outlets on public transport routes and 10 minute neighbourhood concept – expand and apply these ideas better. Make sure neighbourhoods are close together and well connected by cycle networks.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’) in the officers’ report, and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 9) with respect to the 10-minute neighbourhood concept. Officers did consider that better linkages could be made in Our Space as to the policy intent behind Key Activity Centres and the relationship with 10 minute neighbourhoods, and recommended changes to Section 5 of the Strategy. They also noted that Our Space is principally focussed on the land use component of settlement planning, and that transport matters are addressed in other plans such as the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan.

We are satisfied that these matters are adequately addressed in Our Space.

We accept the officers’ position, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Mandate cycle networks within and between neighbourhoods and towns.

We heard from Mr Dirk De Lu who spoke on behalf of Spokes Canterbury in relation to this submission point. Mr De Lu is concerned that there is little mention of cycling, or transport mode choice, and funding for these is, in his view, inadequate.

Officers noted the submissions. They also said that the Christchurch City Council had invested, and is planning to continue to invest, significantly in developing improved cycle infrastructure.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Drop greenfield developments which will only increase single occupancy vehicles; build housing where the jobs are; make sure higher density urban development offers features such as the 10 minute neighbourhood and affordability to attract residents.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Mr De Lu said that does not focus on single occupancy cars, the impacts of sprawl, and not prioritising for climate change, sea level rise, and real sustainability. This leaves the members with real concerns that the plan will fail. It does not support the change needed to change people’s habits or changing people’s carbon emissions. Increasing urban density and providing for 10 minute neighbourhoods will help, but this will not be achieved by building on the fringe of the city. He said that affordability of living on the fringe of the city is not sustainable. He said that urban sprawl that requires subsidies from ratepayers is, in his view, not commercially feasible.

He said that it was important to put higher densities in the existing centres, and provide for jobs within those areas. Mr De Lu considered that the plan could reject the business as usual approach and deal with issues that arose out the earthquakes, by planning for development in the best places.

Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts), 7 (Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the central city) and 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’).

Officers noted that Our Space seeks to ensure there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in Greater Christchurch to meet demand over the medium and long term, and that this demand is met in a way that aligns with the strategic directions from the Urban Development Strategy. With this in mind, over 80% of the development capacity identified in Our Space is already zoned in district plans, either in existing urban area zonings that enable redevelopment at higher densities (45%) or in undeveloped greenfield areas (36%).

We note that in terms of planning for further development, that concepts such as the 10-minute neighbourhood can be worked into both greenfield and intensification proposals.

We accept officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Explore ‘value capture’ and make this a requirement in the plan.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted this point. The said that Value Capture can be explored as part of a range of related business cases.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point

Our Space needs to take account of sea level rise.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:** Mr De Lu urged the Panel to consider future generations that have not yet been born, and raised concerns in relation to those areas subject to sea level rise. Spokes Canterbury considers that planning should be undertaken with a 100 year timeframe in mind and plan for sea level rise. In response to questions from the Panel, he said that provision should be made for managed retreat for sea-level rise.

Officers referred to their comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 11 (Addressing climate change and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals). Officers said that the proposed direction of Our Space are guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals in the Urban Development Strategy, especially in terms of the ‘integrated and managed urban development’ theme. This involves planning for risks from natural and other hazards, including those related to sea level rise and climate change. The Urban Development Strategy approach to addressing broader sustainability objectives could be referenced through additional wording in Section 4 and 5 of Our Space. They also noted that climate change, and in particular sea level rise, is an integral part of the work undertaken by district councils related to coastal and river flooding issues.

We consider the response with regard to addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals merits its own new section under Section 4 in Our Space, elevated to a higher priority, and
amendments to Section 5 of the report, with tighter, clearer and more aspirational wording. As a result, we accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.

Concern that much of the land for greenfield development is agricultural.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 3 (Protecting productive/agricultural/high quality soils from urban expansion). Officers noted that the role of Our Space is to ensure there is sufficient land available to support future housing and business demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the wider strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. Section 2.3 of Our Space highlights these strategic directions, having particular regard for the theme of ‘integrated and managed urban development’ for the purposes of this document.

While some areas within Future Development Areas contained versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

One Voice Te Reo Kotahi (OVTRK) Organising Group (042)

Supports the submission from Sustainable Ōtutahi Christchurch.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

We refer to our recommendations in relation to the submission of Sustainable Ōtutahi Christchurch (#37).

Suggests the role of Third Sector Organisations as collaborative partners should be explicit in the document.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Officers consider that the role of Third Sector Organisations as collaborative partners could be referred to more explicitly in Our Space. They recommend adding a reference to third sector organisations in the second para of section 6.3 beginning “Although the implementation...”.

We accept the officers’ position on this and recommend that it is amended accordingly.

Red Spur Limited (043)

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Kennedys Bush Road, Christchurch.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

We accept the officers’ evidence in the hearing report which is set out in Section 4 Theme 4. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and Greater Christchurch. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas for inclusion should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.
Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report.

We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that some existing zoned hill areas will not be practical, economic or feasible to develop.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers said that the assessment of sufficiency of housing development capacity underpinning Our Space includes an additional capacity margin as required by the NPS-UDC, to account for sites (such as the example given in the submission) that may not presently be practical, economic or feasible to develop.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter’s land.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act processes.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

*Simon Britten (044)*

---

5 Page 8 National Policy Statement of Urban Development Capacity – Summary evaluation report of Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessments for high-growth urban areas, published July 2018
Seeks investment in active transport and public transport.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport). They noted that Our Space is principally focussed on the land use component of settlement planning, and that transport matters are addressed in other plans such as the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan.

We accept the officers’ position, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Need for a more supportive approach to creative affordable housing solutions with current rules a barrier.**

**Officers’ comment:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types). They noted that Our Space does not limit the potential for appropriate innovative housing options, such as tiny houses or adaptable new builds, nor mechanisms that enable partitioning of existing larger houses to create two households. Territorial authorities already have some planning provisions in this regard and can consider this further through subsequent district plan reviews and changes. They noted the comment regarding rule provisions in the Christchurch District Plan outside this process.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

---

**Tony Dale (045)**

**Predictions to 2048 are probably wrong.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report. They noted that in July 2018, MFE and MBIE published a report that evaluated capacity assessments undertaken for the high growth urban areas. This report stated that most high growth urban areas used an alternative to Statistics NZ’s medium projections, and in general, the choice to use a different projection could be clearly explained and justified with recent trends. The report considered the demand assessment for Greater Christchurch to be best practice amongst high growth urban areas.

They noted that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in Our Space reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances and may not align with the strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy to increasingly enable growth through redevelopment. Hence the adoption of the transitional approach to territorial authority housing targets in Our Space that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. Greater Christchurch targets still provide for projected demand over the long term. It is in the apportionment by territorial authority that Our Space differs from current projections.

We are satisfied with the officers’ response. In addition, we note there are a number of other considerations such as ability to service, maintenance of a compact urban form, and presence of natural hazard which will all contribute to whether it is appropriate to develop in a particular location.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Highly productive agricultural land should not be wasted.**
**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 3 (*Protecting productive/agricultural/high quality soils from urban expansion*). Officers noted that the role of Our Space is to ensure there is sufficient land available to support future housing and business demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the wider strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. Section 2.3 of Our Space highlights these strategic directions, having particular regard for the theme of ‘integrated and managed urban development’ for the purposes of this document.

While some areas within Future Development Areas contained versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Intensification north of Riccarton is occurring but need ways to encourage central city population rather than around suburban centres.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (<em>Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City</em>). They said that the Capacity Assessment confirms that the existing provisions of the Christchurch District Plan are sufficient to accommodate such demand and that the Christchurch District Plan’s zones and associated rules allow for a range of densities and housing types appropriate to their location (Central City, inner suburbs or outer suburbs).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

They also observed that Christchurch City has many examples of high quality residential intensification. However, it is recognised that there are examples of poor outcomes resulting from past intensification, including poor urban design, amenity impacts (noise, car parking, etc) and reduced social cohesion. The reasons that lie behind this matter and the potential solutions that can ensure future higher quality intensification are many and varied and are best dealt with at a territorial authority level. It is also noted that improving intensification outcomes is currently a priority for the Government as it develops a new National Policy Statement on Quality Intensification.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Social and affordable housing could revitalise the city centre.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (*Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types*) in the officers report.

The submitters point is noted.
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Commercial activity should be directed towards the city centre rather than suburban centres.**

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (*Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’*). This acknowledges that the explanation of, and policy intent behind, Key Activity Centres is limited in Our Space, and officers recommend the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept should be clarified in Our Space through additional wording in Section 5.

We accept the officers’ recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Supports reversion of converted industrial premises in eastern Christchurch back to industrial use.**

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted this, however considered this is outside the scope of Our Space.

We accept the officers’ recommendation on this. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

### Don Babe (046)

Encourage more of the growth within the Central City.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We heard from Mr Don Babe in relation to his submission.

He considered there is too much emphasis on housing away from the central city in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. A big issue was climate change, in particular issues with carbon as a result of transport, and a key way to address this is through density. He showed us a presentation that included a graph showing carbon created per person, compared to urban density. He considered that a vibrant central city was needed, and for this it needed more people in it. A concentrated central city would have benefits such as agglomeration effects, but also social benefits as well. He considered that if people had a 20 minute bus ride, or a 10 minute walk from work to home, then this would have benefits.

Mr Babe also showed us costs of infrastructure costs from Halifax in Canada, that suburban costs approximately $3000 per year to service infrastructure, compared to $1000 per year for urban development. He admitted there were differences in what was funded, but even if the savings were half of what they were in Canada, there would still be significant savings. Mr Babe concluded that more housing needs to be met in the central city, rather than Rolleston or Rangiora.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Babe said that there was a significant amount of land in the central centre that could be upgraded, such as the area between Fitzgerald and Barbadoes Street. He noted sites that are land banked, and financial incentives need to be made so that land is developed. He said that while 70% of people live and work in Rangiora, there are another 30% that don’t and they commute. He also said that people are changing in terms of their preferences, and migrants are used to much different densities.
Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that both provides for current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years. In doing so, it identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing, and adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on the projections.

They considered this holistic approach to targets seek to respond to projected changes over the long term and is different to constraining growth in the districts over the medium term to benefit development prospects and outcomes in the City, especially the Central City, as suggested by some submitters.

Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

We note the principle behind the submission, and to that extent we accept it. However, no changes are proposed to Our Space in response to the submission point.

Less caveats on new development and development levy discounts for affordable housing.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted this, however considered this is outside the scope of Our Space.

We accept the officers’ recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

2013 Census biased due to EQ work so cannot be relied upon.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands). They note that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in Our Space reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances.

We accept that there is uncertainty in the projections. The ongoing capacity analysis cycle (undertaking capacity assessments every three years) provides for monitoring of uptake and development, and the ability to adjust capacity assessments and improve the capacity assessment methodology to ensure demand and uptake is understood.

We are satisfied that no changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Considers BAU approach needs to be tested in light of changes since the original strategy.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted the comments, and that the proposals set out in Our Space are strongly guided by the vision and strategic goals from the Urban Development Strategy and the extensive planning framework that has already been developed for Greater Christchurch to support long term growth. They noted it focuses on
responding to key growth issues for Greater Christchurch identified in Section 4 of Our Space. Section 6 recognises additional work is required to ensure the planning directions for the longer term are appropriately investigated and implemented and effectively respond to emerging drivers of change for Greater Christchurch.

We accept the Officers’ recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Does not fix the problems that remain or halt urban sprawl, better resolved through a common % increase in each area, meaning targets of 70k in Christchurch, 9k in Waimakariri and 7.6k in Selwyn.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) and 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) in the officer reports. They note that Our Space allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. Greater Christchurch targets still provide for projected demand over the long term. It is in the apportionment by territorial authority that Our Space differs from current projections.

We accept the officers’ recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Most jobs in the central city impact travel and transport infrastructure from outlying areas.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport) in the officers’ report.

This point is acknowledged.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Transport, infrastructure, social, health and business agglomeration benefits of more housing in the city.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts).

This point is acknowledged.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Carrot and stick approach needed to encourage more development in the city.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
This point is acknowledged.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Foddercube Products Limited (047)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside PIB) on Springs Road on Christchurch Selwyn boundary. Some land is adjacent to the CSM2 and more appropriate for industrial use.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard and considered the evidence provided by Ms Fiona Aston (Planner) and Mr Jeremy Speight (Bayleys Commercial and Industrial sales and leasing) on behalf of their client, Foddercube Products Limited. The land itself covers approximately 20 hectares and is located outside of the projected infrastructure boundary on the corner of Springs Road and Marshs Rd in South Hornby, adjoining existing industrial general zoned land.

Following questions from the Panel about the impact of the proposed development on rural amenity, Ms Aston did not consider the area to be critical as a buffer and considered it as a logical infill of industrial land.

Mr Speight identified that industrial land in Christchurch was held by a few owners, with a lack of supply of bare land, given that a lot of industrial land had been developed using ‘design build sale’ or ‘design build lease’ models, rather than sale of bare land. No proposal was put forward as to how this would be addressed for the subject land, nor that its ownership would necessarily be retained.

Officers’ position is that the best time for consideration of what the future use of the land will be is as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. Generally, officers consider that given the over-supply of industrial land that provision of further industrial land as part of a future development area is not appropriate at this stage.

We do not consider that expansion of the future development area for industrial land to incorporate the submitters land to be appropriate. In this respect, we accept the recommendations of staff as set out in Section 4 Theme 4 of the officers’ report. However, we do recommend amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

We address the matter of flexibility around the provisions of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement below.

Development capacity targets are uncertain and likely to be inaccurate and based on flawed methodology.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We refer to the officers’ comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands).

While the submittor provided further information as to the nature of design build sale and lease forms of industrial land supply, no recommendations were made as to how this should be addressed in the methodology, or how the submitters land would supply a different market. We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the business land capacity and feasibility work done by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’.6

We are satisfied with the officers’ position that no changes are required, noting that further refinement of the methodology may be undertaken as part of future capacity assessments as part of continual improvement.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. By way of observation, we note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter’s land.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept officers’ reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act processes.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Olly Powell (048)**

Questions need for growth and considers city to already be a good size and growth would impact this.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts).

They noted that the NPS-UDC requires the local authorities in Greater Christchurch to ensure there is sufficient development capacity to support projected population growth. This is explained in section 1 of Our Space. Further, Our Space does not propose any additional greenfield future development areas for Christchurch City (beyond those already identified in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the Christchurch District Plan); therefore in this respect the city’s urban boundary is not increasing in size, growth will be accommodated within existing areas of Christchurch City (primarily through intensification).

We accept the officers’ recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Transpower New Zealand Ltd (049)**

Impact on National Grid and giving effect to NPSET unclear, appropriate buffer from critical infrastructure.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that the assessment of capacity of greenfield priority areas took account of Outline Development Plans, which show powerlines that are a constraint on development. For redevelopment in Christchurch City, the District Plan zones with the higher potential for redevelopment largely avoid powerlines. They noted that relatively small areas of Residential Suburban and Residential Hills zoned land are affected, however, the overall impact is considered to be minimal in the overall assessment of capacity. Officers therefore consider the requirements of Policy PB3(a) of the NPS-UDC have been met.
Officers do not consider it necessary to identify the location of National Grid transmission lines and substations on the maps in Our Space. This is consistent with the approach to (not identifying) telecommunications, water supply, wastewater or stormwater infrastructure networks or social infrastructure.

We accept the officers’ recommendation. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Grant Poultny (050)

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Worsleys Road, Christchurch.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

We heard from Ms Jo Appleyard, counsel for Mrs Sue and Mr Grant Poultny. Ms Appleyard described previous mapping errors in relation to the Poultny’s property at 353 Worsleys Road made in 1995, have subsequently informed district plan reviews and the development of Map A in the CRPS. Mr Poultny has engaged numerous times with the CCC for the error to be corrected. Mr Poultny submitted on the Christchurch District Plan, however the Independent Hearing Panel was unable to make the changes requested.

Mr Poultny is concerned about being deferred to later resource management processes, which has happened in the past, and seeks the ability to place two dwellings on the flat part of the property. Our Space is an important document for the CRPS review and will have significant implications. Ms Appleyard noted that the CCC’s technical advice supported the inclusion of Mr Poultny’s land. She highlighted that the officers’ report does not recommend any changes to Our Space to recognise the Poultny’s land.

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers’ report.

They said that the points made in the submission relating to an alleged historical error in the zoning of this property are noted. However, officers consider that the merits of any amendments required to Map A to address this are more appropriately considered through an RMA process.

We agree with the Officers’ position. However, we have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Suburban Estates Ltd, Sovereign Palms Ltd and Doncaster Developments (051)

Considers the approach does not meet market demand or lifestyle preferences of development in the districts and that the NPS-UDC does not support the directive or coercive approach to the provision of feasible development capacity. Identifies risk that NPS-UDC policies will not be given effect to.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

We heard legal submissions from Ms Pru Steven, counsel for the submitter and evidence from Mr Adam Thompson (economics) Mr Kim Sanders (company engineer for Suburban Estates), Mr Bruce Thompson, (planning consultant), and Mr Regan Smith (engineer) for Suburban Estates Limited.

Ms Steven described the ‘long term’ in the NPS-UDC as that applying to the next 20-30years. She invited the Panel to consider whether the land identified in Our Space is sufficient. She submitted that Our Space must
also balance certainty with the need to be responsible to demand for such development. She said there is a clear current demand for development in Selwyn and Waimakariri at a density that is lower than that in the Christchurch City.

Ms Steven submitted to us that Our Space fails to give effect to Policy PA3 of the NPS-UDC as it is not sufficiently responsive to the type or the market of housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn Districts. Ms Steven adopted the submissions of Mr Fuller in this respect where he referred to the requirement for housing choices that meet the needs of the people. Ms Steven also challenged the “allocative approach” evident in Our Space, being the percentage of growth allocated to the districts (Selwyn and Waimakariri) relative to that provided for within Christchurch City, which she submitted was too directive and lacking in support from the NPS-UDC provisions.

In relation to table 3 of Our Space, Mr Thompson noted the shortfalls for Waimakariri over the medium and long term. He took us through the shortfalls in the Market Economics report undertaken by Waimakariri District Council, which also showed a shortfall in the medium to long term. Mr Thompson said that meeting demand meant having a range of housing types. In terms of the proposed development in west Rangiora, he said he had reviewed the Rangiora market and considered there was insufficient greenfield priority land, and he considered there was no infill development that was feasible. The submitter’s proposal would add 96 lots to the market in north west Rangiora. He considered more developers in the market would provide more competitive pricing. In relation to Kaiapoi, he said that there was approximately 1 year of greenfield land left, and only sufficient land out to 2021.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Thompson conceded that you could think about Greater Christchurch as a whole market, but he would recommend that ensuring that Waimakariri and Selwyn can meet their housing targets is an important piece of the puzzle, should Christchurch not be able to deliver on its targets. Mr Thompson said that event with including the land put forward by the submitter, there would still be a shortfall.

Officers noted that Our Space is guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy, which were developed after extensive consultation and represent the collective aspirations and preferences of people in Greater Christchurch. Section 2.3 of Our Space highlights these strategic directions, having particular regard for the theme of ‘integrated and managed urban development’ for the purposes of this document.

Officers consider the approach is consistent with the NPS-UDC and associated guidance. Policy PC9 of the NPS-UDC provides that territorial authorities shall set minimum targets in accordance with the Capacity Assessment under Policy PB1, and with Policies PA1, PC1 or PC2, and PD3. Policy PD3 states that local authorities that share jurisdiction over an urban area are strongly encouraged to collaborate and cooperate to agree upon the specification of the minimum targets required under PC5 and PC9 and their review under policies PC6, PC7 and PC10. This indicates that local authorities have discretion to agree upon a territorial authority target that is different from the Capacity Assessment, provided that the aggregated targets are not less than the regional minimum target, and that other requirements of the NPS-UDC are met. They also said that as required by the NPS-UDC, market indicators will be monitored on a frequent basis and the housing and business development capacity assessment will be updated every three years. This will ensure an up to date base of information is available and enable spatial planning decisions to be responsive to changing population and household projections as well as changes in market conditions and other relevant factors. The housing and business development capacity assessments will provide a clear evidential basis for understanding the amount of feasible development capacity that has been enabled and what additional capacity is required in different locations.

We disagree that Policy PA3 should be read in the manner suggested by the submitter. We must provide for the social, cultural, and environmental wellbeing of people and communities, but in doing so, we have particular regard to those matters set out in PA3(a)-(c). It does not require that we meet demand in micro-markets in all locations. If that were the case, we would be directing intensification to all high demand areas, such as more expensive suburbs within the city.
This is where the evidence of Mr Adam Thompson was incorrectly focussed at a local level. We note that Mr Thompson's assessments were narrow, based solely on supply within specific townships. We take a broader, and more strategic view, and consider that it is appropriate to look wider across all of Greater Christchurch. To that extent, it is only the officers who have provided an analysis of the entire area.

We are satisfied with the officers' recommendations and reasons in this respect. We accept the officers' recommendation on this matter, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Seeking the Projected Infrastructure Boundary / Urban Limit lines be removed from the update, the CRPS and other planning documents.

Ms Steven accepted that changes would be required to Map A in the CRPS, but that recommendations could be made in our Space for changes to the CRPS.

Officers said that Map A was inserted into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement through the Land Use Recovery Plan, having previously been included in Plan Change 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. They said that the projected infrastructure boundary gives infrastructure providers certainty around where growth will be focused, for forward planning and infrastructure planning purposes. Officers consider this remains an appropriate mechanism to ensure the strategic integration of infrastructure with urban activities and the attainment of the intensification and consolidation objectives of Chapter 6 in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Officers considered that the appropriate process to consider the merits of such a policy change is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work.

While that may be a matter that could be considered through the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review, we consider that there are strong reasons for containment of urban activities in order to achieve the vision and principles of the Urban Development Strategy. We received many submissions concerned with the effects of more greenfield development. We are satisfied at this time that sufficient feasible development capacity can be provided within this framework and that the ongoing monitoring and review required by the NPS-UDC and signalised in the schedule of further work in Section 6.2 balances the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development as required by Policy PC13(b) of the NPS-UDC.

We accept the officers' recommendation and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Seeking inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in north-west Rangiora and south-west Prebbleton.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district) in the officers' report.

Mr Smith presented to us in relation to ground conditions, wastewater, the ability to service the site with minimal upgrades.

Mr Bruce Thompson also described the land in west Rangiora. He said that except for its identification outside the projected infrastructure boundary, he was not aware of any reason for it not to be developed. The point made in the submission and Mr Bruce Thompson's evidence relating to an alleged historical error in the zoning of the northwest Rangiora land is noted. However, given its use for rural residential purposes, which is what the Residential 4a and 4b zones are, it is difficult to understand what the error is.

Officers consider that the merits of any amendments required to Map A to address this are more appropriately considered through an RMA process.

We accept the officers' recommendation on this matter, and recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of
Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Expresses concern that the approach in Our Space is too directive, and that the ‘deferred status’ should be removed from land identified for development and a move to higher densities of housing be supported and facilitated but not required or directed through statutory plans.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) and 6 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land). They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but considers that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas.

We continue to support the use of minimum densities. Submissions in relation to those can be considered as part of the review to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We accept the officers’ recommendation and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Seeks that the future development area identified in Kaiapoi is a Greenfield Priority Area.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report.

Mr Kim Sanders presented evidence to us and said that there were people that wanted to build in Kaiapoi, but there was no land left. He said that restricting supply had an impact on price.

Officers addressed this matter in their Reply Report and explained the reasons why proposed future development areas are included in Our Space rather than greenfield priority areas. We agree with the response provided by Officers.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Areas of Christchurch existing zoned land to remain undeveloped due to geotechnical remediation costs.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

No evidence has been provided to support this submission point. A number of greenfield areas have been economically remediated and bought up to TC2 equivalent. Assessment and allowances for site conditions are as set-out in the Harrison Grierson report: “Development Feasibility Assessment – Greenfields”. For the assessment of redevelopment feasibility in Christchurch City, the foundation cost assumption was adjusted to reflect the Technical Category of each tested development site.

Notwithstanding that, monitoring will determine whether shortfalls in planned development exist. This can feed into future capacity assessment noting uptake.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Woolworths New Zealand Limited (052)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PiB) cnr of Marshlands/Prestons Road, Christchurch.
Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We heard and considered the evidence of Mr Dean Chrystal, planner, on behalf of Woolworths New Zealand Limited. Mr Chrystal is concerned that the Our Space document will form an extremely strong direction through later RMA processes such as the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. He noted that in relation to those processes, it is his view that the proposed extension will most certainly be declined as it is not consistent with Our Space, and then it would become a circular argument. He told us he was concerned that in relation to Woolworth’s submission, that officers had recommended that there was sufficient inner city industrial land available to transition to commercial use to meet the cities long term needs. He noted that the central city was a completely different market to that land at Prestons. He did not consider that there were ‘other methods’ available to locate a supermarket, as they have specific land needs (approximately 2 hectares for carparking etc.). He did not consider that a supermarket would have distributional effects on surrounding key activity centres or the central city.

In relation to the second part of the submission, Mr Chrystal noted that the submission sought a review of identified commercial areas as part of the comprehensive Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review. Consideration needs to be given to where projected commercial growth will occur, whether existing identified but undeveloped commercial activity remains appropriately zoned, and whether the hierarchy of centres remains appropriate. He said that the difficulty with the Capacity Assessment is that it has not been ground truthed and has been a desktop analysis.

The officers’ position on the submission is that at present, sufficient capacity is identified to meet short term needs in the north, and also notes that shortfalls in the long term will be met through transitioning of industrial land in the inner city over time. We understand that this was not to say that Woolworths should be setting up further supermarkets in the central city; rather that the wider business market could be catered for in the long term through the conversion of industrial land.

Mr Chrystal was not able to provide any information on the need for local shopping services, nor any updated traffic information in support of identification of the land for commercial use. This will be impacted by changes from the Northern Arterial route currently under construction. We accept that there may be difficulties with provision of residential activities on commercial zoned land, but at the same time consider that changes to the urban area need to be supported by wider analysis of business development in the north. We accept the officers’ position that opportunity needs to be provided for development of the Key Activity Centre at Northwood/Belfast, and that the proper opportunity to address this further is as part of the future review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Land has opportunities for commercial and residential development.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted this matter. We refer to our reasons set out above.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Cockburn Family Trust (053)

Landowner seeks inclusion of land (inside the PIB) for industrial use at Hoskyns Road, Rolleston. Land, adjacent to I-Zone, is within PIB but not identified as a Greenfield Priority Business area in the CRPS.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We heard from Mr Dean Chrystal, planner (who also presented in relation to the statement of evidence from Mr Beresford regarding industrial real estate matters) in relation to the submitter’s 49.2 hectare block of land at Rolleston, which is inside the Projected Infrastructure Boundary, but is not identified as a Future Development Area or Greenfield Priority Area.
Mr Chrystal talked to us about matters that are similar to those for Rolleston Industrial Holdings (refer submission 073). That included land that was able to be purchased as vacant land, and the importance of access to the rail network. He also highlighted what he considered to be discrepancies with identification of vacant land, which he did not consider properly reflected vacant business land.

We didn’t hear any evidence regarding the makeup of business located next to rail sidings or with access to the rail network, nor whether specific land was being set aside for those business that require rail transport modes. Better understanding is required as to the demand for this type of development with access to the rail network, and the potential impact that releasing more industrial land will have on the viability of existing centres. As such, we consider the Greater Christchurch Partnership should look to refine its methodology for industrial business land by considering, as part of future capacity assessments, the impact of modal shift (from road to rail) on demand. We consider that this is important in respect of Objective 5.2.1 and 6.2.1. and 6.2.4. of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement regarding integrating land use and infrastructure under.

It appeared to us that the identification of the land as a future development area (or not) was a matter of timing. As we mention above, further work may also need to be done around particular industrial activities with locational needs such as the rail network (including consideration of areas served by rail elsewhere in the city).

We note that the land has specific infrastructure requirements associated with the rail network. We also note that an over-supply of specific types of industrial land should not be compared in the same way as an oversupply of residentially zoned land, which has the potential to impact on residential intensification objectives and targets in the central city and key activity centres, although they may have an impact on maintaining a compact urban form. We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

We accept in part the submitter’s request, to the extent of our recommendations for Environment Canterbury to engage with the landowner and for the local authorities to consider the relationship of transport modes to demand in specific locations as part of future capacity assessments.

**Grassmere Residents (054)**

| Should develop land in the City first to create density and vibrancy. |
| Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation: |
| Ms Ngaire Button, Mr Ryan Geddes, Mr Stuart Mitchell, Mr John Button and Mrs Ann and Mr Mike Toth appeared on behalf of the Grassmere Residents. |
| Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts). |
| We accept that it is appropriate that both greenfield development and infill should take place contempraneously. |
| No changes are recommended in response to this submission point. |
| Take care not to build on land suited for growing food. |
| Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation: |
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 3 (Protecting productive/agricultural/high quality soils from urban expansion). Officers noted that the role of Our Space is to ensure there is sufficient land available to support future housing and business demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the wider strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. Section 2.3 of Our Space highlights these strategic directions, having particular regard for the theme of ‘integrated and managed urban development’ for the purposes of this document.

While some areas within Future Development Areas contained versatile soils, additional guidance is required at a national level before this matter is addressed. This may be a matter which impacts on net density as a result of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, if such soils are to be protected at a national level.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Partner with Government to help finance affordable housing.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing and a range of housing types), and reporting officers’ reply report (question 8). Officers said that Christchurch City Council, working in partnership with the Ōtautahi Community Housing Trust, has a substantial social housing stock, while Selwyn District Council has recently agreed a policy approach that fosters social and affordable housing but does not entail any direct provision. Nationally, they noted new Government initiatives such as KiwiBuild can complement and support the work locally undertaken by housing providers. We were also told of the use of incentives in Queenstown regarding inclusionary housing in relation to the submission of Te Waipounamu Affordable Housing Network. An action plan to look at social and affordable housing is included in Our Space.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**More extensive use of development contributions to build infrastructure.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers noted the comment, but considered that this submission point falls outside the scope of Our Space.

We do, however, encourage the submitter to make submissions on the Annual Plan. In addition, we recommend that Christchurch City Council consider whether there are any options or alternatives available to facilitate, fund or enable infrastructure development at Cranford Basin, that was the subject of the Cranford Basin Regeneration Plan.

**Hughes Developments Limited (055)**

Provision of additional greenfield land in Rolleston is essential.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We heard from Mr Mark Brown, a planner, and Mr Jake Hughes for Hughes Developments Limited. Mr Brown described the land development of Hughes Developments Limited, including Faringdon in Rolleston. He described how addition of Faringdon South wasn’t successful through the Land Use Recovery Plan, but was later added as a Special Housing Area. The submitter supports the identification of actions to address medium term shortfalls in Rolleston, however they consider that there is uncertainty around demand and capacity identified in the capacity assessment. Mr Brown described how the minimum densities are not supported at 15 households per hectare, nor do they support maximum caps as a means of sequencing.

Officers said that Our Space proposes that some new greenfield housing areas should be released in Rolleston to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls for Selwyn over the medium to long term (Section 5 of Our Space).
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Current supply levels identified in the capacity assessments potentially do not reflect what is actually happening.

**Officers’ comment:**
In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Brown considered that the capacity assessment was highly driven by score analysis, and that analysis about how things look on the ground should be undertaken. He also noted the lag of land being identified, through to houses getting on the land. In relation to land at Rolleston, he did not think that growth and uptake was being accurately portrayed. In terms of their yield to date, yield was around 12-13 households per hectare. He said that demand for different densities had varied, and they responded accordingly. In relation to responding to demand, Mr Brown noted that they responded to this by looking at sales, then adjusting subdivisions that are underway. He noted they were moving away from the more intense super lot development.

Officers noted that the capacity assessment will be reviewed every 3 years and can be updated to reflect recent developments and changes in terms of the provision of infrastructure.

We accept the officers’ position and note that future capacity assessments will provide for a responsive planning framework in relation to any action undertaken. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Graeme Alan and Joy Yvonne McVicar (056)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Worsleys Road, Christchurch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We accept the officers’ response in Section 4 Theme 4 in the Officers Report. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officers consider that the appropriate consideration of further areas for inclusion should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater
Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that some existing zoned hill areas will not be practical, economic or feasible to develop.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers said that the assessment of sufficiency of housing development capacity underpinning Our Space includes an additional capacity margin as required by the NPS-UDC, to account for sites (such as the example given in the submission) that may not presently be practical, economic or feasible to develop.

We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter’s land.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept officers’ reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act processes.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**B. Welsh, S. McArthur, T. Kain (057)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in NW Belfast, Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept the officers’ evidence in the hearing report which is set out in Section 4 Theme 4. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed previously, the appropriate consideration of further areas is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

---
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We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Canterbury District Health Board (058)**

**Need to ensure greenfield development enables easy access to core amenities, nearby public services and employment opportunities.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Dr Anna Stevenson in relation to the CDHB submission. Dr Stevenson noted that in general, Our Space is supported, but that the CDHB considered that there were some areas that required some more emphasis. She considered more needed to be included about intergenerational equity, and that uncertainty is recognised. This provides the ability to be able to monitor and respond to change. She considered there needed to be more emphasis on the challenges associated with aging, as well as other wellbeing impacts. In addition, Dr Stevenson considered that the impact of greenfield development was more nuanced than just dealing with congestion. Dr Stevenson noted issues with affordability now and into the future, and the need to address this through better refined actions. She also highlighted the importance of the protection of drinking water, and sought greater emphasis on climate change. The CDHB supported the 10-minute neighbourhood concept and the way this tied into the key activity centre approach. She said that the CDHB strongly supports the relationships between partners to ensure the ability to move forward together, and to enable the Partnership to be responsive.

Subsequently, at the Panel’s request, Dr Stevenson provided us with some recommended wording in relation to Our Space, which officers commented on and responded to.

We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

**Supports 10 minute community diagram but notes not specifically identified for implementation.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

**Supports a range of housing types and housing being close to existing centres; housing should be good quality, affordable, accessible and in a location that builds community; encourage universal design principles to ensure homes are suitable for all ages and stages.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

**Supports the focus of commercial development around existing centres and encourages a focus on employment opportunities for people who live in the area and placement of public services within these areas.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

**Evidence provided by capacity assessment should be supplemented by information from communities on what they want and need.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

Considers densities around key centres to be key to the success of Our Space.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

Suggests the document makes a clear statement as to the importance of building strong, connected neighbourhoods using the 10 minute neighbourhood as an example.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Refer to the above.

Notes that specific populations may require additional resourcing for active and public transport infrastructure e.g. Eastern areas of Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

Encourages infrastructure planning to be clearly articulated in Our Space including how other plans or strategies might contribute e.g. linking into community knowledge, signalling spaces and places for park and ride options so these can exist around existing infrastructure.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

Considers Our Space does not deal strongly with natural capacity and resource sustainability, and suggests there could be stronger links to zero carbon plans.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ recommendations for the reasons set out in their response.

---

**Ernst Frei (059)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) on Cashmere Road, Christchurch.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Refer to the officers’ comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

Mr Frei owns land at 564 Cashmere Road. Part of the site is zoned New Neighbourhood in the Christchurch District Plan. Mr Frei seeks further development of the site. Mr Frei emphasised that the addition to the existing zoned area would amount to approximately two rows of houses which he considered very small. Mr Fox told us that it was not economically viable to undertake the development of just 25 lots, and that it needed to get to the 50 lots to be economically viable. The land sought to be rezoned lies within the Henderson Basin ponding area. Ms Aston explained how compensatory storage can be formed to overcome this.

The officers’ report did not agree to adding further future development areas, on the basis that sufficient capacity is provided for in the existing Christchurch district plan area. However, a report prepared by the
Christchurch City Council\(^8\) did consider that there was merit in considering three additional areas on the basis that these landholdings are:

- Small-scale;
- Have no servicing constraints;
- Are considered feasible to develop by the landowners; and
- Support urban consolidation (and other key objectives) of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

We did not have the opportunity to test the authors on those criteria, as they did not appear as witnesses. Christchurch City Council has indicated that it does support considering the three areas by way of changing the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Having considered the information filed with us by the Christchurch City Council, the officers’ report, and the evidence of Ms Aston and Mr Fox, and we consider that this land should be investigated further as part of the full review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

No recommendations were made by the submitter as to how this should be addressed in the housing capacity methodology. We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’.\(^9\) The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

---

\(^8\) Appendix E, Supplementary technical advice in support of the Christchurch City Council’s submission, dated 15 February 2019, by Mr David Falconer, Ms Sarah Oliver and Ms Adele Redburn
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Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter’s land.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We accept officers’ reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act process.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

GFR Rhodes Estate & Larson Group (060)

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in Prebbleton.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We heard from Mr Peter Fuller, counsel for the submitter, Mr Adam Thompson, an economist, and Ms Fiona Aston, a planner for GFR Rhodes Estate and Larson Group. Mr Fuller’s legal submissions and Mr Thompson’s economic evidence were based on the premise that growth had to be provided for in relation to all communities. We refer to our assessment in relation to submission 51.

We accept the officers’ position set out in Section 4 Theme 4. Of the Officers’ Report. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and Greater Christchurch. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Propose zoning for smaller more affordable sections based on Urban Economics assessment of Prebbleton.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We refer to the evaluation above and accept that officers’ report discussion set out in Section 4, Theme 4. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report.

We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’.10 The report recognises that more could be done regarding...

---
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Item No.: 21

Attachment A

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter’s land.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
We accept officers’ reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act process.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Martin Pinkham (061)

Sees a lack of long term planning in Waimakariri and a need for standalone infrastructure authorities.

Mr Pinkham appeared before us and presented his submission. He spoke to us about the lack of integration of transport infrastructure and land use in the Greater Christchurch area. He said that Christchurch had sat on its hands and not created a credible case for transport funding. He considered the lack of development of a Council Controlled Organisation to manage transport had been a disaster. He said there was a major disconnect between transport planning and Our Space.

Officers noted this submission point and said that Waimakariri Council does have a District Development Strategy and is working on structure planning for new residential areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi and an update to the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy. Officers did not recommend any changes in response to the submission point.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Lower development contributions, more apartments, improved legislation to improve housing affordability.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing and a range of housing types) in the officers’ report. We note that a social and affordable housing action plan is to be developed, which may address some of the submitters concerns. Matters such as development contributions are a matter for annual plan processes.
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Townsend Fields Limited (062)**

Landowner supports inclusion of greenfield priority land (inside the PIB) on Johns Road, Rangiora.

Officers noted supported.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Greenfield priority area should be rezoned ahead of identified future urban areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (*Sequencing and staging of greenfield land*) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but consider that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Carolina Homes Limited (063)**

Landowner supports inclusion of greenfield priority land (inside the PIB) on Johns Road, Rangiora.

Officers noted supported.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Greenfield priority area should be rezoned ahead of identified future urban areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (*Sequencing and staging of greenfield land*) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but consider that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Riccarton Bush Kilmarnock Residents Association (064)**
Considers future projections beyond 2030 based on data sets to be risky approach.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report.

They noted that Statistics NZ incorporate immigration forecasts in the population projections and this remains the most robust information available to predict future population changes. The NPS-UDC requires a new capacity assessment every three years to ensure planning is responsive to such changing trends. Officers said that the approach to setting housing targets in Our Space, as outlined in Section 3.2 is also considered to represent a principles-based approach rather than following a purely projections-led approach.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Intensification in existing areas ongoing, such as Riccarton, but no on-site parking causes problems, including health and safety issues.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the central city).

We note that on-site parking is a matter for the district plan to consider.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Avoid large medium density communities due to potential social problems.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 7 (Poor intensification outcomes and preferences to focus intensification in the Central City). They said that the Capacity Assessment confirms that the existing provisions of the Christchurch District Plan are sufficient to accommodate such demand and that the Plan’s zones and associated rules allow for a range of densities and housing types appropriate to their location (Central City, inner suburbs or outer suburbs).

Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Christchurch District Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

They also observed that Christchurch City has many examples of high quality residential intensification. However, it is recognised that there are examples of poor outcomes resulting from past intensification, including poor urban design, amenity impacts (noise, car parking, etc) and reduced social cohesion. The reasons that lie behind this matter and the potential solutions that can ensure future higher quality intensification are many and varied and are best dealt with at a territorial authority level. It is also noted that this improving intensification outcomes is currently a priority for the Government as it develops a new National Policy Statement on Quality Intensification.
We adopt the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Disagree with one-size-fits-all approach to greater living densities around key centres.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to the submission point above in relation to Section 4, Theme 7 of the officers’ report. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Difficult and expensive to impose a comprehensive new public transport system with low current patronage.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport). They noted that Our Space is principally focussed on the land use component of settlement planning, and that transport matters are addressed in other plans such as the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan.

We adopt the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Still a reliance on cars and plans should be more pragmatic and realistic.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to the submission point above in respect of Section 4, Theme 6. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

### Scarborough Hill Properties Ltd and Directors/Shareholders Ruth Kendall & Ewan Carr (065)

**Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in Scarborough, Christchurch.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Ms Juliette Derry, counsel for the submitters, and Mr Ewan Carr, director, presented the submission for Scarborough Hill Properties. Part of the submitters site lies within the Residential Port Hills zone, while part is zoned Rural Port Hills. The submission seeks that the Our Space strategy does not preclude the inclusion of additional land outside of the urban boundary. Mr Carr discussed his vision for the block. Mr Carr described the property, being the residual area of the original farm, which included fire access. He considers that residential use on the site (such as high-end larger lots with revegetation) is a relatively natural progression for the urban edge and should not be constrained, and the site is already connected to services which run from Godley Drive. At present the site has little economic use for running stock on the land, and caters for about 100 stock units, essentially running at a loss.

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Carr described how in 1999, work done by Davis Ogilvie estimated a yield of approximately 200 sites from the development. He acknowledged there are issues with the road (Scarborough Road), but that Richmond Road had similar issues but was only one way, and yet approximately 150 additional sites were allowed. Mr Carr talked about the ability to merge with the hillside. He mentioned that there might be the opportunity to have a thoroughfare through the site for walking and pedestrian access up to Godley Head Road.

We accept the officers’ recommendations set out in Section 4 Theme 4 of the Officers’ Report. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Concern that uncertainties will mean identified development opportunities will not be realised.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that the assessment of sufficiency of housing development capacity underpinning Our Space includes an additional capacity margin as required by the NPS-UDC, to account for sites that may not presently be feasible to develop. We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers noted that Our Space highlights how changing demographics and affordability will likely affect future housing demand in Greater Christchurch, with growing demand for smaller, more affordable housing. Section 6 highlights the key role of ongoing monitoring of household trends and further investigation of opportunities to encourage the provision and uptake of a range of housing types to meet future demands. District plan provisions play an important role in helping to deliver a broad range of housing types.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**AgResearch (066)**

Need to provide sufficient buffer between research farms and urban development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers noted the submission point.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Maintain PIB in current proposed position for Rolleston and Lincoln.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

Our Space does not propose any changes to the projected infrastructure boundary.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

**Lyttelton Port Company (067)**

Seeks extension of urban limits (PIB) to account for port reclamation area.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Ms Appleyard, Counsel for Lyttelton Port Company, described the process of reclaimed land becoming formally ‘land’ for the purpose of planning documents, and the consequences for resource consent applications for land use activities. She said that the Port was essentially an industrial activity, in the CRPS, and therefore could be considered an urban activity. She acknowledged that the officers had recommended changes to the Existing Urban Area be considered as part of the review of the CRPS.

The geographic extent of Greater Christchurch, for the purposes of Chapter 6 of the CRPS and Our Space, is the area shown on Map A in Chapter 6 of the CRPS. The reclamation area facilitated by the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan is not located within the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A. This is because the boundary of the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A represents the territorial authority boundaries at the time that Map A was inserted into the CRPS. As the reclamation area was not ‘land’ at that time it did not fall within the territorial authority boundaries. Therefore, the reclamation area is not within the Greater Christchurch Area shown on Map A and the provisions of Chapter 6 of the CRPS do not apply. Likewise, the
reclamation area sits outside the geographic area of focus for Our Space. On that basis, we do not consider Our Space or Chapter 6 of the CRPS to be an impediment to activities on the future reclamation site and do not consider it necessary, or appropriate, to identify the future reclamation site in Our Space.

We note for completeness that in accordance with section 60 of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016, a decision maker on a resource consent application cannot make a decision that is inconsistent with the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. Under section 60(4), Lyttelton Port Company Limited may request that the Minister consider and decide whether a decision would be inconsistent with the Recovery Plan.

Officers consider that the appropriate process to consider any alteration to the Projected Infrastructure Boundary is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work.

We are satisfied that the officers’ recommendation is appropriate, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Seeks that sensitive activities are avoided in any development adjacent to the Midland Port facility in Rolleston.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development) of the officers’ report, and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 7). They noted that the protection of key infrastructure (such as the port and airport operations, and railway network) from the adverse effects arising from development is considered to already be well-managed by the existing planning framework, including through Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans. Given the proposals in Our Space do not deviate from the growth strategy that has been in place for Greater Christchurch for some time, the proposals are not expected to have significant adverse effects on key infrastructure and therefore have only been briefly referenced.

We accept the officers’ recommendation, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Include strategic freight routes and upgrading of the Brougham Street section of SH76 and possible Lyttelton freight tunnel.

### Officers’ comment:

Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport) and 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development), and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 7).

Officers noted that the strategic road and rail networks have been identified in the Business Capacity Assessment which informs Our Space but could be included in a final Our Space document. Constraints with SH76 are identified in the Business Capacity Assessment which informs Our Space. They also said that further investment options are better investigated through Land Transport Management Act processes.

Officers did recommend amending wording for Section 5.6 to provide greater explanation of freight hubs/networks and strategic infrastructure, with potential identification in Figure 18.

We accept the officers’ recommendation and recommend that Our Space be amended accordingly.

Highlight constraints on rail network impacting freight now and into the future with expected growth.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport) in the officers’ report. Officers consider the vision, strategic direction and work underway to implement the intent of recently updated transport plans, such as the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan, will provide appropriate land...
use and transport integration to support the consolidated urban form outlined in Our Space. Our Space is principally focused on the land use component of settlement planning and will need to monitor and review the implementation of such plans as part of subsequent capacity assessments.

We accept the officers’ recommendation, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports roading overpass proposed at Rolleston.

Officers’ comment:
Noted. Refer to the submission point above.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Central City Business Association (068)**

Opposes the proposed changes to the settlement plan as it will undermine the recovery of Christchurch, particularly in terms of the rebuild and revitalisation of the Central City.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts).
They said that the submission notes that the Central City Business Association (CCBA) is opposed to the proposed changes to the Greater Christchurch settlement pattern, but does not indicate what changes in particular the submission opposes. This makes it difficult to directly respond to the submission.

We agree that the submission lacks specificity.

No changes are recommended a result of this submission point.

**Fully supports the ChristchurchNZ/Development Christchurch Ltd submission (Submission 077).**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to our discussion and recommendation in respect of submission 77.

**Lincoln Developments Ltd (069)**

Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in north Lincoln.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We accept the officers’ evidence in set out in Section 4 Theme 4 of the officers’ report. This outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.
No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers capacity assessment targets to be uncertain, inaccurate and based on a flawed methodology.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands) in the officers’ report.

We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, that it considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’.

The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes the inclusion of a new policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS to provide flexibility to develop outside the urban boundary where certain criteria are met.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept the officers’ position that it is appropriate to consider such matters as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work. We note that the changes sought by the submitter to Chapter 6 would provide significantly less certainty and guidance for investment as to where land is appropriate to develop.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Proposes that Figure 16 should be included in District Plans rather than the CRPS.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept the officers’ position that the appropriate process to consider such policy changes is through the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that streamlined RMA processes be used to rezone the submitter’s land.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept officers’ reasoning that such changes are better considered through subsequent Resource Management Act process.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

---

**Brendon Harre (070)**

New development in Waimakariri and Selwyn should be integrated with new rapid transport services.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Mr Brendon Harre presented his submission to us at the hearing. He discussed the need to integrate housing with rapid transport and the lack of public transport placing reliance on private motor vehicles which affects peak time transport and subsequent productivity. If Greater Christchurch could reduce its car
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ownership, this would reduce congestion. Congestion charging and road pricing could be incorporated, but in order to do so, rapid transit is needed, and this links into density. He provided examples of development at Hobsonville of up to 100 households per hectare. He considered that with densities lower than 20 households per hectare, it would be difficult to provide rapid transit at a good cost. Mr Harre also showed how rent in the residential market had increased 41% over three and a half years, which placed a burden on households. Building a rapid transport network would help Christchurch out of the choice of congestion versus affordable housing, encouraging the city build upwards, rather than outwards, improving city liveability. Greater Christchurch would need to co-ordinate with central government to deliver such a project.

In response to Mr Harre’s submission, officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport).

That notes that investment in rapid transport north and south-west of Christchurch City, and other service enhancements across the network, can support land uses change and encourage higher density development along such corridors. Officers said it is critical for achieving effective land use and transport integration that land use policies do align with transport investments. Planning and investment decisions, including identifying the most appropriate public transport mode, are the subject of further detailed work underway as part of business case processes. The officers’ informed us that this ongoing work will help to determine what changes may be required through spatial and district planning to support the vision for a fully integrated transport system and urban form in Greater Christchurch.

The Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan highlight the potential for emerging technology and transport services to alter and enhance transport patterns, mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch. This will require ongoing monitoring and review but at this stage it is considered supplementary to the need to provide mass transit options across Greater Christchurch.

Our Space identifies how future transport plans can drive and support the proposed future settlement pattern but relies on these separate transport plans, required under the LTMA.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Use Urban Development Authority powers to achieve a mix of housing.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 ( Provision of social and affordable housing and a range of housing types).

We note that the Authority, while it has been announced, does not yet exist. That will require legislative change.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Queries decline in growth from 2023 for all growth scenarios (page 9).

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officers noted that the reason for this is that Statistics NZ is projecting that the recent historically high migration rates will reduce back to more average levels and the birth rate will drop.

We accept the recommendations of the officers and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Densification requires rapid transport with delivery in the short to medium term.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
As we note above, transport matters are subject to other processes, including the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case.
We accept the recommendations of the officers and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**End current dependence on the automobile.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts) and 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport).

The submission point is noted, but no changes are recommended in response to the submission point.

**Allan Downs Ltd (071)**

Landowner supports inclusion of greenfield priority land (inside the PIB) on Johns Road, Rangiora.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Support noted. No changes are required in response to this submission point.

**Greenfield priority area should be rezoned ahead of identified future urban areas.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Sequencing and staging of greenfield land) in the officers’ report. They note that Our Space identifies sufficient, feasible development capacity to meet demand but consider that district plan processes are best placed to consider appropriate sequencing and zoning of land for urban use (if enabled to do so through a change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). This is in part because detailed structure planning has yet to be fully completed or reviewed by territorial authorities in a collaborative manner with relevant landowners, developers and communities for future development areas. In addition to this, we note that Greenfield Priority Areas are those that were introduced as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. This is the reason for differentiating them from future development areas, as set out in the officers’ response to questions from the Hearings Panel (question 1).

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Kevin and Bonnie Williams (072)**

Seek to develop land on Marshs Road, Prebbleton for rural residential use.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Ms Fiona Aston (planner) appeared on behalf of and Mr Kevin Williams and Ms Kelly Williams, seeking to develop their land for rural-residential purposes, or potentially industrial land use. The site is approximately 55 hectares, after land was acquired for the Christchurch Southern Motorway, on the boundary of Christchurch and Selwyn districts.

Ms Aston considered the site was well serviced and is close to Christchurch, with services to the boundary. She noted that it is the buffer between Christchurch City and Prebbleton, but that the site is proposed for development of a low-density nature.

12 Mr Kevin Williams and Ms Kelly Williams (#72)
In relation to rural residential land, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement sets out a framework for consideration of these areas, and requires them to be included in a rural residential strategy in the case of Waimakariri or Selwyn District, or in the case of Christchurch City, no provision is made for further new rural residential land.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Development capacity targets are uncertain and likely to be inaccurate and based on flawed methodology and do not consider rural residential development.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We accept the officers’ position that the capacity assessment is sound and fit for purpose. We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, which considered that the housing demand assessment undertaken by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The report recognises that more could be done regarding setting out assumptions around feasible development, but throughout the document, this appears as a recommendation for future capacity assessment reports. We are satisfied that the housing capacity assessment is fit for purpose, and that continual refinement will address future capacity and feasibility as markets change and more information is gathered.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (073)**

Industrial development capacity does not accurately account for the space intensive and low employee occupancy nature of activities at i-Zone and i-Port.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Rolleston Industrial Holdings opened iPort and own a further 25 hectares of land that has a railway siding. They seek that this land be included as a Future Development Area, should it be required.

We received evidence from Mr Phillips (planner) and Mr Copeland (economist), and received legal submissions from Ms Semple and further oral submissions from Mr Carter (Company Director) regarding the Rolleston Industrial land, in particular regarding freight movements and the availability of land related to iPort, which incorporates the Midland Port owned by the Lyttelton Port Company. The key criticism of the industrial land capacity assessment was that it did not properly take into account freight modes, and this was also identified as an issue for the Cockburn Trust land. Mr Carter offered that in his opinion, there would be serious land supply issues in the next 2-3 years, and that it was important to have additional land available that has a railway siding, to ensure that businesses wishing to use rail for freight could be efficiently supported.

We are reassured by the assessment outlined in the Ministry for the Environment’s report, which we requested from officers and was provided to us, which considered that the business land capacity and feasibility work done by Greater Christchurch to be an example of ‘best practice’. The officers’ position was that the Business Capacity Assessment methodology does take account of the different industrial sectors and applies different employee to floorspace / land area ratios. It looks not just at site specific landholdings but the wider industrial market. This includes land in southwest Christchurch (Hornby and Islington) where there are also significant areas of industrially zoned land. Officers consider that no further provision for industrial land is considered necessary at this time, and noted that the Greater Christchurch
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Partnership will continue to monitor take up and market indicators and will review the capacity assessments on a three-yearly basis so as to be responsive to market needs.

We have considered the submissions and in particular the evidence of Messrs Copeland and Phillips, and the position of officers. We didn’t receive any evidence regarding the makeup of business located next to rail sidings or with access to the rail network, nor whether specific land was being set aside for those businesses that require rail transport modes. We do think that a better understanding is required for the demand for this type of development with access to the rail network, and the potential impact that releasing more industrial land will have on the viability of existing centres. As such, we signal that it is appropriate that the Greater Christchurch Partnership look to refine its methodology for industrial business land by considering, as part of future capacity assessments, the impact of modal shift (from road to rail) on demand. We consider that this is also an important aspect of fulfilling the objectives under the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement for integrating land use and infrastructure.

We note that the land has specific infrastructure requirements associated with the rail network. We also note that an over-supply of specific types of industrial land should not be compared in the same way as an oversupply of residentially zoned land, which has the potential to impact on residential intensification objectives and targets in the central city and key activity centres, although they may have an impact on maintaining a compact urban form. We have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

We accept in part the submitter’s request, to the extent of our recommendations for Environment Canterbury to engages with the landowner and for the local authorities to consider the relationship of transport modes to demand in specific locations as part of future capacity assessments.

---

**Christchurch City Council**

**Inconsistencies in Our Space.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers provided a response in relation to inconsistencies in Our Space in the officers’ report, along with an analysis of those matters in Appendix F to the report.

They noted that Table 3 of *Our Space* reports a surplus of housing development capacity in Selwyn District over the medium term of 1,125. The associated text (page 13) and table footnotes in Our Space, as well as the evidence base documented in the Capacity Assessment highlight that feasibility tests produced a wide range of results and that further work to improve the modelling tools was underway. Given such uncertainty with regard to the feasibility of development capacity (and the implications for sufficiency in the medium and long term) Our Space refers to a ‘potential shortfall in capacity’ in relation to this matter.

They told us how updated feasibility analyses for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts completed prior to the Our Space consultation period but too late to be incorporated into the Our Space document, were included as part of the supporting consultation material. This was therefore available to submitters and reinforced the work required to refine feasibility and sufficiency conclusions as part of a final Our Space document. Christchurch City Council did not appear in relation to its submission.

Officers recommended updating the Actions in Our Space to work on an improved methodology for capacity and making amendments to the wording of Section 3.2. We accept the reasons and recommendations of the officers. We understand that density in new urban areas in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts remains an issue.

Updating proposed policy interventions to reflect emerging data.
**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to their comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (*Accuracy and uncertainties of projected future demand*) in the officers’ report.

They said that throughout Our Space the need for ongoing monitoring and review of the evidence base to support decision making is clearly stated. This is a requirement of the NPS-UDC as part of monitoring of market indicators and the preparation of a capacity assessment at least every three years (with subsequent consideration to review housing targets and the future development strategy where necessary).

We accept the officers’ position on this matter, noting that policy interventions are available to reflect emerging data. In particular, for the short to medium term these can be addressed in the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequencing of development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (*Sequencing and staging of greenfield land*) in the officers’ report. In addition, the evaluation in Appendix F of the officers’ report is also relevant. In relation to this they recommend that sequencing is identified as part of structure planning processes and infrastructure servicing, which is best determined by the relevant territorial authorities. They noted that such processes would need to have regard to existing Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provisions, and recommended wording amendments to clarify this.

We accept the officers’ reasons and recommendations on these matters, and accept the submission in part to the extent that the changes outlined in theme 5 of the officers’ report are made clarifying that sequencing will be addressed in the manner described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensification in townships and increase densities in greenfield areas and future development areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Christchurch City Council seeks a minimum net density of 15 households per hectare, while the remaining Councils are satisfied that 12 households per hectare is appropriate. The Chief Executives of the Greater Christchurch local authorities presented to us in relation to achieving 12 households per hectare as part of the district plan review processes.

The Hearing Panel heard oral evidence regarding densities from developers and planners undertaking work within Rolleston and Waimakariri, as well as evidence from individuals seeking higher densities in the settlement areas outside of Christchurch. Generally, the position was that 12 households per hectare is appropriate in those areas. This is higher than the current requirement of 10 households per hectare in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Having considered the Christchurch City Council’s submission and the officers’ position, we accept the officers’ position in part. In terms of timing, we do not agree with officers that a review of density takes place as part of the 2019 change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. We consider that this a matter for the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022, as it has the potential to stall the change process planned for 2019, which is urgently required. In addition, we consider that Our Space contains a strong direction that 12 households is to be achieved in the interim. We are satisfied on the evidence we received that this is both achievable and appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factoring in rural capacity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers recommended in Appendix F of the officers’ report that Table 3 in Section 3.2 be updated in relation to this submission point to recognise rural capacity, and made recommendations to include this in future updates for capacity assessments, noting factors that create uncertainty around the assessment.
We accept the officers’ position and therefore accept the submission, and recommend changes in accordance with officers’ recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Reviewing business sufficiency.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers told us that modelling of business demand was undertaken for the Capacity Assessment using the projected household demand in Table 1 of Our Space. With the development of Our Space, in particular the proposed housing targets in Table 2, there was insufficient time to remodel the implications of such an alternative apportionment of demand by each territorial area.

Population growth generally and in different locations will have an impact on the economy, the growth of the workforce and demand for business land or floorspace. Remodeling of business demand using the housing targets in Table 2 Our Space was completed and Table 4 amended to reflect this more accurate assessment of business sufficiency.

We accept the officers’ reasoning and update Table 4 accordingly.

**Addressing social and affordable housing.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Refer to the officers’ comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing).

Officers noted that Figure 13 (page 20) of Our Space outlines the workstreams anticipated to comprise an action plan to enable social and affordable housing provision across Greater Christchurch, and Action 2 in the schedule of further work in Our Space section 6.2 specifically identifies this initiative for completion during 2019-2020.

They said that the more specific mechanisms proposed in the CCC submission primarily relate to RMA land use provisions that can be addressed through respective district plan reviews (including the related submission points on appropriate densities in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts and the officer response outlined in this Officers Report). Section 5.3 and Action 9 in section 6.2 of Our Space also reference the investigation of redevelopment and intensification opportunities in existing urban areas and close to town centres (which would presumably encourage smaller lot sizes and multi-unit dwellings).

We accept the officers’ position on this submission for the reasons set out above and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

No changes to Our Space are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Ministry of Education (075)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall support for the proposed strategy, and the inclusion and consideration of social infrastructure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
The submission point is noted.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Encourages councils to undertake early engagement with the Ministry when implementing development areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
The submission point is noted.
No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Support for the concept of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’ but notes there is limited commentary in Our Space.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (*Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a ‘10-minute neighbourhood’*). This acknowledges that the explanation of, and policy intent behind, Key Activity Centres is limited in Our Space, and officers recommend the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept should be clarified in Our Space through additional wording in Section 5.

We accept the officers’ recommendation with the recommended clarification.

Encourages exploring opportunities for the Ministry and councils to share recreational and community facilities.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
The submission point is noted.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

### Carter Group Limited (076)

**Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) in Kainga.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (*Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district*) in the officers’ report. The officers’ position is that no new industrial areas are proposed, given the significant oversupply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand identified in the Capacity Assessment. They noted that while there may be reasons other than land supply which weigh in favour of enabling the rezoning of this land, that the appropriate process to consider the merits of any expansion of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and/or other enabling policy changes is during the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work.

We accept the officers’ position on this. However, we have recommended amendments to Section 6.2 to ensure that Environment Canterbury engages with this landowner prior to the notification of the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in relation to the appropriateness of the inclusion of this land within Map A of Chapter 6 and in light of the next Capacity Assessment.

### ChristchurchNZ and Development Christchurch Limited (077)

**Proposed settlement pattern approach in Our Space driven by growth forecasts rather than an active approach that considers how urban areas should be developed to meet broader strategic aspirations.**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We heard from Mr Nick Bryan and Mr Steve Clarke for ChchNZ and Development Christchurch. In preparing the Strategy, Mr Clarke would have liked to have seen explicit analysis of the strategic priorities for Greater Christchurch and how these shape the settlement patterns to best deliver these. He considered the starting point should be an articulation of the preferred outcomes, then an analysis of how spatial distribution of activities can best support these. Instead, the proposal provides for a passive approach, responding to demographic forecasts. The organisations would prefer an approach that responds to outcomes.
Officers said that the principal aim of Our Space is to ensure that there is sufficient housing and business development capacity in Greater Christchurch to support future demand, and that this demand is supported in a way that aligns with the vision, principles and strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy.

The main source of demand for housing and business space relates to population growth. To understand the scale and type of demand that is likely in the future, Policy PB2 of the NPS-UDC states that local authorities shall use information on demand when preparing their capacity assessment, including likely demographic changes using Statistics NZ population projections.

They noted to accommodate these projected demands in a way that aligns with broader strategic aspirations for Greater Christchurch, Our Space was guided by the strategic directions of the Urban Development Strategy. This is set out in Section 2.3 of Our Space. The long term settlement pattern approach outlined in Our Space reflects the previously agreed urban limits of the Urban Development Strategy and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Adopting a transitional approach to housing targets in Our Space also demonstrates a clear strategic consideration of how future demand should be accommodated in Greater Christchurch, diverging from the adopted growth projections. This approach directs more demand to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term.

Taking into account the explanation from officers, we consider that the approach taken is correct, and aligns with both the requirements NPS-UDC and the vision, principles and strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy.

We accept the position of officers’ and as a result, we do not recommend any change in response to this submission point.

Cities’ prosperity is vulnerable unless the mix of economic activity shifts away from reliance on the rebuild and servicing the local population, which requires the aspiration to create new and better economic prospects.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers noted that Our Space does not determine the types of economic activities to be undertaken across Greater Christchurch, but seeks to ensure there is sufficient commercial and industrial space available to support business needs over the long term. The Capacity Assessment indicated this capacity is well planned for with the Central City recognised as the core commercial hub for the Greater Christchurch area.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Insufficient attention is given to the importance of driving urban growth to the central city and inner suburbs in the short to medium term, to position Greater Christchurch as an attractive proposition in the long term.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that both provides for current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years. In doing so, Our Space identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing, and adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on the adopted projections.

They considered this holistic approach to targets seek to respond to projected changes over the long term and is different to constraining growth in the districts over the medium term to benefit development prospects and outcomes in the City, especially the Central City, as suggested by some submitters.
Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

We note the principle behind the submission, and to that extent we accept it. No changes are proposed to Our Space in response to the submission point.

Concern regarding the information and assumptions used in the preparation of Our Space, specifically in terms of the post-earthquake effects on population and employment forecasts.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**  
Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands). They note that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, they said, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in Our Space reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances.

We accept that there is uncertainty in the projections. The ongoing capacity analysis cycle (undertaking capacity assessments every three years) provides for monitoring of uptake and development, and the ability to adjust capacity assessments and improve the capacity assessment methodology to ensure demand and uptake is understood. No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Specific comment on the Executive Summary, that wellbeing strategies should inform and drive settlement pattern strategies, not be made to fit and complement them.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**  
Officers noted the submission point.  

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Specific comment on Section 2.1 (page 3), that central city employment levels are well below pre-earthquake levels and there is still a long way to go to create a vibrant ‘principal commercial hub’ for the region.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**  
Officers acknowledged that wording in Our Space related to Central City employment levels nearing those attained prior to the earthquakes may be misleading and should be amended.

We agree and recommend amending Section 2.1 of Our Space to clarify that employment levels in the Central City remain below pre-earthquake levels.

Specific comment on Section 4.1 (page 15), that a key issue that is missing is the need to ensure momentum in regeneration is maintained and accelerated to create a vibrant urban centre and higher economic relevance.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**  
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts). They note and support the submission point highlighting the importance of the Central City and that it should be a
focus for development. However, the challenges outlined in Section 4.1 relate to an assessment across Greater Christchurch and have not identified where in particular such issues are most important.

For the reasons set out, no change is recommended.

**Lincoln University (078)**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted the submission point.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

Maintain PiB in current proposed position for Rolleston and Lincoln.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district).

Our Space does not propose any changes to the Projected Infrastructure Boundary.

No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.

**KiwiRail Holdings Limited (079)**

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Support for UDS principles and strategic goals guiding Our Space, and reference to the GPS on Land Transport.

We heard from Ms Rebecca Beals (RMA team leader) and Ms Jeanine Benson in relation to the submission from KiwiRail Holdings Limited.

In relation to this submission point, support is noted, and no changes are recommended.

Industry and tourism growth is anticipated to result in some increased demand on the rail network.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Comment is noted, no changes are recommended.

Relevant business areas should be appropriately protected and developed, along with links to the transport network, to ensure existing rail functions and future opportunities to use rail are not compromised.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development) in the officers’ report.

The rail network is strategic infrastructure for Greater Christchurch that requires protection from inappropriately located development, thereby ensuring safety and efficiency are not compromised, or reverse sensitivities created. The submitter notes that KiwiRail already works closely with councils to ensure such issues are recognised and addressed through district plans, which is the appropriate planning mechanism to address such matters.

We consider that that protection is adequately recognised and provided for in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need to ensure any new development does not generate reverse sensitivities for the rail network.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 10 (Provision and protection of key infrastructure and integration with development) in the officers' report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rail network is strategic infrastructure for Greater Christchurch that requires protection from inappropriately located development, thereby ensuring safety and efficiency are not compromised, or reverse sensitivities created. The submitter notes that KiwiRail already works closely with councils to ensure such issues are recognised and addressed through district plans, which is the appropriate planning mechanism to address such matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We consider that that protection is adequately recognised and provided for in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will work with the Partnership where possible to assist in achieving the vision for the transport network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment is noted, no changes are recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking clarification around what is intended in terms of improvements to the transport network, and that KiwiRail is party to any discussions that have implications for the rail corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These matters will be further explored as part of transport business cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a reference in Section 5.6 of Our Space that future growth may require changes to the rail network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These matters will be further explored as part of transport business cases. Changes are recommended to section 5.6 to provide further detail about transport business cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the last paragraph in Section 5.7 of Our Space (beginning “Further more detailed assessment…”) to include consideration of how future growth areas will integrate with land transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These matters will be further explored as part of transport business cases. No changes are recommended in relation to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Robert Fleming (080)**

Considers that Christchurch City should be developed prior to additional greenfield space outside the city boundaries (cost, efficient infrastructure provision, diminishing quality and quality of productive land).

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that both provides for current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years. In doing so, it identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing, and adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on the adopted projections.
They considered this holistic approach to targets seek to respond to projected changes over the long term and is different to constraining growth in the districts over the medium term to benefit development prospects and outcomes in the City, especially the Central City, as suggested by some submitters.

Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

We accept the officers’ reasons and recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports active and public transport options, better transport options within the city, shared transport options, and rapid transit between regional Canterbury towns combined with walkable park and ride solutions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong> Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport) in the officers’ report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NZTA and local authorities in Greater Christchurch are working towards making more efficient use of the network. The importance of taking a multi modal approach to managing the network, which includes active transport such as walking and cycling and public transport for those who are less mobile or unable to cycle, is recognised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better transport options to industrial areas should be provided for.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong> Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport) in the officers’ report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NZTA and local authorities in Greater Christchurch are working towards making more efficient use of the network. The importance of taking a multi modal approach to managing the network, which includes active transport such as walking and cycling and public transport for those who are less mobile or unable to cycle, is recognised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Malc Dartnall (081)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights a lack of larger houses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong> Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing and a range of housing types).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officers said that the evidence underpinning Our Space highlights how changing demographics and affordability will likely impact the range of housing types demanded, increasing the need for smaller and multi-unit dwellings to complement the existing housing stock dominated by larger standalone houses. The number of larger families, as a proportion of overall household growth, is predicted to decline. Our Space seeks to provide for the range of housing types likely to be needed to accommodate future population growth – it does not preclude the development of larger houses. Our Space will need to monitor and review the anticipated scale and pace of changes to housing demand as part of subsequent capacity assessments.

We accept the officers’ reasons and recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Concerned that the current planning framework encourages small houses and disregards the needs of larger families; considers that Our Space should be family friendly with the needs of larger families specifically mentioned.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We refer to the evaluation in relation to the above submission point and do not recommend any changes in response to the submission point.

**Concerns**

Concerns there is a lack of industrial zoned land in Waimakariri.

**Officers note**

Officers note that the Capacity Assessment identified a significant oversupply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand. Section 3.3 of Our Space outlines these findings.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

---

**Helen Broughton (082)**

Concerned that this process is occurring so soon after the same issues were considered through the Christchurch District Plan Review.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We note that the development of Our Space, being a future development strategy, is a requirement under the NPS UDC and is mandatory.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Suggests**

Suggests that both low and medium growth projections should be used.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands).

Our Space adopts population projections that reflect recent growth trends in Greater Christchurch, with the rationale for the adopted projections fully documented in the Capacity Assessment. The projection scenario used for the purposes of Our Space anticipates a Greater Christchurch population of 640,000 in 2048, which is higher than Statistics NZ’s medium (or most likely) projections by 22,000, but much lower than Statistics NZ’s high projections that anticipates a population of 742,000 in 2048. The projection scenarios considered in developing Our Space are shown in Figure 7.

It is of note that in developing the Urban Development Strategy in 2007, the Greater Christchurch population was expected to be in the region of 550,000 in 2041. In comparison, the projections used for Our Space anticipates this population closer to 2031, some ten years sooner than was anticipated by the 2007 UDS.
In July 2018, MFE and MBIE published a report that evaluated capacity assessments undertaken for the high growth urban areas. This report stated that most high growth urban areas used an alternative to Statistics NZ’s medium projections, and in general, the choice to use a different projection could be clearly explained and justified with recent trends. The report considered the demand assessment for Greater Christchurch to be best practice amongst high growth urban areas.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions whether the decrease in home ownership in Christchurch identified on page 11 is realistic.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers advise that the projected decrease in home ownership rates reported on page 11 was one of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>findings of a comprehensive assessment of the future housing demand profile for Greater Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commissioned as part of the Capacity Assessment (Livingston Associates, Housing Demand in Greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch). This refers to the proportion of the additional households projected in Christchurch City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over the period to 2048 whose housing needs are likely to be met by the rental market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Suggests that given there is sufficient housing in Christchurch City major urban planning changes for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch need not occur.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and uncertainties of projected demands).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Identifies negative effects of intensification. Comments that intensification should be directed to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>central city, with no further intensification in suburban Christchurch beyond what is currently permitted; if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intensification is further considered any area the [Christchurch District Plan Review] Hearings Panel judged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be inappropriate for medium density should retain suburban density. If medium density is to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continued it should have allowance for parking and more courtyard space and plantings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In response to questions from the Panel, Ms Broughton said that in Ilam, some accommodation was needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for students, but that students do have cars and can travel. Ms Broughton considered that the current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zonings were enough. She thought there would need to be an attitude change to transport, and that would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only happen if the price of petrol went up. She would prefer to see greenfield land opened up, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intensification in the city, before additional intensification took place in the suburbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers refer to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social and affordable housing and a range of housing types).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We note that the Independent Hearings Panel left future decisions regarding further up-zoning to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Considers there is sufficient land in Christchurch City for the long term with low to medium growth and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no need to focus on further medium density areas.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to the officers’ comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and uncertainties of projected demands). Officers noted that Statistics NZ population projections remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the most robust information available to predict future population changes. The NPS-UDC requires a new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity assessment every three years to ensure planning is responsive to changing trends. Officers said that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the approach to setting housing targets in Our Space, as outlined in Section 3.2 is also considered to represent a principles-based approach rather than following a purely projections-led approach.

Our Space also outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Questions the accuracy of the infographic in Section 3.2 of Our Space (p 11) with regard to the affordability constraints of new households.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers addressed this matter in their Reply Report. They considered that on investigation, the wording in the infographic should more accurately read:
62% of new households housing in the City, 35% in Selwyn and 58% in Waimakariri.

Officers stated that this information is derived from the expert analysis of Livingston Associates who prepared a Housing Demand Assessment as part of the Capacity Assessment. This work used Statistics NZ demographic data and extrapolated current trends in household size, income and other classifications through to 2048.

New households formed over the next 30 years are expected to experience increasing affordability pressures, even with a sufficient supply of new housing appropriate to the needs of a changing household composition. An important aspect of this infographic however is that it is the total housing stock available that would need to meet the financial thresholds identified (i.e. under $350,000 to buy or $200/week to rent) to be considered affordable.

We accept the officers’ position and changes recommended.

**Youth Voice Canterbury (083)**

Keen to identify how Our Space meets priorities identified in youth strategies, action plans and surveys and consider how the future settlement pattern proposed addresses the challenges over the next 30 years and the quality of life of future generations.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Youth Voice Canterbury tabled information in relation to their submission, which included a number of closing recommendations. Officers considered that this information was best addressed by other processes. We note the issues of concern for Youth Voice, and identify the following processes where these matters may be followed up, or more appropriately addressed in relation to each recommendation:

1. Enforce warrant of fitness standards for houses to ensure that all homes built in the future are of high standards – this is better addressed at a national level through legislative change and will be considered as part of rental tenancy reform.
2. Ensure there is some form of community, low income housing to provide a space for the homeless especially those who are young – this is addressed by housing agencies, but we note that it also is picked up in part by an action in Our Space (Action 2).
3. Investment in more buses that travel around the suburbs/communities without going into the central city – this is a matter for the Regional Public Transport Plan.
4. Re-introduce the free shuttle around the central city – this is a matter for the Regional Public Transport Plan.
5. Reduction of the price of the trams for locals so they are affordable and able to be used as public transport – this is a matter for the Regional Public Transport Plan.

6. Invest in light rail from Kaiapoi/Rangiora to Rolleston, via east side/Marshland area and provide funding and support the introduction of innovative transport concepts like solar powered trains – this is a matter for the Regional Public Transport Plan although we note that amendments have been made in Our Space around transport and funding and identification of rapid transit routes.

7. More opportunity for cultures to express themselves through cultural events – this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes.

8. Increase knowledge of diversity through cultural hubs - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes.

9. Use empty land and city council public areas to make youth friendly spaces - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes.

10. Increase outdoor seating, street lighting, and shaded areas - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes and engagement with community boards in particular locations.

11. Improve footpaths - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes and engagement with community boards in particular locations.

12. Make the central city greener, create more and improve places and walks with native trees and fauna, and increase community input into creating green spaces - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes and engagement with community boards in particular locations.

13. Ensure green spaces have natural and peaceful seating areas and adequate lighting - this is a matter that is appropriately directed to district council long term planning and annual planning processes and engagement with community boards in particular locations.

We accept the officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point except to the extent that amendments are recommended to Our Space in relation to Action 2 in the Schedule of Further Work and transport and funding and identification of rapid transport routes.

Richard Graham (084)

Considers that the plan should first consider what level of population growth (if any) there should be in Greater Christchurch and questions whether providing for housing and infrastructure for levels growth indicated by Statistics NZ projections is the best outcome for the region.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Refer to the officers’ comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 1 (Accuracy and uncertainties of projected demands). Officers noted that Statistics NZ population projections remain the most robust information available to predict future population changes. The NPS-UDC requires a new capacity assessment every three years to ensure planning is responsive to any changing trends. Officers said that the approach to setting housing targets in Our Space, as outlined in Section 3.2 is also considered to represent a principles-based approach rather than following a purely projections-led approach.

Our Space also outlines that, with appropriate densities, demand can be met for future housing needs both within the Christchurch City area, and the wider Greater Christchurch area. As discussed below, the appropriate consideration of further areas should be considered as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2022.

We accept officers’ position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

No assessment of the impact of further urban expansion on existing rural amenity or on holiday destinations.

Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:
Officer referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2
(Reducing urban sprawl, developing in the City (and Central City) first ahead of surrounding districts).

The comment related to impacts on holiday destinations is noted, but is beyond the scope of matters
considered in Our Space.

We accept officer's position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Comments that all new developments should be encouraged to provide a range of housing typologies that
provide for a range of family sizes and requirements.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that Our Space supports the delivery of a range of housing types, sizes and tenures that will
be required to meet future demand, including by responding to projected changes in housing need and
demand over the next thirty years. District planning plays an important role in the delivery of a broad range
of housing types.

We accept officer's position and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Comments that new commercial development should be contained within existing commercial hubs where
possible, particularly encouraging greater activity within the CBD.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing
commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a 10-minute neighbourhood). This acknowledges that
the explanation of, and policy intent behind, Key Activity Centres is limited in Our Space, and officers
recommend the connection with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept should be clarified in Our Space
through additional wording in Section 5.

We accept the officers' recommendation on this, with the recommended clarification.

**Pomeroy round table (085)**

Submission withdrawn

**Kieran Williamson (086)**

Considers that greenfield development in exurban areas such as Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi is
unsustainable (increased CO2 and PM pollution, congestion and obesity).

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2
(Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) in
the officers' report. They said that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that both provides for
current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years.
In doing so, it identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing, and
adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported
through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on the projections.

They considered this holistic approach to targets seeks to respond to projected changes over the long term
and is different to constraining growth in the districts over the medium term to benefit development
prospects and outcomes in the City, especially the Central City, as suggested by some submitters.
Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Christchurch District Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

We accept the position of the officers and no changes are proposed to Our Space in response to the submission point.

Proposes that all future development should be restricted to the current Christchurch City limits and a large majority of new development should be multi-unit dwellings (close to shopping, work and public transport) with single family detached dwellings discouraged.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

We refer to the above evaluation, in respect of Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) in the officers’ report. For the reasons referred to above, we do not recommend any changes to Our Space in response to the submission point.

Our Space pays only lip service to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in respect to Theme 11 (Addressing climate change and achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals). We generally accept the officers’ position on those matters, however we recommend changes with regard to addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals. We consider this merits its own new section under Section 4 in Our Space, elevated to a higher priority, and amendments to Section 5 of the report, with tighter, clearer and more aspirational wording. As a result, we accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.

Large format retail serviced only by road corridors and suburban shopping mall developments should not be allowed to develop in new areas or expand in existing commercial areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers referred to their comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of a '10-minute neighbourhood') in the officers’ report, and the reporting officers’ reply report (question 9) with respect to the 10-minute neighbourhood concept. They said that Our Space reflects the current Canterbury Regional Policy Statement direction that the Central City and Key Activity Centres are the focus for commercial activity (office and retail), not just shopping malls, but also other public and community facilities such as education, health and leisure services. These centres integrate high quality public realm spaces and are well-connected by public transport services and safe cycle networks. Medium density housing in and around such centres support their vitality and viability.

We further note provision for neighbourhood centres in each of the district plans in Greater Christchurch, which are smaller centres providing for smaller scale commercial activities. These are also an important factor when considering 10-minute neighbourhoods.

We accept the officers’ recommendations on this, and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Small scale retail and office development should be allowed in areas without sufficient existing amenities within walking distance.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We refer to the evaluation above, namely that Our Space reflects the current policy direction in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, in regards to Central City and Key Activity Centres which integrate high quality public realm spaces and are well connected to public transport services and safe cycle network.

We do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point and accept the officers’ recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 8 (Focusing commercial activity in key centres and the nature of the ‘10-minute neighbourhood’).

Suggests that the best way to retain and increase the viability and vitality of existing commercial centres is to increase the density of housing within the catchment areas of these centres; replace existing old stock single family occupancy homes with multi-unit dwellings and develop greenfield and other underutilised spaces within existing city limits.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that Our Space promotes greater densities around key centres. District Plan provisions also play a key role in this regard. The Christchurch District Plan is enabling of residential intensification within and surrounding existing centres. The recent Christchurch District Plan Review up-zoned many areas around Key Activity Centres to facilitate medium density residential development and considerable potential also exists within the central city to support the CBD economy.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Considers priority should be given increasing / ensuring public transport access to industrial areas.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport) in the officers’ report.

The NZTA and local authorities in Greater Christchurch are working towards making more efficient use of the transport network. The importance of taking a multi modal approach to managing the network, which includes active transport such as walking and cycling and public transport for those who are less mobile or unable to cycle, is recognised.

Officers have recommended changes to include more detail on the transport business cases underway.

We agree with these recommendations. No further changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Supports higher densities within the current city limits.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
This submission is noted, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Axel Wilke (087)**

Supports the sentiments expressed in Our Space.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Support noted. No change is recommended in response to this submission point.

Does not consider the targets set in Our Space are ambitious enough to prevent further climate change; much of the development will only be supportable by auto-centric lifestyles; objective should be to define high-capacity public transport corridors with high density alongside; greenfield developments should only be permissible with good public transport provision from day one.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 5 (Transport needs and implications, including public transport). We consider the response with regard to addressing climate change, achieving sustainability and zero carbon goals merits its own new section under Section 4 in Our Space, elevated to a higher priority, and amendments to Section 5 of the report, with tighter, clearer and more aspirational wording. As a result, we accept the submission in part to the extent that changes to those sections are made.

**Colin Eaton (088)**

Considers that Christchurch does not have the infrastructure to support more growth – identifies concerns relating to drainage, stormwater, sewerage and market garden land and orchards.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Infrastructure is planned out for a period of 30 years under the infrastructure strategies prepared under the Local Government Act 2002. Matters such as market gardens and orchards can be address through treatment of land and sampling under the relevant National Environmental Standards.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Comments that social housing does not mix well.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Noted. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Suggests that all vacant industrial land and buildings should be revitalised before planning for more industrial areas.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

No new industrial areas are planned given the existing significant supply of industrially zoned land in Greater Christchurch. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Considers that the plan should show we care for the future and city environment not driven by the economy and greed.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Noted. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Comments that the transport network will only work if it is good and regular and private cars are banned from the central city.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

The suggestion to ban cars from the city centre is out of scope of the matters considered in Our Space.

No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Chris Morahan (089)**

Considers that resolving distortions in the housing market created by the transport system and removing planning rules that restrict dense development will lead to higher demand in the inner city and along public transport corridors, and lower demand in outlying auto-centric suburbs like Rolleston and Rangiora, in the future.

### Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:

Noted. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.
Agrees with intensifying the inner city and public transport corridors; disagrees within more auto-centric sprawl.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Mr Chris Morahan presented his submission. Mr Morahan is a transport planner and blogger. Mr Morahan described how the decisions being made now would make a big impact on his daughter and her peers, than it would on the current people in the room. He referred to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and its recent reported on the current state of climate change, and its conclusions. He noted that even without climate change, modal shift provides for public health benefits and safety. He noted that the draft public transport plan was released, and the general theme of submissions was that public transport needed to go further, and it should address passenger rail. He referred to a recent Colman Brunton survey that noted less than 50% of people are concerned about climate change and the need to act.

In relation to development, Mr Morahan observed that higher density is needed, pedestrian connections are required, with well-planned corridors, and areas are contiguous. He said that people will use rail corridors if rail is provided. He considered it was likely there will be a zero carbon act, with better carbon prices, and a need for better walking and cycling. His three takeaway points would be a need for more ambitious intensification around existing corridors, no more greenfields sprawl, and not to preclude existing rail corridors. He considered while the text of Our Space was good, it didn’t line up with percentages of greenfield development that are proposed, and he did not think it would deliver a dense compact city.

Officers referred to the comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) in the officers’ report. They said that Our Space seeks to provide a balanced approach that both provides for current market demands and reflects the anticipated changes in these demands over the next thirty years. In doing so, it identifies a range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities to support new housing, and adopts an approach to housing targets that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term than would be anticipated based on projections.

They considered this holistic approach to targets seeks to respond to projected changes over the long term and is different to constraining growth in the districts over the medium term to benefit development prospects and outcomes in the City, especially the Central City, as suggested by some submitters.

Officers said that an approach to limit intensification to the Central City alone would be counter to these existing Christchurch District Plan provisions, would likely only deliver a segment of the housing types envisaged by intensification policies (i.e. higher density townhouses and apartments), and would be highly unlikely to provide the level of new housing required to meet projected demand.

They noted that Christchurch City Council has embarked on an ambitious programme to encourage Central City living, titled Project 8011, with a target of increasing the Central City population to 20,000 by 2028 from a current level of around 6,000. Project 8011 signals that over time the initiatives and mechanisms that comprise the programme can be rolled out more broadly, where appropriate, to encourage and support city-wide intensification.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**

Officers noted that Our Space has been prepared in accordance with the existing principles of the Urban Development Strategy and policy framework of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Both documents reinforce the centres-based approach. Any change in policy direction regarding the centres-based approach is more appropriately considered as part of the 2022 review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.
We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Strongly agrees with promoting higher densities around key centres. Suggests that railway lines could be included as key future public transport routes.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We understand that the option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

**Wayne Phillips (090)**

Large greenfields development in Rangiora and Rolleston will lock in auto dependence.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred to comments and recommendations outlined in Section 4 in relation to Themes 2 (Reducing urban sprawl and developing in the City (and Central City) ahead of the surrounding districts) and 6 (Transport needs and implications, including for public and active transport).
We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

Planning for other transport options for such towns needs to take place now.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
We understand that the option of rail services in Greater Christchurch is being considered as part of the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case. No changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Encourage key worker housing (such as nurses, police, teachers).

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers referred us to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 9 (Provision of social and affordable housing, and a range of housing types).

The purpose of a social and affordable housing action plan would be to enable social and affordable housing across Greater Christchurch. However, specific details of such an action plan have yet to be determined. The action plan is discussed in Section 5.1 and Section 6.2 of Our Space. This may help to facilitate housing for such workers.

We accept the officers’ position that no changes are required and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.

Basing projections on high post-EQ rates is dangerous.

**Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:**
Officers noted that the projections are only the starting point for spatial planning. For instance, the setting of territorial authority housing targets in Our Space reflects projections over the medium term, but over the long term it was considered that simply duplicating projections would not take account of Greater Christchurch’s unique post-earthquake circumstances and may not align with the strategic goals of the Urban Development Strategy to increasingly enable growth through redevelopment. Hence the adoption of the transitional approach to territorial authority housing targets in Our Space that allows for a greater share of new households to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. Greater Christchurch targets still provide for projected demand over the long term. It is in the apportionment between territorial authorities that Our Space differs from current projections.
We are satisfied with the officers’ response. In addition, we note there are a number of other considerations such as ability to service, maintenance of a compact urban form, and presence of natural hazard which will all contribute to whether it is appropriate to develop in a particular location.

We accept the officers’ recommendations and do not recommend any changes in response to this submission point.

**Landowners ODP 12 Rolleston (091)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners supporting inclusion of existing greenfield land (within PIB) on East Maddisons Road, Rolleston.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We heard from Ms Angelene Holton, a landowner, regarding low value rural land which has been identified in Our Space as a Future Development Area. Ms Holton described how the area (known as ODP Area 12B) at the southern end of Rolleston was not included in the Land Use Recovery Plan changes to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. The land is low value rural land that is not of use for much more than grazing horses. Ms Holton advised that she had provided submissions to the Minister on the Land Use Recovery Plan. A copy of the submission to the Minister was attached to her submission. The submission was not supported, and the land was subsequently not included in Map A, Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Ms Holton described how, in response to questions from the Panel, how this was a constraint to development. Ms Holton generally supported the Our Space document, which identifies the land in which she has interest as a Future Development Area (notated orange in Figures 15 and 16 of the Strategy), although she remained concerned that she had been advised that a private plan change would be required to release the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is noted that changes will still be required to both the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the relevant district plan in order for subdivision and development to occur on the site, and that further discussions are required with Selwyn District Council as to timing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes are recommended in response to the submission point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**John Law (092)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowner seeks inclusion of additional land (outside the PIB) for industrial use on Main South Road. Considers that the CRPS inadequately accounts for future industrial development trends.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Panel discussion and recommendation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers referred to the comment and recommendation outlined in Section 4 in relation to Theme 4 (<em>Need for further greenfield areas, including specific sites proposed in each district</em>) in the officers’ report. The officers’ position is that no new industrial areas should be proposed, given the significant oversupply of industrial land in Greater Christchurch to meet long term demand identified in the Capacity Assessment. They noted that while there may be reasons other than land supply which weigh in favour of enabling the rezoning of this land, the appropriate process to consider the merits of any expansion of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and/or other enabling policy changes is during the review of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2022 as part of the review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. This review is identified in Section 6.2 in the schedule of future work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We accept the officers’ position on this, and no changes are recommended in response to this submission point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2 – Our Space document

This incorporates amendments recommended in the Addendum dated 5 June 2019 to the Report and Recommendations of the Hearings Panel.
Have Your Say

[INSERT MESSAGE FROM PARTNERS AND MINE]

What this document is about

This Settlement Pattern Update (Update) to the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) is a review of the land use planning framework for Greater Christchurch. It outlines the Greater Christchurch Partnership’s proposed settlement pattern and strategic planning framework to meet our land-use and infrastructure needs over the medium (next 30 years) and long-term (10 to 30 years) periods. The Update has been prepared in order to satisfy the requirement to produce a future development strategy, as outlined in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC).

Why you should make a submission

The Partnership wishes to hear from stakeholders and the public to ensure the decisions made in relation to the Update are well-informed by feedback. This includes whether the proposed planning directions set out in this consultation draft will sufficiently provide for the needs of people and communities, and our future generations, and support broader opportunities to improve social, economic, cultural, and environmental wellbeing by planning for growth and development.

Submissions will help shape the final content of the Update, which is due to be adopted early in 2019. Your input is important to let us know whether you consider we have got it right, and if not, what needs to be changed and why.

How to make a submission

Anyone can make a submission. It may be in written, electronic or audio format, and can range from a short email or letter on a single issue, to a more substantial document covering multiple issues. Please provide any supporting facts, figures, data, examples and documentation wherever possible to support your submission. Every submission is welcome; however, identical submissions will not carry any more weight than the merits of the arguments presented.

A submission form is available on the Partnership’s website at www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz/space

Submissions may also be emailed to your.name@greaterchristchurch.org.nz

Submissions made in accessible, searchable PDF formats are preferred. Hard copies may also be posted, particularly if appending other material. If you send your submission by post, please also email an electronic copy if possible. Postal submissions should be addressed to:

OurSPAC Consultation
Greater Christchurch Partnership
PO Box 73032
Christchurch 8144

Submissions should include the submitter’s name and contact details, and the details of any organisation represented. Please clearly state if you wish to be heard in support of your submission. The Partnership will not accept submissions that, in its opinion, contain inappropriate or defamatory content.

The deadline for submissions is 30 November 2018.

What the Partnership will do with submissions

The Partnership will make all submissions publicly available on its website.

Your written comment, including your name, will become public information. If you consider there are compelling reasons why your name and/or feedback should be kept confidential please outline this in your submission.

Even if...
you request confidentiality we may have to release your written comment at a later date if a request is made under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 or the Official Information Act 1982.

A Hearings Panel will hear from submitters wishing to be heard; review the content of all submissions and make recommendations on changes to this consultation draft. A final version of the Update, which has been informed by the feedback received and any further information; will be considered by the Partnership for adoption; followed by ratification of the Update by constituent partner councils.

Other ways to participate in the consultation

The Partnership’s constituent partner councils will be holding drop-in sessions in Christchurch, Rolleston and Rangiora. Further details are available on the Partnership’s website.
Mihi

Hāro ana te kāhu i te ipukarea o Tahu Pōtiki
Tau atu rā kī te tīhi o tōku pou tipua
Aoraki Matatū, Aoraki Mataoho
Ka mihi kī ngā maunga, ka mihi kī ngā awa
Tihei Mauri Ora

Tēnei te mihi kī ngā tātaitanga o te tahiwa nei
Kia tākina te hono kia puawai te kaupapa
me ngā hua o te Mātāmoko ki ū, kia mau
hui e Tākī e

The Kāhu soars the lands of Tahu Pōtiki
And settles on the summit of my ancestral mountain
Aoraki Steadfast, Aoraki Viliant
It acknowledges all the mountains and rivers
Behold the essence of life

We acknowledge those with a vested connection to the land,
who ensure this bond and the collaboration of this document
and the values within to ensure its Society
Together in Unity!
Message from the Strategy Partners

The Greater Christchurch Partnership continues to demonstrate the cross-agency collaboration and leadership required to effectively plan for and manage urban development across the Greater Christchurch area, working together to address those key strategic issues that span council and political boundaries. Te Tira Te Tahi - One Group, Standing Together.

Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāneki O Te Hūrara Nohoaanga represents a further building block to ensure our partnership approach to planning takes account how things have changed in recent years, and what demands and trends might shape the future of our urban areas during the next thirty years. Its particular focus is how best to accommodate housing and business land use needs in a way that integrates with transport and other infrastructure provision, building greater community resilience, and contributing to a sustainable future for Greater Christchurch that meets the needs and aspirations of our existing communities and future generations.

We first recognised the need to undertake this work when we adopted an update to the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy in 2016. This was then reinforced by the development of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, which requires councils with high growth urban areas to produce a future development strategy demonstrating there will be sufficient development capacity to meet future needs. Our Space has been collaboratively prepared to satisfy this requirement for Greater Christchurch’s councils.

The strategic planning directions contained in this document have been strongly guided by the vision, goals and principles enshrined in the Urban Development Strategy, which continues to provide the roadmap for growth planning in Greater Christchurch. Our Space therefore does not seek to replace this comprehensive strategy, but rather builds on it by considering and updating many of our key settlement pattern matters. Other plans, strategies and initiatives referred to in this document also complement Our Space, helping provide a broader wellbeing approach that ensures Greater Christchurch remains an attractive place for people to live, learn, work, play and invest.

We would like to acknowledge and thank those that have helped shape this document, and would encourage all to contribute to its implementation and the realisation of our shared vision for the future of Greater Christchurch.
Executive Summary

Greater Christchurch has responded to the initial challenges following the earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 and is now embracing the opportunities that lie ahead to help us realise our long term vision - mā tātou, ā, mā kā uri ā muri ake nei, for us and our children after us.

A growing urban area can bring future prosperity and enrich our lives and communities, but it needs to be done if it is managed so we protect and enhance the aspects we value the most and that make it a unique place for people to choose to live, learn, work, visit and invest. Greater Christchurch is growing, with the population expected to grow to about 640,000 by 2048, some 150,000 more people than today.

Planning for future urban growth in Greater Christchurch must also be informed and guided by the principles that are relevant to the exercise by mana whenua of kaitiakitanga. Integral to the exercise of kaitiakitanga are the values of respect, reciprocity and sustainability. For mana whenua, it is vital that the effects associated with urban growth are managed so as to avoid the degradation of the natural environment – including our coastal environment, waterways and landscapes.

The Greater Christchurch Partnership has worked collaboratively for more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development across Greater Christchurch. This Partnership brings together the leadership roles of local government, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, the district health board and government agencies and is guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals outlined in the Urban Development Strategy (UDS).

This Update to the UDS addresses various aspects of that Strategy as it:

- focuses on the critical role of how our urban areas accommodate growth and how efficient infrastructure planning can support and guide development decisions;
- reaffirms and builds on existing plans that show we are already well-placed for future development over the next 30 years;
- balances the projected future demands of housing and business markets with the urban form that will best enable sustainable growth;
- recognises that how we live today will be quite different to 30 years from now, so we need to be responsive to these changes, grasping the opportunities afforded by Government policy and emerging technologies to make this transition.

In so doing, this Update demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term while maintaining an urban form that helps achieve the UDS vision and strategic goals. Two challenges stand out in this regard:

1. How can future housing provision be affordable, high quality and cater for an aging population that is linked to a more general trend for more one person and couple-only households?

2. And how can our urban areas grow, through redevelopment and new greenfield subdivisions, without increasing the congestion that would ensue if our current travel patterns remain?

The solutions to these and other challenges will come from a wide range of responses from public agencies, the private sector and communities. Many drivers of change are uncertain, so regular monitoring and review is critical.

This Update outlines the proposed planning framework that integrates and guides other work and demonstrates the commitment of the partners to achieving its strategic goals. It has been informed by an assessment of where we are...
now and anticipated future demands; and aligns with recently adopted Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies of the constituent councils. Specifically it:

- sets out how targets for housing for the next 30 years will be met, accommodating an additional 150,000 people;
- identifies preferred locations for housing growth, encouraging Central City and suburban centre living while providing for township growth in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi;
- reinforces the role of key centres in providing additional retail and office floorspace as required, in particular the Central City and, if needed, a transition of its surrounding light industrial zones;
- promotes a compact urban form, which provides for efficient transport and locates development in a manner that takes into account climate change and sea level rise;
- recognises the existing industrial land provision as sufficient to cater for industrial growth for some time yet;
- outlines a series of implementation actions and further work required to give effect to the Update.

It responds to the new Government Policy Statement on Land Transport, which has increased funding for mass public transit schemes, and meets the requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) 2016 to prepare a future development strategy.

Many other plans, strategies and initiatives will complement this Update in improving our wider social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing. The draft Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) proposes a vision to fully integrate the public transport system with the wider transport system and urban form, thereby increasing mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch, Development and implementation of recovery and regeneration plans for central Christchurch; the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor (currently being developed) and Kaiapoi address the future land uses of areas most affected by the earthquakes. Coastal hazards, climate change and Carbon Zero projects are underway to better understand the resilience and adaptation needs of Greater Christchurch. And economic and social enterprise strategies help position the City and the region to thrive and show we are open for business and innovation.

This Update is therefore an important piece of the jigsaw that provides certainty for the sustained and collective investment we can all make to the wellbeing of Greater Christchurch, Our Space.
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1. Introduction

Kupu Whakataki

The Greater Christchurch Partnership has worked collaboratively for more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development in Greater Christchurch to support the long term needs of people and communities. This includes the development of the Urban Development Strategy (UDS) in 2007, and the crucial role the Partnership and its constituent partners played coordinating and facilitating rebuild and recovery activities after the earthquakes.

The Partnership has now reviewed the settlement pattern for Greater Christchurch. This review (referred to as the Settlement Pattern Update or the Update) has been undertaken to satisfy the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) for high growth councils to produce a ‘future development strategy’ that shows there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity to support housing and business growth needs. This includes addressing the need for housing and business development capacity in Greater Christchurch over the medium term (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years) periods (see Section 2.4 for further detail on the NPS-UDC).

A collaborative approach makes sense because the urban areas and the transport networks across Greater Christchurch function as one interconnected system. In doing so, it will satisfy the requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) for high growth councils to produce a ‘future development strategy’ that shows there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity to support projected growth needs to 2048. Rather than developing an entirely new strategy the Update builds on the existing UDS to meet the NPS-UDC requirements, and this is encouraged in supporting guidance on implementing the NPS-UDC.

This Update comprises a review of the land use framework outlined for Greater Christchurch in the Land Use Recovery Plan and in key resource management documents, such as the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans. It considers how best to accommodate our future housing and business needs based on the comprehensive strategic planning framework that already exists for Greater Christchurch, being guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals established in the UDS and informed by a Capacity Assessment and relevant Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies.

Our plan for supporting housing and business growth in Greater Christchurch has been shaped by key considerations relating to planning for sustainable urban development, including how we can:

- achieve our desired urban form while supporting our increasing housing and business needs;
- provide for the diversity of housing that meets the needs of a changing resident population;
- integrate land use and transport planning to ensure we create safe, accessible and liveable urban areas.

To ensure that the processes, priorities and outcomes of this Update align with Ngāi Tahu cultural aspirations for Greater Christchurch, both Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (as a member of the Partnership) and Ngā Papatu Rūnanga have been closely involved with the preparation of this document. Particularly significant from a cultural perspective is the need to ensure adequate provision is made for the establishment of kāinga nohoanga settlements in which Ngāi Tahu whānau can live and work on customary Māori land. The Partnership recognises the need for the future role of kāinga nohoanga developments to be important considerations in our planning and decision making processes.

In this context, this draft Update outlines the Partnership’s proposed planning directions for supporting urban growth in Greater Christchurch through to 2048. It highlights the key issues in terms of meeting our growth needs, and sets out the Partnership’s planned responses to these issues, with the aim of ensuring that Greater Christchurch remains an attractive place for people to live, learn, work, visit and invest, both now and in the future.

---

1 The Greater Christchurch Partnership has evolved to comprise Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Environment Canterbury, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, Canterbury District Health Board, New Zealand Transport Agency, Regenerate Christchurch and the Greater Christchurch Group of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.
2 The medium term in this Update includes both the short (next three years) and medium term (between three and 30 years) periods defined by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.
3 Having particular regard to Policy 9A of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.
This draft Update has been released for consultation to provide the opportunity for stakeholders and the public to give feedback on our proposed planning responses.

This feedback will be considered and, where appropriate, incorporated as part of the final document ratified by constituent partner councils.

The remainder of this document covers the following:

- Section 2, Our Place, provides the context in which this Update has been developed;
- Section 3, Our Growth Needs, outlines the anticipated housing and business demands, and the extent to which this demand is already provided for in district plans;
- Section 4, Our Challenges, sets out the key issues and challenges that exist when considering our planning responses;
- Section 5, Our Plan, identifies the planning directions and responses that we believe are required to address the key land use and infrastructure issues for Greater Christchurch;
- Section 6, Our Next Steps, signals further work required to implement our planning responses and support our future decision making.
2. Our Place

2.1 Context and trends

Greater Christchurch is a defined geographical area that includes and surrounds Christchurch City, New Zealand’s second largest city and the largest city in the South Island (Figure 1).

Greater Christchurch currently has a population nearing half a million residents. Just under 80% of the Canterbury regional population and about 40% of the South Island population live in Greater Christchurch, emphasising its importance as a strategic regional centre and the primary economic hub of the South Island. Canterbury is the fastest growing region in New Zealand outside Auckland and more population growth is projected in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years than other high growth cities, such as Hamilton, Tauranga, Wellington and Queenstown.

Administratively, Greater Christchurch comprises parts of three territorial authorities: Christchurch City, Selwyn District and Waimakariri District. The communities and economies in these areas are interdependently linked environmentally by the rivers, groundwater systems, coastal and other natural features that cross territorial authority boundaries, and by infrastructure, with large numbers of people commuting to work in the City, and facilities and services provided in one district often benefitting neighbouring communities.

The larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri that fall within Greater Christchurch include Rolleston, Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Lincoln, while smaller settlements include West Melton, Prebbleton, Fair Papanui, Springston, Taiahiwi, Woodend and Pegasm. Lyttelton and its harbour, Whakaraup, also fall within the defined boundaries for Greater Christchurch, although the rest of Banks Peninsula does not.

![Figure 2: Annual population growth rates](image)

The Canterbury earthquake sequence in 2010 and 2011 had a significant impact on Greater Christchurch’s population and employment. As shown in Figure 2, the population in Christchurch City dropped sharply in the first two years after the earthquakes and recovered to its pre-earthquake population only in 2017. In contrast, Selwyn and Waimakariri have experienced strong population growth since the earthquakes, augmenting the high growth rates seen in the two districts prior to the earthquakes.

The widespread earthquake damage to infrastructure networks and housing areas, especially in the Central City, the eastern areas of the City and in the Kaiapoi area, required many households to find new places to live. Much of this post-earthquake demand was supported by opening new housing areas that had been planned to meet longer term growth needs. Although the development around the urban fringes of the City and the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri has occurred at a faster rate than anticipated at the time the UDS was conceived, it has still been consistent with the longer term growth strategy for Greater Christchurch.

The earthquakes also damaged business premises in Greater Christchurch, especially in the central and eastern parts of the City, with many businesses forced to relocate either temporarily or, in some cases, permanently. Continued momentum behind the Central City recovery has meant businesses and workers are returning to this area, helping to restore the central business district as the principal commercial hub for the region. Employment levels in the Central City continue to increase but are not yet back to levels that existed prior to the earthquakes, one again meaning those attained prior to the earthquakes.
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Changes to the spatial distribution of housing and business activities in Greater Christchurch, coupled with the damage to roads and other infrastructure from the earthquakes, have had substantial impacts on the transport network. This includes altered travel patterns that have resulted in increased traffic volumes originating from the west of the City, as well as from Selwyn and Waimakariri. This has placed more demand on the road network along the western corridor, as well as on the northern and southern approaches to the Central City. Over the past decade there has been significant investment in the Greater Christchurch roading network, which has helped accommodate this demand. Investment has included the building of the Christchurch Southern Motorway Stage 1, Western Belfast Bypass and four-laning of the State Highway 1 Western Corridor (between Hornby and Belfast). The Christchurch Southern Motorway Stage 2 (between Halswell Junction Road and Rolleston), and the Christchurch Northern Corridor are under construction and expected to be fully operational by 2021.

Disruptions to land use, the transport network, and travel patterns have led to increased travel by car and contributed to reduced public transport patronage in Greater Christchurch. However, with a growing number of businesses and workers returning to the Central City, the share of trips taken by public transport in Greater Christchurch is expected to grow, while major investment in the urban cycleway network continues to encourage active transport choices.
2.2 Cultural values and aspirations

The Greater Christchurch area is an outstanding cultural landscape for Ngāi Tahu whānui. It is the hapū of Te Ngāi Tūākiri, Ngāi Tewhе (Rāpaki) and Taumutu Rūnanga who hold mana whenua over this cultural landscape. Integral to its role as mana whenua is the inherited responsibility bestowed upon mandated individuals to act as kaitiaki, and to ensure that the principles of respect, reciprocity and sustainability are adhered to when making decisions that affect the environment in the area.

Central to the role and responsibilities of kaitiakitanga is the holistic concept known as Ki Uta Ki Tai (from the mountains to the sea). The concept of Ki Uta Ki Tai maintains that each of the constituent components of the natural environment are interconnected, and that an action in one location will have a flow on effect and impact on another location.

The concept of Ki Uta Ki Tai can apply equally to the built environment whereby decisions that we make about future urban growth will have repercussions for associated infrastructure and service requirements. Accordingly, this Update has sought to adopt an integrated and holistic approach that recognises the interconnected nature of the Greater Christchurch environment.

Contained within the Greater Christchurch cultural landscape is a mosaic of values, many of which date back to time immemorial and which serve as tangible reminders of the intergenerational relationship that Ngāi Tahu Whenua share with the natural environment. In preparing this Update, the Partnership recognises that decisions we make about the future spatial distribution of housing and business activities in Greater Christchurch must align with traditional and contemporary cultural values. These values include:

- Wāhi inoa (place names), which often represent people, historical events, geographical features and Natural flora and fauna;
- Ara tawhito (traditional trails), which were the arteries of important social and economic relationships;
- Ngā wai, which are the freshwater resources that are the life blood of Papatūanuku (Earth Mother) and the life giver of all things;
- Mahinga kai, which encompasses the customary (and contemporary) gathering of food and natural materials, and the places where these are gathered from;
- Mauri, which encompasses the essence that binds the physical and spiritual elements of all things together, generating and upholding life;
- Wāhi tapu and wahi taonga sites, which include both archaeological sites and natural features, and species that are sacred, treasured and revered by Ngāi Tahu whenua.

The key principles that govern the manner in which these values are to be managed are set out in the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan. The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan is an expression of kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga, and contains detailed policies that reflect the kaupapa of Ngāi Tahu whenui in respect of the management of natural and physical resources.

Although much of the cultural landscape that envelopes the Greater Christchurch area is now highly modified, its significance to Ngāi Tahu whānui is in no way diminished. The many traditional values that attach themselves to the cultural landscape maintain a contemporary significance. To this end, the preparation of this document has been undertaken in close partnership with both Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (as a member of the Partnership) and Ngā Papatipu Rūnanga who hold mana whenua over Greater Christchurch.

It is important to record that, for Ngāi Tahu, subdivision and land use change can increase the potential for effects on sites and areas of cultural significance. These effects may be concerned with land disturbance and the introduction of activities which are inappropriate in close proximity to, or causing the displacement or loss of wāhi tapu or wahi taonga values. In addition, intensification of the built environment may increase demand for water supply, wastewater and stormwater disposal, adversely affecting surface and groundwater resources.
2.3 Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

The Urban Development Strategy (UDS) was produced by the Partnership in 2007 to provide the strategic direction for urban growth in Greater Christchurch. It promotes an integrated and intergenerational approach to planning for urban growth, and seeks to ensure that development is managed in a manner that protects environments, improves transport links, creates liveable areas and sustainably manages population growth. Formed after extensive consultation, the UDS seeks to consolidate development in and around well-defined urban and rural town centres.

The vision, principles and strategic goals in the UDS continue to guide the Partnership’s approach to enabling future growth, and have helped to shape the planning directions proposed in this Update.

**Vision (kaupapa)**

Greater Christchurch has a vibrant inner city and suburban centres surrounded by thriving rural communities and towns, connected by efficient and sustainable infrastructure.

There is a wealth of public spaces ranging from bustling inner city streets to expansive open spaces and parks, which embrace natural systems, landscapes and heritage.

Innovative businesses are welcome and can thrive, supported by a wide range of attractive facilities and opportunities.

Prosperous communities can enjoy a variety of lifestyles in good health and safety, enriched by the diversity of cultures and the beautiful environment of Greater Christchurch.

---

1 An update of the UDS in 2016 retained the vision for Greater Christchurch but revised the principles and strategic goals from the 2007 UDS to reflect the changes that had occurred since the earthquakes.
Principles and strategic goals (whainga)

The principles and strategic goals of the UDS expand on the vision by describing the key outcomes we seek to achieve under four themes: healthy communities, enhanced natural environments, prosperous economies and integrated and managed urban development. Given the emphasis of this Update on spatial planning matters, particular regard has been given to the strategic goals related to ‘integrated and managed urban development’, while also recognising the broader contribution that quality urban environments can bring to our overall quality of life.

Figure 3: UDS principles, themes and relevant strategic goals
2.4 National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) came into effect in December 2016, providing direction to decision-makers under the Resource Management Act 1993 in respect of planning for urban environments. It requires all councils that have part, or all, of a medium or high growth urban area within their district or region to produce a future development strategy which demonstrates that sufficient, feasible development capacity is available to support future housing and business growth. This includes over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years) periods.

The Christchurch urban area was defined by Statistics NZ in 2016 as a high growth urban area. Given the strategic planning arrangements that already exist between councils in Greater Christchurch through the Partnership, it was agreed that a review of Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern should be done collaboratively, and in doing so, meet the statutory requirements of the NPS-UDC. Accordingly, the Partnership has determined that the Greater Christchurch area shown in Figure 1 should be the geographic area of focus for the Update and the relevant urban environment for the purposes of the NPS-UDC requirements. This Update therefore meets the requirements of Policies PC12 and PC13 of the NPS-UDC related to producing a Future Development Strategy by:

- demonstrating that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity over the medium and long term;
- identifying the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity in new urban environments and intensification opportunities within existing urban environments;
- balancing the certainty regarding the provision of future development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development;
- being informed by a Capacity Assessment, the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies required under the Local Government Act 2002, and any other relevant strategies, plans and documents;
- having particular regard to NPS-UDC Policy PA1.

To inform the spatial planning decisions outlined in this Update, the Partnership has developed an evidence base that provides information about current and future housing and business trends in Greater Christchurch. This has included monitoring urban development indicators and preparing a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, which are both required by the NPS-UDC.

Figure 4: NPS-UDC policies and their interrelationship

---

1 The Christchurch urban area is identified by Statistics NZ as including the towns of Fendalton in Selwyn and Kaiapoi in Waimakariri.
2 The Urban Development Indicators Monitoring Reports and Capacity Assessment produced by the Partnership can be accessed at www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz.
The Capacity Assessment estimates the demand for and supply of housing and business land to indicate whether there is sufficient, feasible development capacity currently planned in Greater Christchurch to meet our growth needs for the next 30 years.

In undertaking this work, the NPS-JDC requires councils to estimate the sufficiency of development capacity to meet future demand taking into account relevant regional and district plan provisions, actual and likely availability of development infrastructure, the current feasibility and rate of take up of capacity, and the market response in terms of what has been built, where this has occurred and at what price.\(^1\)

This Update summarises the findings of the Capacity Assessment, identifies any sufficiency issues and provides our planning and policy response.

**Figure 5: Aspects of development capacity**

### 2.5 Where does this Update fit?

**National context**

This Update has been prepared within the legislative context of the Resource Management Act 1991, Local Government Act 2002 and Land Transport Management Act 2003. It has also been undertaken at a time when the Government is strengthening its approach to urban development and regional economic growth, and reviewing the mix of instruments available to effect change in New Zealand’s cities. This includes a review of how local government can effectively finance infrastructure improvements to support future growth, which is a critical challenge facing most high-growth urban areas.

The Urban Growth Agenda is the Government’s response to the challenges confronting New Zealand’s cities, especially in terms of worsening housing affordability. It seeks to address the fundamentals of land supply, development capacity and infrastructure provision by removing any undue constraints, with the initial focus of the programme on:

- enabling responsive infrastructure provision and appropriate cost allocation;

\(^1\) Requirement of Policy PB3 of the NPS-JDC.
• enabling strategic planning to increase development opportunities and support quality built environments;
• building stronger partnerships between local and central government as a means to undertaking pro-growth and integrated spatial planning;
• ensuring the price of transport infrastructure promotes access to the network and efficient urban form; and
• ensuring the regulatory, institutional and funding settings under the Resource Management Act, Local Government Act and Land Transport Management Act are collectively supporting the objectives of the Urban Growth Agenda.

The Government’s commitment to this Urban Growth Agenda has been reinforced by the creation of a new Ministry of Housing and Urban Development. There are also important interdependencies between the Urban Growth Agenda and other Government initiatives, such as establishing a national Urban Development Authority, the Kiwibuild programme to build 100,000 affordable homes for first time buyers, the Housing First programme to house and support people who have been homeless for a long time and face multiple needs, the Public Housing Plan to increase the supply of social housing and proposed changes to the Residential Tenancies Act 1986 to improve the conditions for people renting.

The new Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has also influenced this Update. The GPS makes clear that the transformation of the land transport system is a priority for the Government, signalling its commitment to:

• a mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment;
• incorporating technology and innovation into the design and delivery of land transport investment;
• integrating land use and transport planning and delivery.

Future updates to the GPS are likely to seek to establish local and central government agreements on transport’s role in the future development of metropolitan areas, such as Greater Christchurch. It will consider the role of transport as an enabler, connector and shaper of New Zealand’s cities, and opportunities for investment in rapid transit options (e.g., light rail and dedicated bus routes) to support transit-oriented development in major urban areas.

Other considerations at the national level include the emerging National Policy Statement on Versatile Land and High Class Soils and the Zero Carbon Bill, with the latter aiming to achieve net zero emissions in New Zealand by 2050.
Local and regional context

A range of plans, strategies and programmes have been developed, or are being developed, at the local and regional level that will influence how Greater Christchurch grows and changes in the future. It is important this Update aligns and integrates with these initiatives to support a cohesive approach to planning. Key considerations encompass transport plans, regeneration plans and strategies, health programmes, climate change and hazard management programmes, and other plans, strategies and programmes being delivered by councils and iwi in relation to growth management.

The implementation of some of the planning responses proposed in this Update will also require changes to resource management documents, including the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri. This will involve, at a minimum, the insertion of housing targets for each local authority.

Figure 6: National, regional and local context for the Settlement Pattern Update
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3. Our Growth Needs

Guidance produced by the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment to help councils meet the evidence and monitoring policies of the NPS-UDC acknowledges that the "future is inherently uncertain and impossible to accurately predict, especially over the long term". 9

3.1 Population and household growth

The risks associated with planning for an uncertain future can be managed by utilising the most up-to-date and robust population and household projections, and considering possible growth scenarios. In this way, Statistics NZ provides three possible projection scenarios: low, medium and high growth. As shown in Figure 7, the variances in these scenarios are relatively high for the territorial authorities in Greater Christchurch, partly due to the disruptions and associated uncertainties created by the Canterbury earthquake sequence in 2010 and 2011.

Statistics NZ’s projection scenarios were considered against historic trends and local circumstances to determine the most appropriate scenario to adopt for each territorial authority, and consequently for Greater Christchurch. These provide estimates of the demand for housing (and indirectly for business land) over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years).

![Population growth scenarios for Greater Christchurch](image)

To reflect the recent growth trends in Greater Christchurch, the Partnership agreed to adopt the medium projection for Christchurch City, and the medium-high projection for both Selwyn and Waimakariri, as the basis for the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment. This approach sought to balance a desire to be ‘ahead of the curve’ when planning for growth, with ensuring that the financing and provision of new infrastructure is timely to support future growth needs. It is possible, should local trends and circumstances change, that subsequent Capacity Assessments adopt different projection scenarios for Greater Christchurch.

9 National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, June 2017, p26
Based on the adopted scenario, the population in Greater Christchurch is projected to grow to about 640,000 by 2048, being 150,000 more residents than in 2018. As outlined in Table 1, this population growth translates to about 74,000 new households in Greater Christchurch by 2048, with 54% of this growth in Christchurch City, 28% in Selwyn and 18% in Waimakariri.

Although not specifically planned for as part of this Update, the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy suggests the need for net migration in the Canterbury region to be higher than historic rates to help sustain a strong regional economy. Should new policy settings be adopted by the Government in the effort to achieve more aspirational population growth either nationally or regionally, the Partnership would need to consider the implications of an even higher growth scenario as part of future updates and reviews of the UDS.

3.2 Housing

Demand

Based on the adopted growth scenario for Greater Christchurch, projected population and household growth will generate demand for about 74,000 new dwellings over the next 30 years. When the margins (or buffers) required by the NPS-UDC are added to this housing demand, the number of new dwellings that need to be planned for in Greater Christchurch increases to almost 87,000, as set out in Table 2. These margins provide flexibility to allow for situations when developments are not brought to the market, reducing extra development capacity is required to ensure future needs are met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Projected Housing Demand in Greater Christchurch, 2018 – 2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term (2018-2038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bracketed numbers include the additional planning margin required by NPS-UDC Policies P1 to P4. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100.

A comprehensive assessment of the future housing demand profile for Greater Christchurch was commissioned as part of the Capacity Assessment, and revealed common trends likely for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri over the next 30 years. Of significance are the projected increases in the elderly population and decreases in the average household sizes across Greater Christchurch, and the implications of these changes for the types of dwellings required to meet future needs.

While standalone homes on large sections will continue to make an important contribution towards meeting future housing demand, the shifting demographic and household profile in Greater Christchurch means a growing share of demand is expected to be met by smaller housing types, such as apartments and townhouses. Much of the growing demand for smaller housing types will be focused in the City and provided through the private rental market, while some demand for such housing types will also be evident in the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri by 2048.

Due to the close location of Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri, these local housing markets share a number of similarities, for example three to four bedroom dwellings make up about two thirds of the overall housing stock for each territorial authority. Although some demand for housing will be transferable between these local markets, this is not always the case given individuals and families make decisions on where they want to live based on their own needs and wants at the time of buying a house. Such factors include lifestyle, and proximity to amenities, education

---

[11] Margin include an additional 20% over the medium term and 15% over the long term as outlined in Policies P1 to P4 of the NPS-UDC.
[12] Livingstone Associates, Housing Demand in Greater Christchurch, November 2017
[13] Census 2013: Number of bedrooms for occupied private dwellings in Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri.
and employment. In the future, these factors are also likely to alter due to demographic changes, meaning the three housing markets will need to adapt to the changing profile of future housing demand.

Figure 8: Housing demand by Council area and housing type across Greater Christchurch

What key factors will influence our future and changing housing demand profile?

- **Increase in the share of households with aged 65 years +**: Projected to grow from currently 24% to 35% by 2048
- **Growth in single person households**: Number of households projected to increase by 50% by 2048
- **Smaller average household size**: Household sizes projected to decrease from 2.5 to 2.4 in the City, 2.9 to 2.6 in Selwyn and 2.6 to 2.4 in Waimakariri
- **Decrease in home ownership rates**: 73% of housing demand in the City will be met by private rentals, 33% in Selwyn and 30% in Waimakariri
- **Share of housing demand likely to be met by multi-unit dwellings**: 60% of housing demand in the City, 7% in Selwyn and 25% in Waimakariri
- **Share of all new households that will need housing under $350,000 to buy or $200/week to rent to be affordable**: 62% of new households in the City, 33% in Selwyn and 58% in Waimakariri

**Targets**

The NPS-UDC directs councils to set minimum targets for housing development capacity for both the medium and long term periods. These targets are informed by the projected demands for housing identified in the Capacity Assessment. Through this Update, Councils need to demonstrate how sufficient, feasible development capacity will be provided and serviced to accommodate the number of new dwellings planned for each territorial authority over these periods and set out how these targets will be met.

Having considered the most appropriate housing targets for Greater Christchurch, the Partnership believes that targets that simply duplicate the projected demands for each territorial authority would not take account of our unique post-earthquake circumstances, and over the longer term, may not align with the strategic goals of the UD5 to increasingly support growth by redeveloping and intensifying existing urban areas.
However, the development trends that currently characterise Greater Christchurch will also not change overnight, with the market and people’s preferences needing time to respond to the new opportunities being created by regeneration and place-making initiatives underway in the Central City, suburban centres and surrounding local neighbourhoods in Christchurch City.

The proposed targets for housing development capacity therefore represent a transitional approach that align with projected demands over the medium term, but allow for a greater share of new households in Greater Christchurch to be supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term. The regional targets for Greater Christchurch correspond to projected demand, it is only the territorial authority apportionment of these targets over the long term that represents a transitional approach.

In this context, the targets set out in Table 2 for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri represent the development capacity that each council will, over the medium term, zone and otherwise, seek to enable through their relevant planning processes and mechanisms (district plans, structure plans, outline development plans and infrastructure strategies) and over the long term, identify in relevant plans and strategies, to meet the demand for housing in Greater Christchurch over the medium and long term. A change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2019 will include a policy that will enable land required to meet an identified medium term capacity to be rezoned in district plans. Unless already enabled, additional development capacity required over the long term will only be shown on Map A of the Regional Policy Statement as a future Development Area, identified in relevant plans and strategies, and the development infrastructure required to service it will be identified in each council’s infrastructure strategy.

These targets will need to be revisited every 3 years following the completion of scheduled Capacity Assessments.

### Table 2: Targets for Housing Development Capacity in Greater Christchurch, 2018 - 2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medium Term (2018 - 2048)</th>
<th>Long Term (2020 - 2048)</th>
<th>Total 30 Year Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>13,900 (43%)</td>
<td>23,550 (77%)</td>
<td>55,850 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>6,600 (17%)</td>
<td>8,640 (15%)</td>
<td>17,240 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>6,100 (18%)</td>
<td>7,060 (13%)</td>
<td>13,340 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>26,600</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>85,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures included in the table represent number of dwellings. Graduated figures represent the share of dwellings for that period.

### Sufficiency

Collectively, the district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri already allow for a substantial number of new dwellings to be built in and around their urban areas. This development capacity is provided through greenfield housing areas (new subdivisions) and the redevelopment of existing housing areas. Some additional capacity also exists in rural locations surrounding the main towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri. Most of the capacity in Greater Christchurch is currently provided in the City, with only about 13% provided in Selwyn and 6% in Waimakariri.

The Capacity Assessment included extensive work to assess the commercial feasibility of housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch. This work highlighted that assessing feasibility can be extremely complex and that further work is required to better understand and then respond to the challenges of improving feasibility, especially in relation to the redevelopment market. Key areas for further investigation include understanding the influences on and

---

11. The longer term share of new households to be provided within Christchurch City reflects those outlined in the LDS 2007.
12. Table 2 will be inserted into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in Chapter 8 (Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch). Relevant local authority targets will also be inserted into the district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri.
13. Development infrastructure means network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater, and land transport as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003, to the extent that it is controlled by local authorities, and including New Zealand Transport Agency.
of land values, sales prices and build and land development costs, and how these factors could change over time to improve the relative feasibility of housing developments.

In this context, the feasibility tests undertaken as part of the Capacity Assessment produced a wide range of results for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri depending on the adopted set of assumptions and inputs. Further work to improve the modelling tools used for Capacity Assessment findings will occur as part of the next assessment in 2020 reported in this update is underway.

Based on the housing targets, the overall amount of feasible housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch is sufficient to meet demand over the medium term. However, there is insufficient development capacity in certain locations within Greater Christchurch in the medium term and overall when you consider the long term housing demand.

At the territorial authority level, given the range of reported feasibility, capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri may not be sufficient to meet demand over the medium term, while the significant capacity in the City is expected to be sufficient over the next 30 years, even with a higher share of growth anticipated to be City over the long term period (see Table 3).

These projected shortfalls in housing development capacity must be resolved to enable our urban areas to develop and change, and respond to the needs of both current and future generations. How the Partnership proceeds will be to respond to the projected capacity shortfalls in Greater Christchurch is addressed in Sections 5 and 6.

Table 3: Sufficiency of Housing Development Capacity in Greater Christchurch against Housing Targets, 2018 - 2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Development Capacity</th>
<th>Housing Target</th>
<th>Sufficiency of Housing Development Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Term (2018 - 2028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>59,960</td>
<td>55,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>9,725</td>
<td>17,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>13,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>73,875</td>
<td>86,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Capacity figures included in the table represent number of dwellings (numbers have been rounded to the nearest 1000). In the medium term, capacity for around 3,500 dwellings in Christchurch is constrained by the provision of necessary infrastructure.

Sufficiency of housing development capacity will be reviewed and published as further feasibility modelling and investigation is completed. These housing targets include the additional capacity margins required by the NPS-UDC as shown in Table 1.

* Alternatively, unadjusted scenarios documented in the Capacity Assessment, which are based on less favourable assumptions, developed development capacity for approximately 52,875 or 58,400 dwellings.

** These capacity figures are derived from a qualitative assessment of greenfield land only. An alternative modelled scenario, including existing zoned land and incorporating changes in prices and costs over time, identified development capacity for the long term of approximately 9,200 dwellings in Selwyn and 6,100 dwellings in Waimakariri.

*** These sufficiency figures have been adjusted to discount the demand over the medium and long term likely to be met through sets of development in rural zoned areas (averaging 70 dwellings/year for Selwyn and 20 dwellings/year for Waimakariri). Demand met through capacity in rural areas will be reviewed following the review of rural zoning as part of respective District Plan Reviews in Selwyn and Waimakariri.

Further and ongoing refinement of the feasibility tools will be undertaken by constituent partner councils and incorporated as part of the next capacity assessment due in 2020. This assessment will also benefit from more up-to-
3.3 Business

Demand

Significant business growth is projected in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years. This increase is driven predominantly by population and household growth and consequently the highest growth sectors are those providing retail goods (contributing 17% of employment growth), health/education (contributing 42% of growth) and services (19% of growth)\(^\text{20}\). Given the strong population growth driver, the structure and quantum of employment growth projected by the Capacity Assessment could be different if the population growth projected by Statistics NZ does not eventuate.

The tourism sector is also expected to contribute to a significant proportion of the growth over the period (accommodation contributing 16% of growth) whilst employment in the primary and industrial sectors is expected to remain relatively stable, contrasting with historic negative trends observed for these sectors.

In total, an additional 44,246,000 employment opportunities are projected by 2048, with most of these located within Christchurch City (44,000) and creating additional demands for land and fiberoptic.

Figure 9: Projected employment growth

\(^{20}\) Greater Christchurch Housing and Business Capacity Assessment (2018)
Sufficiency

The Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri district plans already make generous provision for meeting the long term needs for industrial land, and future commercial space is also mostly provided for, at least over the medium term.27 Over the longer term, the Capacity Assessment identifies potential shortfalls in commercial space, notably in areas projected to experience significant residential growth, including the Central City, the south-west and north-west parts of the City, and the main centres in Selwyn and Waimakariri.

The sufficiency of industrial and commercial development capacity to meet projected demand is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Sufficiency of Industrial and Commercial Development Capacity in Greater Christchurch, 2018 – 2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Sufficiency of Industrial Development Capacity</th>
<th>Sufficiency of Commercial Development Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>+ 89565</td>
<td>+ 289200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>+ 224205 to + 245270</td>
<td>+ 190 to + 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>- 400 to + 90110</td>
<td>+ 145 to + 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>+ 930 to + 1,010</td>
<td>+ 430 to + 505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures included in the table represent land in hectares (rounded to the nearest 5 hectares from the Capacity Assessment). Ranges reflect the uncertainty that additional demand for business land will be accommodated by under-utilised business land.

Commercial development capacity includes both commercial office land and commercial retail land.

Business land is inherently more flexible than housing land, with a wide range of business uses enabled on most business sites. As a consequence, the Capacity Assessment identified that most industrial and commercial zoned land in Greater Christchurch was commercially feasible for at least one type of business use. Given that longer term demands for business space can be affected by a wide range of factors, regular monitoring and review of uptake and other market indicators, as well as sensitivity testing of modelled assumptions, will be important to confirm actual levels of demand and ensure appropriate planning responses are made at the necessary times.

27 Reference to commercial space includes both commercial office space and commercial retail space.
4. Our Challenges

4.1 Key growth issues for Greater Christchurch

Aising from the context outlined in Section 2 and the evidence base from the Capacity Assessment summarised in Section 3, the Partnership recognises that there are some key issues that need to be considered as part of developing our proposed planning directions and responses. These key issues for Greater Christchurch are discussed below.

Delivering new dwellings through redevelopment and intensification

Delivering higher density housing is essential to supporting the needs and preferences of a growing share of the population, and for achieving the consolidated urban form that most effectively accommodates growth. Although the uptake of redevelopment opportunities in Greater Christchurch is not yet back to pre-earthquake levels, the scale of redevelopment has started to trend upwards and is getting close to the intensification targets set in the UDS and Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. To unlock further redevelopment opportunities, the new Christchurch District Plan has ‘up-zoned’ areas to allow for medium and high density housing redevelopments, and streamlined consenting approval processes. However, there are challenges to delivering redevelopment in Greater Christchurch requiring the development sector to be appropriately supported to help bring such developments to the market and ensure the rate of new dwellings delivered through intensification strengthens.

Meeting housing needs and preferences for current and future residents

In comparison to other New Zealand cities, the cost of housing in Greater Christchurch is relatively affordable, however the provision of social and affordable housing will become an increasingly critical issue. Enabling higher density housing developments at different price points will be vital to meeting the projected increase in demand for smaller, more affordable dwellings. District plan provisions play an important role in helping to deliver a broad range of housing types, while other targeted programmes by constituent partner councils aim to support the development sector in delivering higher density housing to the market. Public sector investment can also play a role in boosting the attraction of areas for such developments, especially in the Central City, key activity centres and district town centres.

Recognising post-earthquake trends and anticipating future drivers

Since the earthquakes in 2010 and 2011, the location and pace of housing and population growth have been different to that anticipated at the time the UDS was produced in 2007. The increasing uptake of redevelopment in Christchurch City during the 2000s has since slowed, while development of greenfield land enabled by the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) has been advanced rapidly. These trends partly reflect the unique situation in which a significant number of households had to be urgently reaccommodated following the earthquakes. A key challenge is therefore to understand whether the demands driving these trends will continue in the future or shift back to pre-earthquake trends, and whether any policy intervention will be required. This highlights the importance of both monitoring, to understand any key changes, and the role of planning and policy directions in this Update to enable the market to meet future demands.

Integrating land use and transport planning to shape desired urban form

Integrated land use and transport planning is a key principle that underpins the strategic direction for urban growth in Greater Christchurch. However, the key challenge of achieving sufficient and equitable infrastructure funding remains. In this context, the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has offered new opportunities for investing in our transport system, with the possible development of a local and central government agreement on transport’s role in the future development of Greater Christchurch signaled in the GPS. Discussions with the Government and infrastructure providers will be important in delivering the types of improvements to our transport network that will help enable our desired urban form. Aligning development with good access to a range of transport modes will reduce the reliance on private vehicles, and provide associated social, environmental and economic benefits for all people and communities.
Living with, and mitigating climate change impacts

The way we plan Greater Christchurch has a big impact on how we use and consume resources, including those that have an impact on climate change, and also how we respond to effects associated with climate change. Providing opportunities for modal shift to active forms of transport, increased uptake of public transport, reducing trip distances, and promoting new non-fuel burning transport technologies all minimise the impact the residents have in terms of their contribution to greenhouse gas emissions. How we enable carbon offsetting activities to work towards zero net carbon emissions also needs to be a consideration in our planning frameworks. Planning for development in the right places ensures that as a wider community, the adverse effects from the impacts of climate change can be appropriately avoided or mitigated, and potentially, lead to long-term resilience and security for food production. This includes making the right choices that take into account sea-level rise, as well as changing weather patterns and their contribution to severe weather events, including flooding and drought, so that future generations do not bear the cost of our decision-making.

Valuing the relationship between our urban areas and the environment

Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern principles from the UDS promote a sustainable urban form that protects our natural environment, rural character and versatile soils. They also align with the Ngai Tahu value of kaitiakitanga, and recognise the mauri of waterways and cultural landscapes. Where new greenfield development will be required to help meet our future needs, there are constraints as to where development can and should occur across Greater Christchurch. Coastal and flood hazards areas, groundwater aquifers, outstanding natural landscapes, versatile soils and airport noise contours all create limitations on where new development can be located. Figure 19 outlines some of these relevant constraints (some data layers are currently being refined as part of District Plan Reviews). Other constraints exist but some can and have been mitigated ahead of development occurring, such as ground improvements in areas with geological constraints or requiring raised floor levels in areas with lower flood risk. In this context, it is important to ensure that our plan for growth recognises that the quality of our urban areas is intrinsically linked to that of our environment, and that our urban areas need to be increasingly resilient to changes in our natural environment and better integrate natural systems within the urban landscape.

Fostering an equitable planning approach across our communities

Although the focus of this Update is to demonstrate sufficient development capacity for growth, the wider strategic goals of the UDS will not be realised without considering the needs of more disadvantaged areas and communities. One key element of Christchurch City Council and Regenerate Christchurch’s work programme is supporting regeneration in eastern Christchurch, with the post-earthquake movements of people and businesses westward heightening some pre-existing disparities. Targeted place-making investments by the public sector can give confidence to private sector housing redevelopment which typically favours more affluent neighbourhoods, driven by the more attractive returns from higher sales prices.

Underlying all these challenges will be how Greater Christchurch responds to known or potential shocks and stresses to the economy, society and our environment. For example, understanding, preparing, mitigating and adapting to climate change will be central and the Partnership’s Resilient Greater Christchurch plan. Furthermore, global financial fluctuations and the disruptive impact of new technology can fundamentally change growth projections, labour force requirements and how we function as a society. This Update is conscious of the role settlement planning can contribute to a more sustainable and resilient future but recognises that, to be effective, change needs to be a shared responsibility across all sectors and appropriately supported nationally and internationally.

---

21 The Resilient Greater Christchurch Plan sets out how Greater Christchurch can be stronger, smarter and more resilient to the physical, social and economic challenges that are growing part of the 21st century. It can be accessed at http://greaterchristchurch.org.nz/projects/resilient-greater-christchurch/
Figure 10: Example constraints on development across Greater Christchurch
4.2 Priorities for this Update

This Update focuses on those key strategic planning directions that need to be undertaken collaboratively through the Partnership to address the land use and infrastructure issues identified in the Capacity Assessment. It recognises that providing development capacity is not just about land supply so also considers other more detailed planning and policy actions that will need to be implemented to realise our broader growth aspirations.

The priority areas for the Update include:

- Achieving the desired urban form and principles of the UDS, and the coordinated planning and decision-making required under the NPS-UDC, and addressing:
  - Projected shortfalls of housing development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri;
  - Projected shortfalls of commercial development capacity across Greater Christchurch;
- Unlocking redevelopment opportunities across Greater Christchurch, but especially in the central city, key activity centres, district town centres and along core transport corridors;
- Ensuring that future housing provides a range of dwelling types to meet the changing demand profile in Greater Christchurch, including the projected higher demand for Wester, more affordable units, and the future demand of Ngāi Tahu whānau to establish kāinga nohoanga settlements on their ancestral land;
- Integrating land use and transport planning to ensure future urban growth is effectively and efficiently supported by the transport network, including delivering a significantly enhanced public transport system;
- Ensuring public and private investments support the desired pattern of urban growth.

Our proposed plan in response to these priorities for Greater Christchurch is described in Section 5, Our Plan. Further actions to be undertaken by constituent partners following this Update are set out in Section 6, Our Next Steps, recognising that although the long term is addressed in this Update, additional work is required to ensure our planning directions for the longer term are properly investigated and implemented, and effectively respond to emerging drivers of change for Greater Christchurch.
5. Our Plan

5.1 Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern

The Partnership’s proposal for supporting urban growth over the next 30 years is strongly guided by the vision and strategic goals from the UDS, and the extensive planning framework that has already been developed for Greater Christchurch to support long term growth. It focuses on responding to the priorities detailed in Section 4, Our Challenges, and seeks to provide greater certainty over the medium term (next 10 years) than the long term (10 to 30 years). This will allow the Partnership to further consider the most appropriate planning directions and responses to our longer term issues.

Our plan aims to maintain the UDS principle of consolidating urban development in and around Christchurch City, and the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri. It balances the strong demand for housing in towns outside the City with the anticipated return to stronger levels of demand for higher density housing in the City. To deliver new housing of the right type and location to meet demand, both now and in the future, it is important that a suitable range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities are provided to the market.

This takes into account the need to provide for efficient movement of people and goods, so that transport efficiency is optimised. This in turn will have an impact on Christchurch’s overall contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and the efficient use of energy resources. The impact of having a compact urban form increases the ability to contribute to the uptake of public transport opportunities, as well as reduced trip distances that enable active modes of transport. Choice also need to be made to ensure that development takes place in the right places, so that we contribute to intergenerational equity and ensure that our future generations inherit a city that functions efficiently and is resilient to future impacts from climate change and resource scarcity.

In this context, the Partnership proposes identifying that, by setting the housing targets shown in section 3.2, 65% of Greater Christchurch’s housing growth through to 2048 should be supported in Christchurch City, with the remaining 20% in Selwyn and 15% in Waimakariri.

This settlement pattern approach features a slightly lower share of growth in the City than envisaged by the UDS, with the higher share in the districts a reflection of the strong housing demand that has characterised these areas. Our plan seeks to ensure that sufficient housing capacity is provided in both Selwyn and Waimakariri to enable growth in district towns, while also transitioning to more growth being provided through redevelopment in the City over the longer term.

To implement this plan, the Partnership proposes considering that some new greenfield housing areas should be released, or otherwise identified in Rolleston, Rangiora and Ralipo to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls for Selwyn and Waimakariri over 100 medium to long term. The location of these greenfield areas would be consistent with the long term growth strategy from the UDS. Increasing take up of redevelopment opportunities will also be essential to achieve the housing targets for the City and realise the consolidated urban form aspirations for Greater Christchurch. Christchurch City Council is developing programmes to support redevelopment in the City, with the initial focus on the Central City.

Our plan for supporting business growth over the next 30 years is to focus on boosting the self-sufficiency of growing areas and respond to the needs of different commercial and industrial sectors.

While industrial space requirements are already well catered for in Greater Christchurch, new commercial space is required to support the needs of our growing population. The Partnership proposes will continue to focus commercial developments predominately in the Central City, reinforcing it as the principal commercial hub of the Canterbury region, while also supporting developments in key activity centres, town centres and neighbourhood centres as part of supporting thriving local communities. Opportunities to facilitate redevelopment of brownfield land will continue to be investigated.\(^{19}\)

\(^{19}\) Brownfield land refers to abandoned or underutilised business land with potential for redevelopment.
Underpinning this settlement pattern approach is the vision for a transformation of the transport network that fosters much greater public and active transport usage, and reduced reliance on the private vehicle.

Achieving this vision would require commitment from the Government to invest in the necessary improvements to our transport system, which could include investing in rapid transit services, recognising the key role of transport in shaping urban form and creating liveable urban areas.

How will the range of housing needs be met?

As well as providing for overall projected household growth this Update encourages a balance between new housing enabled through redevelopment opportunities within existing urban areas and development capacity, in greenfield locations in Christchurch, Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. The approximate breakdown between these different locations for the period 2018 to 2048 is shown in Figure 12.

How will we address housing affordability challenges?

Housing need relates to more than just ensuring our district plans provide sufficient development capacity. As outlined in Section 3, Our Aims, and Section 4, Our Challenges, an increasing number of households will face affordability pressures in either renting or owning their home.

Many of the potential initiatives to provide affordable housing choices across a housing continuum will need to be advanced outside of the land use focus of this Update. The Partnership is however committed to working collaboratively to develop an action plan and establish partnerships to enable social and affordable housing provision across Greater Christchurch.
Figure 13: Potential components of a social and affordable housing action plan for Greater Christchurch.
## What will urban growth look like in different areas of Greater Christchurch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central City</strong></td>
<td>Continued investment in the central city significantly advances its regeneration and renewal, and improves its attraction as a vibrant and thriving Central City area. Its vitality as the main commercial hub for Greater Christchurch and the Canterbury region is bolstered by the completion of anchor projects and public realm improvements. Older industrial areas located in and around the central city are available to transition to meet demand for retail and office space, while commercial areas are remodelled and used more efficiently to maximise floorspace. New residential developments that enable 20,000 people to live in the central city are facilitated by a comprehensive programme of support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Activity Centres</strong></td>
<td>New residential and commercial opportunities become available in and around the key activity centres in Papamoa, Shirley, Linwood, New Brighton, Belfast, Northwood, Riccarton, North-Hallwick, Spryton and Hornby, meeting the demands arising from the growing population. Brownfield sites are increasingly redeveloped to support new land uses linked to the surrounding neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburbs and Outer Urban Areas</strong></td>
<td>The wellbeing and resilience of communities in the eastern suburbs are greatly improved as a result of major regeneration projects, including the restoration, enhancement and development of the Ōnawe Avon River Corridor. New communities become established in the northern and southwestern parts of the City, especially in and around the Halawell area. Industrial developments are mainly taken up along core freight routes to Lyttelton Port, Christchurch Airport and the rest of the South Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rolleston and Lincoln</strong></td>
<td>Rolleston continues to grow as the principal centre in Selwyn, with a range of new developments supporting a vibrant town centre and the choice of housing broadening to reflect the changing demand profile of the growing town. Industrial and large format retail expand around the z-Zone Southern Business Hub, benefitting from improved connections across State Highway 7. Lincoln develops while retaining its village and university character, with opportunities emerging from new academic and business partnerships through the Lincoln Hub initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rangiora and Kaiapoi</strong></td>
<td>Rangiora remains the principal centre in Waimakariri, continuing its town centre rejuvenation and expanding mostly eastwards to support household growth. Greenfield developments are balanced with opportunities to redevelop some of the town’s older housing stock. New commercial space integrates with the existing town centre, while new industrial developments are focused in the Southbrook area. Mixed-use business areas identified through regeneration planning integrate with a growing town centre in Kaiapoi, with new housing supported by extending the town to the north. New housing and business developments in Ravenswood enable growth and better connections between Woodend and Pegesus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customary Maori Lands</strong></td>
<td>Kāinga nohoanga settlements on customary Māori land build stronger Ngāi Tahu networks and relationships, enabling more Ngāi Tahu whānau to live in more traditional housing arrangements, including clusters of housing with a range of housing types, linked to market, social and community facilities and locally appropriate customary employment activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Christchurch City

By 2048, over half a million people will call Christchurch City home, and the City will provide over 85% of the employment opportunities in Greater Christchurch. The Christchurch District Plan, supported by the Christchurch City Council’s Long Term Plan, provides substantial opportunities to redevelop and intensify existing urban areas to meet both housing and business needs. This includes in and around the Central City, key activity centres, larger neighbourhood centres and nodes located along core public transport corridors.

The Council is developing programmes to support investment and housing redevelopment, with the initial focus on the Central City. A Central City Action Plan is being developed, together with those who already live and do business in the Central City, to provide support over the next two to three years as anchor projects and major attractions are being completed and opened. Another priority action of the Council is the Central City Residential Programme which aims to increase the residential population of the Central City from 6,000 in 2018 to 10,000 in 2028. More people means more activity and more spending which will build confidence in Christchurch’s city centre. This in turn will stimulate new investment, attract residents and deliver on the city’s post-earthquake potential. The Programme is a long-term commitment to achieve six overall goals:

- More people - More people choose to live within the Central City;
- Housing choice - There is housing choice that meets the diverse needs of a wide range of households;
- Liveable neighbourhoods - Central City neighbourhoods are valued highly liveable by their residents;
- Encourage delivery - The risks of development are reduced, feasibility is improved;
- Support delivery - Effective support and advice is provided to and used by Central City housing developers;
- Accelerate delivery - Delivery of Central City housing is accelerated and sustained.

Priority actions have been identified for the first three years of the Programme. These actions will put in place the processes, tools and mechanisms to increase sustainable housing delivery for the full 10 years of the Programme, and identify the early, high-potential opportunities to increase housing delivery. The geographical focus for the Programme is the Central City, however it is expected that key programme learnings and initiatives will apply to other Key Activity Centres and along transport corridors targeted for medium density development. A focus of the Council will be working with developers and local community to support new development that is both commercially viable and of a quality to achieve high standards of livability.

The new greenfield areas zoned in the District Plan have been carefully chosen to avoid and protect areas of value, such as the Port Hills, the protection of our drinking water sources from unconfined aquifers, efficient operation of our airport (noise contours), preservation of productive rural land and avoidance of risk from natural hazards.

A further focus of the Council will be to advance appropriate elements of the social and affordable housing action plan outlined in Section 5.1, through partnership with central government, housing developers and community housing providers.

There will also be growth in employment opportunities. Over the next 30 years the central city will gain an additional 40,000 jobs, resulting in over 75,000 people working in the central city, many more than pre-quake. Employment is concentrated in select number of areas – existing industrial and commercially zoned land and expansion of existing centres in the long term if required[2]. Surplus industrial land is available to transition to commercial uses, particularly if needed to support central city growth.

Half of all the jobs in Christchurch are and will likely continue to be located in the corridor between the Central City and Hornby, and nearby suburbs, including Sydenham, Addington, Riccarton, Ilam, Sockburn, and Wigram. Providing rapid transit (busways or light rail) along this corridor will make it easier for people to reach these employment opportunities and also catalyse housing development, so more people can have the opportunity to live closer to where they work. The Northern Corridor (between the Central City and Belfast via Papanui) is another opportunity where the provision of rapid transit could stimulate redevelopment. Over time other corridors such as the airport, to Linwood and Cashmere could be considered for rapid transit to stimulate redevelopment. Outside these corridors

[2] The significant commercial shortfall identified by the capacity assessment for the long term, will be further sensitively tested in the next capacity assessment.
commercial activity will continue to be located within the existing network of commercial centres particularly key activity centres11.

Figure 14: Christchurch Spatial Plan

Christchurch City is the principal centre of Greater Christchurch and contains most of the population, but the surrounding districts have also been growing quickly. Less than half of the residents of the surrounding districts work within the districts, resulting in significant commuter flows from the surrounding districts into Christchurch City. Over 100,000 vehicle trips are each day travel between the districts and the City, putting pressure on the City’s transport network.

As our region grows this will increase the delays on the transport network. Encouraging more of the growth to occur in Christchurch City, where the employment opportunities are, will be vital to manage the effects of growth and reduce transport network pressures. The city will work to reduce the number of vehicles that travel into the city, particularly single occupancy vehicles, but improve transport options such as active and public transport, to enable people to move around the city easily. Improvements to public transport services and infrastructure, along with associated demand management and road pricing are being considered as part of transport planning and development of business cases.

11 Riccarton, Hornby, Northlands/Papanui, Linwood/Beddgelert, North Heathcote, Belfast/Northwood, New Brighton and Barrington/Spreydon.
5.3 Selwyn and Waimakariri towns

The current district plans for Selwyn and Waimakariri provide for greenfield housing areas in alignment with the settlement pattern outlined for Greater Christchurch in Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).\(^2\)

This map was inserted into the CRPS following the adoption of the Land Use Recovery Plan and covers the post-earthquake recovery period through to 2028.

The Partnership has previously considered the longer term growth needs of Greater Christchurch through to 2041, with the extent of planned greenfield areas around Christchurch City and the main towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri to support future housing growth delineated by the Projected Infrastructure Boundary on Map A.

Given the projected shortfalls in housing development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri to meet their future needs, a change to the CRPS is proposed to allow Chapter 6 and Map A the flexibility to respond to identified medium term capacity needs. Additional capacity will be directed in the first instance to the key towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi in support of the public transport enhancement opportunities mentioned elsewhere in this Update. This is likely to identify future development areas in the two districts that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary. Such a change would be prepared subsequent to this Update and would likely be notified in 2019. These new areas will provide much of the capacity required over both the medium and long term. A 2019 change to the CRPS would ensure that land can be reserved to meet medium term capacity needs, and the longer term will be further considered as part of a comprehensive review of the CRPS scheduled for 2023. While it is intended Our Space provides direction to inform future Resource Management Act processes, Figure 16 is indicative only.

To most efficiently utilise land within identified future development areas, consideration will also be given to appropriate residential densities. An evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum densities specified in the CRPS for each territorial authority including a review of what has been achieved to date, constraints and issues associated with achieving these minimum densities, and whether any changes to minimum densities is likely to be desirable and achievable across future development areas will be undertaken in 2019.

\(^2\) Additional housing development in Rolleston has already been enabled through two Special Housing Areas.

\(^3\) The Partnership is investigating whether to request, using the new streamlined planning provision in the Resource Management Act 1991 to make this targeted change to the Regional Policy Statement.
The tables below show the density scenarios and anticipated yields from future development areas should density be managed differently in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts.

Table 5: Selwyn: Long term shortfall: 5,475

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical additional capacity enabled in existing urban areas*</th>
<th>Density 10 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 12 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 15 hh/ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>7,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>7,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>8,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>8,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>9,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Waimakariri: Long term shortfall: 7,675

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical additional capacity enabled in existing urban areas*</th>
<th>Density 10 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 12 hh/ha</th>
<th>Density 15 hh/ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>7,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>8,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Subject to enabling this additional capacity via the District Plan Review and using other mechanisms outside of the District Plan to encourage infill intensification development. Whilst more theoretical capacity may be enabled through District Plan Reviews, robustly calculating feasibility is also limited by a lack of comparable development that provides data (e.g., house sales) within zoned areas.

* This is derived from a 25% to no* hectare and does not take into account infrastructure requirements and structure planning that may reduce the developable area and total dwelling count.

In the meantime, it is expected that new urban housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn will achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare where any Future Development Area is subsequently zoned. For this purpose, net density has the same meaning as set out in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. This will also provide strong guidance for the development of District Plans for both Waimakariri and Selwyn districts.

The housing demand figures in Table 1 captures some additional growth from rural areas. This is from area units that are either part rural or all rural zone being included in the demand figures. However, most of this rural future demand will continue to be met by rural developments in rural zones with some moving to urban areas.

Selwyn District and Waimakariri District are undertaking reviews of their respective District Plans. Both reviews will also assess additional provisions to encourage and enable redevelopment within existing urban areas and close to town centres. This is in response to the projected changes in housing demand over the next thirty years, and the role that redevelopment plays to deliver smaller, more affordable housing types that will increasingly be needed to meet future demand. Until these reviews are complete, an understanding of whether any remaining development capacity shortfalls remain is uncertain and can be better understood as part of future capacity assessments in 2020 and every three years thereafter.  

---

22 This expectation is that a minimum density of at least 12 households per hectare will be achieved.
23 Some potential yields from different development scenarios were investigated as part of the options assessment outlined in Section 5.7.
For Selwyn, this Update supports the purpose and direction of Selwyn 2031 by promoting a sustainable, consolidated centres-based urban growth pattern that supports the changing population and their housing needs. This, in turn, allows for greater public transport usage. The District Plan Review is supporting this by not actively seeking to rezone additional land for living or business outside of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary. This Update will help provide a further evidence base for updates to Selwyn 2031 and other strategic documents to accommodate long-term growth through high quality urban environments. Any potential additional provision of business and housing land within the Greater Christchurch area in Selwyn will be strongly guided by this evidence and the current structure plans and town centre studies, ongoing market indicator monitoring and the evolution of the policy framework through the district plan review process.

For Waimakariri, the Council is at the early stages of planning to develop Structure Plans for east and west Rangiora and east Kaiapoi to identify how best to respond to the residential shortfall in capacity for the medium to long term. This is along with considering the long term capacity requirements of Raverwood, Peregian and Woodend, outlined in Waimakariri 2048: District Development Strategy.

The Council is also focusing on adopting the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan and updating the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy to continue to improve the self-sufficiency of these townships. Once these planning documents have been completed, additional zoning requirements to meet capacity shortfalls in both residential and commercial will be considered as part of the District Plan Review. This will be supported by monitoring ongoing market indicators and detailed commercial assessments.

Figure 15: Proposed Future Development Areas in Rolleston, Kaiapoi and Rangiora

Commented [MLPC14]: Rolleston map updated in response to #28.
Figure 16: Proposed locations of future development areas in Greater Christchurch. While it is intended Our Space provides some direction to inform future RMA processes, Figure 16 is indicative only.
5.4 Land for cultural purposes

Important for mana whenua is the future ability to establish kāinga nohoanga settlements on their ancestral land. The concept of kāinga nohoanga embodies the following types of residential activities:

- Provision for whānau where extended families can live in close proximity to one another and build strong networks and relationships;
- Allowance for the construction of a mixture of housing types and densities;
- Provision for dwellings to be located in close proximity to traditional structures, such as marae, and the enablement of customary activities.

Kāinga nohoanga is not only about creating housing opportunities on tribal land. It is also about providing the commercial, social and community facilities and opportunities that allow Ngāi Tahu whānau to fully occupy and use ancestral land, recognising and enabling the principles for which the land was originally set aside.

Historically, there have been many barriers to the development of Māori customary land, including rural zoning (thereby preventing more intensive residential developments) and the lack of provision of services.
Substantial changes were made to the Waimakariri District Plan following the statutory directions included in the Land Use Recovery Plan. Further work between mana whenua and local authorities is creating a more permissive environment for the creation of kāinga nohoanga, although much work remains to be done.

Additional challenges facing the development by mana whenua of their ancestral land are the issues of climate change and sea level rise. It is likely over coming years that some Māori customary land will be more difficult to service with some areas becoming inundated, rendering them unusable for customary purposes. In these circumstances, it will be necessary for new land to be acquired and classified as Māori land under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.

Recently, significant progress has been made in both the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, the Christchurch District Plan and the review of the Selwyn District Plan towards creating a planning framework that is better equipped to enable kāinga nohoanga to be developed on Māori customary land, providing any adverse effects are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated (particularly those effects that have the potential to emanate beyond the boundary of the kāinga nohoanga development/zone).

At present, there are only two parcels of land within the existing greater Christchurch urban area that are classified as Māori customary land (in accordance with the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993); namely, M8093 at Ōtahuhu and M8875 at Rapaki. In the future, however, it is possible that new areas within the Greater Christchurch urban area may be classified as Māori customary land, provided such land has been appropriately designated as such under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.

While it is not anticipated that future kāinga nohoanga developments would be a major contributor to the overall housing capacity within Greater Christchurch, they are nonetheless viewed by Ngāi Tahu whānui as playing an important future role in enabling mana whenua to live, work and play on their ancestral land in a manner that is consistent with the purposes for which such land was originally set aside pursuant to Kemp’s Deed of 1848.

It is anticipated that an integrated and collaborative approach between district councils and Ngāi Tahu whānui would be taken to any necessary upgrades of infrastructure that are deemed necessary to service future kāinga nohoanga developments, including reticulated sewerage, wastewater disposal and the supply of drinking water.

5.5 Sequencing and staging of growth

At a local level the Capacity Assessment outlined which areas signaled for growth are already supported by trunk infrastructure. This primarily relates to wastewater networks. Infrastructure strategies associated with the recent completed 2018–2028 Long Term Plan have documented the planned infrastructure works scheduled to be completed over the medium and long term to unlock remaining growth areas. These integrate and align with structure plans for main towns covering the development phasing associated with the efficient roll-out of infrastructure.

At a Greater Christchurch level sequencing is important to align with cross-boundary investments, especially those relating to the transport network. Collaborative planning undertaken when developing infrastructure strategies and regional land transport plans will be the mechanism to address and resolve any potential misalignment.

Future growth areas identified in Figure 15 and 16 will require more detailed planning, technical assessments and consultation with landowners to determine more specific staging of development. Existing policies in Chapter 6 of the CRPS already provide clear direction which these detailed planning processes must give effect to, particularly Policies 6.3.3 to 6.3.7. They ensure the staging of development considers how to support good urban design, align with infrastructure needs and integrate with existing urban areas. Associated policy wording is proposed to complement a change to the CRPS Map A. This will enable District Plan reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to, over the medium term, zone and otherwise enable development capacity in accordance with meeting the medium term housing targets incorporated in the CRPS. Reviews of targets and the sufficiency of development capacity are part of periodic capacity assessments and enable the CRPS and district plans to remain responsive to demonstrated needs and consider areas for future growth necessary for the intended life of such plans but include principles or triggers to establish a robust case for rezoning additional land.

[2] Outlined in Section 4.2 and 8.3 of the Capacity Assessment and further detailed in supporting technical reports.
All greenfield growth areas within Christchurch City are already zoned. Redevelopment is largely not constrained by infrastructure so the location and timing of development will be principally governed by the market.

The role of the City Council and other influencers is therefore to encourage and support the market to respond to opportunities most likely to support Central City and suburban centre growth and increase the scale and range of housing available close to key public transport routes.
5.6 Transport and other infrastructure

Integrated land use and transport planning

Over the next 30 years, Greater Christchurch is projected to see significant population growth, meaning more people will be making more trips across the transport network. If traffic volumes increase at the same rate as the population, there will be more congestion and longer journey times. Further major investment in the road network is not scheduled. For Greater Christchurch to remain productive, the integration of land use and transport planning is therefore essential to managing our future urban growth.

Transport infrastructure, services and mode choices are important for enabling and supporting population and housing growth in new and existing urban areas, while the location of growth affects how well the transport system performs. Given transport and land use are so strongly connected, all decisions need to consider their impact on the other.

In this context, the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has provided new opportunities for how we can plan for growth as it represents a fundamental shift in the strategic direction for transport in New Zealand. It seeks to transition to a more holistic, mode-neutral approach to transport investment, with an increased focus on achieving a range of social and environmental outcomes. It also places more emphasis on the crucial role of transport in shaping urban form, creating livable cities and reducing the need to travel by private vehicle.

It will be important to ensure that transport is integrated with land use but also that all the components of the network are joined in a way that makes it easier to make choices on how to travel. Greater Christchurch already has a well-integrated network that has very high accessibility. This means that for a majority of areas there is a choice of options for walking, cycling, public transport or using a private car, with strong integration between these different modes of travel.

Recent investments in the cycleway network have provided more opportunities to encourage safer cycling trips around Christchurch City and between centres, while technological advances, such as electric bikes, will mean that this mode will become increasingly accessible as a means of travel.

However, with significant population growth within the City and in the surrounding districts, the current freedom and independence we enjoy in travelling around will in future become more difficult unless there is a significant shift in how we think about and approach transport.

Transport business cases under way will consider the multi-modal transport programme that will address such matters. These include specific investigations to determine the appropriate investment required to support an enhanced public transport system and improvements along key transport corridors, including those that are part of the strategic transport network and support freight movements. The development of a business case for how the vision for an enhanced public transport system could be achieved is a key element of a wider multi-modal transport programme being considered for Greater Christchurch. This programme would be developed on the basis of the strategic directions from the UDS, and would contribute to the strategic goals related to an integrated and managed urban development.
In particular, it would help create a more efficient, reliable, safe and resilient transport system that promotes the use of active and public transport, and improves accessibility for all people in Greater Christchurch. Integrating land use and transport is particularly important for rapid transit and supporting an efficient public transport network. Each can have a positive influence on the others by improving the accessibility of an area and supporting growth and housing density around rapid transit corridors and stations. This is essential to maximise the benefits from the large investment required to build and operate rapid transit.

**Future of public transport**

The strategic priorities underpinning the GPS align with the work being undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee to deliver a step change in Greater Christchurch’s public transport, as described in the Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP). The RPTP contains an ambitious vision to fully integrate the public transport system with the wider transport system and urban form, thereby increasing mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch.

**Vision for Greater Christchurch’s public transport system**

Public transport is innovative and successful and sits at the heart of a transport network that supports a thriving, liveable Greater Christchurch. The public transport system is accessible and convenient, with high-quality, zero-emission vehicles and facilities. The system gets people where they want to go – as a result it is well used and valued by the people of Greater Christchurch.

As part of achieving this vision by 2048, the RPTP envisions two rapid transit corridors that will offer high-speed public transport services to the north and south-west of Christchurch City, significantly enhancing links with the growing towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. By investing in rapid transit services (such as light rail, rapid bus ways or automated trackless trams) and encouraging higher density development along high demand corridors, more people will be able to access jobs, services, recreation and education without necessarily having to rely on a private vehicle. Ensuring public transport is increasingly usable for all people has major social, environmental and economic benefits.

The improvements outlined in the RPTP include service enhancements across the network, infrastructure improvements on key routes, on-demand services (such as demand responsive transport, bike sharing, ride sharing and car sharing) and being well equipped to adopt new opportunities arising in information technology, intelligent transport systems, zero-emission vehicles and autonomous vehicles.

Realising this vision for our public transport system will require an increase in investment. The Government has signalled through the GPS that the overall level of capital investment available for public transport will be greater, reflecting the strategic focus of shifting trips in New Zealand’s cities from private vehicles to more efficient, low cost modes of transport.
Further conversations with the Government will explore how additional funding could help us to achieve our vision for public transport more quickly, supporting our aspirations for a consolidated urban form and multimodal journeys.

Freight transport

Greater Christchurch is also a major freight hub for Canterbury and the South Island, with two inland ports, the Port of Lyttelton and Christchurch International Airport, acting as major gateways for produce and people. The strategic road and rail networks in Greater Christchurch also play a significant role in the distribution of freight within the sub-region, as well as to neighbouring regions and the rest of New Zealand.

An important part of managing the transport network is to ensure that freight can be moved efficiently to and through Greater Christchurch and this will require effective management of congestion on the main freight routes. It is crucial that the strategic infrastructure and networks across Greater Christchurch are able to meet future demand and are protected from any adverse effects of growth. This is a key aspect of the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) and transport business cases to support future transport investments.

Future programme and investment

While the Partnership is working towards improving transport choice, more work is needed to get people thinking about how they travel differently, whether it be by public transport, walking, cycling or as a passenger in a private car.

Such a transport programme would include:

- Improved public transport network and services including mass transit corridors;
- Development of walking and cycling networks;
- Travel demand management initiatives;
- Completion of funded strategic road network improvements, including the Northern Corridor and Southern Motorway;
- Embracing new technology changes

How to improve integrated land use and transport planning was a key deliberation when deciding how future urban development should be accommodated in Greater Christchurch. Part of the rationale for the proposed locations for growth was therefore to ensure future growth is appropriately aligned with long term transport planning and investment, meaning more people will be living in areas that are accessible to a mix of transport modes.

The existing and future Christchurch transport network is shown in Figure 18. Investment in this future will be considerable (approximately $1.5 billion capital and additional annual operating costs) over the next 30 years and needs to be well aligned to support freighted use. It will require collaboration and investment by the Greater Christchurch Partnership and Central Government as well as the community to achieve this outcome.

Reduced reliance on private vehicles as a result of increased land use and transport integration will have associated congestion, safety, access, environmental and cost benefits for people and communities across Greater Christchurch.
Figure 10: Greater Christchurch transport network – existing, planned or proposed routes and modes
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Routes for proposed rapid transit, other public transport services and cycling are all indicative unless already adopted in relevant Council plans.
Future of public transport
The strategic priorities underpinning the GPS align with the work being undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee to deliver a step change in Greater Christchurch’s public transport, as described in the draft Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP). The draft RPTP proposes a vision to fully integrate the public transport system with the wider transport system and urban form, thereby increasing mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch.

**Vision for Greater Christchurch’s public transport system**

Public transport is innovative and successful and sits at the heart of a transport network that supports a thriving, liveable Greater Christchurch. The public transport system is accessible and convenient, with high quality, zero emission vehicles and facilities. The system gets people where they want to go—as a result it is well used and valued by the people of Greater Christchurch.

As part of achieving this vision by 2048, the draft RPTP envisions two rapid transit corridors that will offer high-speed public transport services to the north and south-west of Christchurch City, significantly enhancing links with the growing towns of Rangiora, Rangitata and Kaiapoi. By investing in rapid transit services (such as light rail, rapid bus ways or automated trackless trains) and encouraging higher density development along high demand corridors, more people will be able to access jobs, services, recreation and education without necessarily having to rely on a private vehicle. Ensuring public transport is increasingly viable for all people has major social, environmental and economic benefits.

The improvements proposed outlined in the draft RPTP include service enhancements across the network, infrastructure improvements on key routes, on-demand services (such as on-demand responsive transport, bike-sharing, ride-sharing and car sharing) and being well equipped to adopt new opportunities arising in information technology, intelligent transport systems, zero-emission vehicles and autonomous vehicles.

Realising this vision for our public transport system will require an increase in investment. The Government has signalled through the GPS that the overall level of capital investment available for public transport will be greater, reflecting the strategic focus of shifting trips in New Zealand away from private vehicles to more efficient, low-cost modes of transport.

Further conversations with the Government will explore how additional funding could help us to achieve our vision for public transport—more quickly supporting our aspirations for a consolidated urban form and multi-modal journeys.

**Other development infrastructure**

Infrastructure networks required to enable new development principally relate to transport and the three waters: water supply, wastewater and stormwater. Based on extensive strategic planning undertaken through the Partnership over the last decade to identify future locations for housing and business growth, the constituent partner councils have been able to plan for and invest in the infrastructure needed to support development in these areas. This means most areas proposed in this Update for future development are already sufficiently serviced to be considered ‘shovel ready’.

Most of the areas not currently serviced with sufficient infrastructure network capacity will be following the completion of planned upgrades. This includes in parts of the northern, south-western and eastern areas of Christchurch City. These capacity constraints are addressed in Christchurch City Council’s Long Term Plan and will be resolved by 2028.

Council’s infrastructure strategies outline how sufficient infrastructure network capacity will be provided for to ensure future growth is effectively and efficiently accommodated. Although Christchurch City Council’s Infrastructure Strategy is based on a lower projected growth for the next 30 years than is considered in this Update, the Council has processes, plans and initiatives that can appropriately manage infrastructure capacity requirements to ensure that the housing growth targets proposed in this Update are met. More detailed infrastructure modelling of areas proposed for commercial redevelopment will follow once specific locations are identified.

---

20. The draft Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan was released for public consultation in September 2018.

21. Some industrial zoned land in Christchurch City is not proposed to be serviced.
In the same way, the Selwyn Infrastructure Strategy also uses a lower projected growth for the next 30 years than is considered in this Update. However, all zoned land as well as land within the Proposed Infrastructure Boundary and Special Housing Areas have been factored into the strategy. Further, any additional up-zoning or greenfield capacity to cater for projected growth, will need to be factored into the infrastructure works programme once the next phase of strategic planning has been undertaken.

Discussions with other infrastructure providers indicate that the availability of such infrastructure as electricity and telecommunications is either available or will be available to service all housing and business growth needs in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years. The provision of social and community facilities, including schools, healthcare and community halls, have also been well planned for as part of the post-earthquake recovery planning for Greater Christchurch, and are therefore not considered to represent a constraint on future development. Existing planning provisions in the CDPs and district plans ensure growth does not compromise the efficient operation of strategic infrastructure.

It will be important that constituent partner councils continue to engage with infrastructure providers to ensure growth is effectively and efficiently supported over the next 30 years by delivery of necessary infrastructure.
5.7 Why is this our proposed approach?

Aligning with the strategic growth directions from the UDS

This Update furthers the achievement of economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing outcomes outlined in the UDS and summarised in Section 2.3. It sets out a settlement pattern and a consolidation approach to urban development that is more sustainable than might result from a more laissez-faire scenario. It responds to anticipated changes in demand while supporting wider programmes of action to address challenges, such as climate change, that require solutions beyond just urban planning.

The locations for growth outlined in Section 5, Our Plan and the housing targets (detailed in Section 3.2) reflect a balanced approach to achieving the consolidated growth directions of the UDS while responding to current and projected market demands. The proposed settlement pattern supports a key aim of the UDS to create a vibrant and thriving Central City.

It fosters an increasing Central City population and enables the Central City and surrounding business land to transition over time to provide for increased office and retail floorspace, maximising the existing public and private investments made throughout a period of recovery.

This approach meets the requirements of the NPS-UDC, being informed by the Capacity Assessment and having had particular regard to NPS-UDC Policy PA1, but has also been guided by the UDS, CRPS, District Plans and the Long Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategies required under the LGA. The Partnership is conscious of the need to balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development. Ongoing requirements in the NPS-UDC for evidence and monitoring to support planning decisions will enable periodic review and consider any required amendments to this approach.

Consolidated growth enables towns and centres to more easily provide the local facilities and services that communities need and maximises the efficiency of key transport routes and other infrastructure services. Supporting the growth and vitality of key activity centres is enshrined in the UDS and the CRPS Chapter 6 gives strong policy direction to territorial authority plans. Figure 19 encapsulates this concept and outlines the types of services, amenities and factors that councils and other agencies can provide for in these areas.

The proposed settlement pattern enables around two-thirds of new households to be accommodated within the Christchurch City area and allows for the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to continue to grow.

Figure 19: Concept of a 10-minute neighbourhood for key centres
This provides a good level of housing choice across Greater Christchurch and recognises that within a single housing market there are many and varied reasons for where and how people choose to live.

Taken together, new subdivisions in greenfield locations across all three council areas will account for around 55% of the identified housing capacity. ‘Intensification’, being development in existing urban areas through infill and redevelopment, is expected to provide for the remaining 45%, primarily in Christchurch City but not exclusively. This broadly corresponds with intensification targets already outlined in the CRPS and Christchurch District Plan.

As outlined in Section 3, Our Growth Needs, much of this housing capacity is already provided for in District Plans. The proposed responses outlined in this document centre on the remaining housing shortfalls shown in Table 3 (around 144,500 dwellings) for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to meet housing targets being considered in context with wider strategic planning.

Directing future housing growth to development capacity already signalled by the Projected Infrastructure Boundary in Map A of the CRPS represents the most efficient and effective option for accommodating these shortfalls. For some time now the Councils have factored these areas into respective 30 year infrastructure strategies associated with Long Term Plans. These plans have already benefited from extensive community input, as did the earlier UD5 engagement and subsequent resource management and recovery consultation processes that led to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Further more detailed assessment of these future growth areas will be required, and undertaken as part of district plan reviews, and can address any new requirements relating to managing risks of natural hazards and mitigating impacts on versatile soils.

Reflecting changing housing needs

As outlined in Sections 2, 3 and 4 demographic change will mean an increasing percentage of our population will be over 65 and average household size will continue to decline. The cost of housing, both home ownership and renting, will continue to represent a significant component of household expenditure.

New households will have different housing preferences and affordability constraints, but to better align the total housing stock across Greater Christchurch with the overall household composition, new development would need to favour smaller and more affordable housing types.

Smaller and multi-unit dwellings that take advantage of more efficient building construction techniques and adopt new home ownership and rental models can aid the provision of more affordable homes. Housing should meet the needs of our population at all stages of life. Locating new development closer to the provision of local facilities and community services can also improve access to the health needs of a ageing population population that is both ageing and has increasing long term conditions and disabilities, and reduce the transport costs associated with overall household expenditure.

Increasingly more households are also beginning to take advantage new technology and on demand services to enable a more inner-city lifestyle, close to the social and cultural amenities offered in and around the centre of Christchurch. The implementation of the 2013 Central City Housing Programme will determine the scale of demand in this market segment and the role public agencies and private sector developers can play to provide for this housing type.

These trends have therefore informed the transitional approach adopted when setting housing targets in Table 2.

Supporting future public transport investment

The future investment in our public transport system highlighted in Section 5.6 will influence and be influenced by how our City and surrounding towns accommodate future growth. For such investment to be sustainable it needs to foster significant increases in public transport patronage.

A settlement pattern approach that encourages greater urban densities, particularly along key public transport corridors provides the greatest opportunity for people to live in close proximity to proposed new rapid transit routes, increasing the likelihood and attractiveness for people to adopt these transport modes.
What about other options?

In arriving at the proposed settlement pattern, three alternative options were investigated.

One option investigated providing for growth based directly on the population and household projections derived from Statistics NZ data (Option A). Another option considered a scenario whereby a greater proportion of additional household growth was directed to the Christchurch City area over the next 10 years, anticipating a more rapid return to the levels of redevelopment in the City experienced prior to the earthquakes (Option B).

Compared to the option proposed in this Update (Option C), Option A would require increased capacity to be provided in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts for the period 2028-2048, totalling nearly 10,000 additional dwellings.

Compared to our proposed plan (Option C), Option B would reduce the housing provision necessary to be identified in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the next 10 years by around 5,500 dwellings (resulting in a total of 15,000 dwellings less than Option A over the 30 year period), relying on the range of housing options available in Christchurch City to meet housing demand not able to be accommodated in the plan bags of the Districts.

Aside from further mitigating many of the local effects identified for Option A, assessment of Option B focused on the significant departure from current market housing conditions.

Option B would require average annual building consents for additional dwellings to be 1750/y for Christchurch City with an increasing proportion met through redevelopment. While consents for new housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts appear to have softened over the last year (partly due to a general decrease in the level of building consents across Greater Christchurch during 2018), in Selwyn they are still tracking closer to the high growth rate.

Further explanation and assessment of these options, and the reasons why Option C was considered the preferred option, is covered in a supporting separate options assessment document.
6. Our Next Steps

6.1 Responsive planning

With many of the primary drivers and influencers of urban development in Greater Christchurch being in a state of change, a responsive approach to planning is necessary to ensure that future opportunities to shape our urban areas and achieve our desired outcomes are realised. This will require monitoring and evaluation, and continued relationship building and commitment to this partnership. Key drivers of change at the local, national and global level include:

- Shifting post-earthquake trends in the residential, commercial and industrial markets, as well as the development sector, as the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch continues to mature;
- Emerging Government policy in relation to urban growth and development, transport, regional economic growth, and local government funding and financing, which will provide new opportunities for our approach to planning;
- Changing population and household profiles, and composition of the local economy, which will influence the type of housing and employment that is required in the future to meet the needs and preferences of residents;
- Evolving technologies (such as mass automation, digital workspaces) and their increasing adoption, which will influence how our urban areas function, especially in terms of how people work and travel (such as autonomous vehicles);
- Delivering large-scale regeneration projects that will significantly affect surrounding local areas and communities, and Greater Christchurch overall, including for the Orbost Avon River Corridor, Kaapoo area and Central City;
- Growing need to manage and adapt to the natural hazard risk facing our coastal communities given the anticipated sea level rise, and related coastal inundation and groundwater level effects, over the next 30 years and beyond.

Given these drivers of change, this Update has been prepared to provide greater certainty over the medium term in regard to how development capacity issues will be addressed (Section 6, Our Challenges) and more flexibility over the long term to enable the Partnership to consider the most appropriate planning directions and responses.

Following the adoption of their response to this Update, the Regional Council and District Councils will insert the relevant housing targets directly into their respective plans, in accordance with NPS-UDC Policies PCS to PC11.

Figure 20: Scheduled implementation and review process 2019-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPS on Urban Development Capacity</td>
<td>Adopt the Sentinel update</td>
<td>Further plan and implementation of the update</td>
<td>Complete scheduled-Capacity Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Regional Policy Statement</td>
<td>Propose change to address housing capacity issues in Selwyn and Waimakariri</td>
<td>Review the minimum targets for housing (if necessary)</td>
<td>Notify the proposed Selwyn District Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Plans</td>
<td>Notify the proposed Selwyn District Plan</td>
<td>Selwyn District Plan decisions issued</td>
<td>Waimakariri District Plan decisions issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Plans and transport plans</td>
<td>Prepare Long Term Plans and implementation</td>
<td>Review RTP and BTPF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 Further work and implementation

The Partnership is committed to undertaking further work to assess, consider and address some of the priority growth issues for Greater Christchurch. These actions include workstreams already planned by constituent partners and those that are now proposed to respond to the priorities identified in this Update. The aim of this future work is to ensure our long term planning directions for Greater Christchurch are appropriately investigated and implemented.

The key actions from this Update have been grouped under three broad themes:

- Strengthen our partnership approach;
- Improve our tools and evidence base;
- Build on our planned direction for growth.

Many of the actions that will be undertaken to implement this Update are linked to pre-arranged planning processes, in that they will be undertaken as part of these processes or help inform them. Such processes include the district plan reviews underway for Selwyn and Waimakariri; the full review of the CRPS is scheduled for notification in 2021, and the statutory requirement from the NPS-UDC for another Capacity Assessment to be prepared in 2020.

### Schedule of future work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Partners</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>STRENGTHEN OUR PARTNERSHIP APPROACH</strong>&lt;br&gt;Work with the Government to further explore opportunities to develop an agreement on the priority actions and investments that will contribute towards an agreed set of growth and wellbeing outcomes for Greater Christchurch. Linked processes: Second stage of the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport</td>
<td>All GCP Partners</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>IMPROVE OUR TOOLS AND EVIDENCE BASE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Work with Government and social and affordable housing providers to better address current and future housing needs across Greater Christchurch, developing an action plan to increase provision, and investigate the most suitable locations and opportunities for new housing ownerships models (such as shared ownership, co-housing, etc). This would be prepared in accordance with the following timeframes&lt;br&gt; - an MOU with the GCP and Network July 2019&lt;br&gt; - an agreement and project level resource August 2019&lt;br&gt; - A good practice and/or barriers research component October 2019&lt;br&gt; - A forum and or consultation component December 2019&lt;br&gt; - A draft action plan February 2020&lt;br&gt; - Intergovernment and alignment with District Plan Reviews April 2020&lt;br&gt; - Alignment and alignment with Annual Plans June 2020</td>
<td>CCC, SOC, WDC</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undertake an evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum densities specified in the CRPS for each territorial authority including a review of what has been achieved to date, constraints and issues associated with achieving these minimum densities, and whether any changes to minimum densities are likely to be desirable and achievable across future development areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri districts. Linked processes: Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews</td>
<td>SOC, WDC, CCC, ECan.</td>
<td>2019-2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 53 | Develop and agree a investigate the opportunity for a single growth model for Greater Christchurch that evaluates the demand, supply, feasibility and sufficiency of residential and business development capacity. | CCC, SDC, WOC, ECan | 2019 - 2020 |
| 54 | Review and recalibrate the Christchurch Transport Model and Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic Model. | CCC, SDC, WOC, ECan, NZTA | 2019 - 2020 |
| 55 | Prepare a new Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment that provides up-to-date information on current and future housing and business trends. | CCC, SDC, WOC, ECan, Ngai Tahu | 2020 |

**BUILD ON OUR PLANNED DIRECTION FOR GROWTH**

| 76 | Insert relevant housing targets directly into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and District Plans, in accordance with NPS-UDC Policies PCS to PC11. | ECan, CCC, SDC, WOC | 2019 |
| 87 | Improve the alignment and integration of constituent partner council’s infrastructure strategies through a coordinated approach that is guided by an overarching sub-regional approach to infrastructure planning and delivery. | CCC, SDC, WOC | 2019 - 2021 |

---

**a. Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to undertake structure planning and review of District Plans over the next year for identified Future Development Areas in the 2019 CRPS.**

- Prepare a proposed change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS at the earliest opportunity:
  - modify Map A to identify the Future Urban Development Areas shown in Figure 15, and include a policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS that enables land within the Future Development Areas to be rezoned in District Plans for urban development if there is a projected shortfall in housing development capacity in Table 3 of Our Space, or if the capacity assessment referred to in Action 6 (or subsequent periodic capacity assessments) identifies a projected shortfall in feasible development capacity.
- Enable territorial authorities to respond to changes in the sufficiency of development capacity over the medium term on a rolling basis as a result of periodic capacity assessments. Prepare a proposed change to Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch) of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement to:
  - Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to undertake structure planning (including the consideration of development infrastructure and the downstream effects on the Greater Christchurch transport network) and review of District Plans over the next year for the identified Future Development Areas in the 2019 CRPS. Change set out in Action 5b above, to provide for the projected medium term shortfall shown in Table 3 or the capacity assessment referred to in Action 6 (or subsequent periodic capacity assessments), at a minimum residential density of 12 households per hectare, informed by the evaluation undertaken as Action 3 above.

The policy will sit within the existing objective and policy framework of Chapter 6 of the CRPS which applies to all local authorities in the Greater Christchurch area, and which, in relation to the integration of land use and transport, includes policies 6.3.3, 6.3.4 and 6.3.5.1.

Identify areas for future growth over the long term.

---

21 Policy 6.3.3 requires that development proceed in accordance with an outline development plan. In addition, Policy 6.3.4 promotes transport efficiency, and Policy 6.3.5 relates to the achievement of land use and transport integration by “ensuring that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development are co-ordinated with development, funding, implementation and operations of transport and other infrastructure.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 21</th>
<th>Page 415</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Consideration of Inclusion of Revised Minimum Density for Future Development Areas
- Ensure the quantum of additional development capacity sequenced by territorial authorities for each town is in accordance with meeting the medium-term housing targets.
- Enable territorial authorities to respond to changes in the sufficiency of development capacity over the medium term on a rolling basis as part of periodic capacity assessments addressing any need for additional housing development capacity over the medium term.

**Linked processes:** Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews

### Undertake Detailed Planning Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019 - 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Evaluating zoning options to further promote consolidated townships;
- Investigating opportunities to encourage the provision and uptake of a range of housing typologies to meet future demands, including considering options for redevelopment, intensification and kāinga rohe/whanaunga;
- Reviewing town centre masterplans and strategies, and exploring options to increase land supply for existing key activity centres.

**Linked processes:** Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews

### Facilitate the Redevelopment of Existing Urban Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>2019 - 2028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Implementation of the H011 Central City Residential Programme;
- Development and implementation of a redevelopment programme for medium density housing areas around key activity centres and along public transport corridors;
- Investigation of opportunities for transition of brownfield land for commercial and mixed use redevelopment

**Linked processes:** Christchurch City Council’s Long Term Plan

### Undertake a Review of Chapter 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121.1</td>
<td>ECAn</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement as part of the scheduled full review, being informed by further planning work being undertaken by Councils and responding to any identified needs in the next Capacity Assessment due to be completed in 2020.
- Environment Canterbury will, prior to notification, engage with submitters on Our Space who sought the inclusion of land for business or housing development in relation to the appropriateness of including the subject land within Map A of Chapter 6.

**Linked processes:** Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews

### Schedule of Work Proposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Plan and agreed scope for review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>Completion of efficiency and effectiveness (RMA s35) review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>Completion of efficiency and effectiveness (RMA s35) review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collation of existing evidence base and identification of information gaps (based on District Plan reviews and structure planning completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional technical evidence completed (if required) – for chapter 6 specifically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Hazards – including climate change and additional land areas required from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southshore project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commented [MLPC26]:** Submissions #26, #27, #28, #50, #53, #59, #73

**Commented [MLPC27]:** Officers’ reply Section 13.
### 6.3 Collaborative partnerships

Opportunities and challenges facing Greater Christchurch in relation to how we will achieve our desired urban growth outcomes cross the administrative boundaries of Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri, and encompass a range of economic, social, cultural and environmental matters. Collaboration between local and regional councils, government agencies and Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu will therefore continue to be essential to successfully plan for growth.

The Partnership is committed to showing visible leadership and using a collaborative approach to address the growth issues identified for Greater Christchurch. Governance and Implementation of this Update will be coordinated through groups at various levels of the Partnership, with the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee responsible for its overall delivery. Although the implementation of this Update will principally be the domain of the constituent partner councils, other government agencies, mana whenua, the private sector, the third sector and the community also have a key role to play in ensuring we realise our shared vision for the future.

Coordinated action between public and private sector infrastructure providers, and the development sector, will be of particular importance to enabling the type and scale of development needed to accommodate our growth needs. It will be crucial that future investments are aligned with our planned direction for growth, which will require strong working relationships between constituent partner councils, infrastructure providers, developers and the property sector.

Building on the close ties already developed through the earthquake recovery, a strong working partnership with the Government will also be pivotal to unlocking the opportunities and addressing the challenges for Greater Christchurch. The Partnership will work closely with relevant agencies and ministries to explore how the Government could support urban development in Greater Christchurch in a way that both aligns with our future aspirations and the Government’s bold intentions for New Zealand’s cities, as signalled in the Urban Growth Agenda.

Partnering with the Government will include exploring the opportunity for developing an agreement on transport’s role in shaping the future of Greater Christchurch, recognising that transport can be a key place-maker for urban areas. This partnership opportunity has already been signalled in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 21</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement pattern</strong></td>
<td>Initial engagement with strategic partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreed partner and stakeholder engagement plan – pre-notification engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 3</strong></td>
<td>Draft Chapter 6 prepared for clause 3 Schedule 1 RMA consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2021/2022</strong></td>
<td>Section 32 Report completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notification of Proposed Chapter 6 as part of full RPS review June 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 4</strong></td>
<td>Submission and Further Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2022/2023</strong></td>
<td>Preparation of Officers’ Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision expected in June 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 Research and monitoring

The Partnership has produced an extensive evidence base to better understand housing and business trends in Greater Christchurch, and inform the planning decisions set out in this Update. This has included monitoring a range of urban development indicators and preparing a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment.

It will be critical that the data and information used as the basis for future strategic planning continues to be refined to support a robust and up-to-date evidence base.

Examples of matters that will require further investigation include:

- Reviewing the 2018 Census results to identify any changes to the population, including to demographic and household profiles, and consider the suitability of the population projections used to underpin our strategic planning;
- Examining the key demand and supply-side factors influencing the housing market, such as preferences by location, constraints on the redevelopment market and the extent of interaction between local housing market areas;
- Interrogating the factors influencing the relative feasibility of developments in different local housing market areas, including testing these factors with local experts and considering how they may change over time;
- Investigating the key drivers for business and employment development in relevant town, such as Waimakariri, and the viable options for increasing the self-sufficiency of these growing towns.

The Partnership publishes quarterly monitoring reports to track a series of core urban development indicators for Greater Christchurch. To improve our understanding of local market trends, the scope of these monitoring reports will be reviewed and expanded where appropriate to incorporate additional indicators. Monitoring trends and changes in Greater Christchurch’s residential, commercial and industrial markets are particularly important given the disruptions caused by the earthquakes, and the new normal that is being established as the recovery and regeneration effort progresses. It is important that this monitoring integrates with other monitoring processes at local and regional levels that will collectively help assess the achievement of the strategic goals of the UOS.
He muka harakeke, he whitau tangata.

The harakeke is woven with the human strand – binding people and places together.
APPENDIX 3 – Hearing Panel Minutes 1, 2 & 3
BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL

UNDER Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002

AND

IN THE MATTER of hearings on Our Space: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update 2018-2048

MINUTE 1 OF THE HEARINGS PANEL
Dated 8 February 2019

INTRODUCTION

1 As set out in the note to submitters dated 10 December 2018, the Greater Christchurch Partnership (GCP) Committee established a hearings panel for the Our Space 2018-2048 Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update comprising the following representatives:

(a) Bill Wasley, GCP Independent Chair (Chair)
(b) Councillor Peter Skelton, Canterbury Regional Council
(c) Councillor Sara Templeton, Christchurch City Council
(d) Deputy Mayor Malcolm Lyall, Selwyn District Council
(e) Councillor Neville Atkinson, Waimakariri District Council
(f) Gail Gordon, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (Ngāti Wheke)
(g) Ta Mark Solomon, Canterbury District Health Board
(h) Jim Harland, New Zealand Transport Agency.

2 The Hearings Panel is a subcommittee of the GCP Committee. Its role it to consider public submissions and the advice contained in an
Officers’ Report and make recommendations to the GCP Committee on the draft document released for public consultation throughout 2018.

3 The Hearings Panel has reviewed a list of submitters and have identified those submitters with whom the Hearing Panel have had current or previous associations:

(a) Councillor Sara Templeton

   (i) Councillor of Christchurch City Council

(b) Ta Mark Solomon

   (i) Deputy Chair of Canterbury District Health Board

Christchurch City Council and Canterbury District Health Board

4 The Hearings Panel has carefully considered the role of Councillor Sara Templeton and Ta Mark Solomon on the Hearings Panel in light of the submissions lodged by Christchurch City Council and the Canterbury District Health Board. The Panel has sought legal advice on this matter to confirm that there is no conflict of interest arising. This has been provided as an attachment to the Officers’ Report.

5 Both Councillor Templeton and Ta Mark Solomon have confirmed that they were not involved in the preparation or subsequent approval of the submissions lodged by their respective organisations. In particular, the CCC submission has been lodged under delegated authority and has not been the subject of a council resolution. Therefore, the Hearing Panel is satisfied that there is a sufficient degree of separation between Councillor Templeton and Ta Mark Solomon and the submissions lodged by CCC and CDHB.

6 Councillor Templeton and Ta Mark Solomon, together with the other Hearing Panel Members, have also confirmed that they do not have a personal interest in the final form of the Our Space document.

7 Each member of this Hearings Panel is committed to approaching the hearing and consideration of submissions with an open mind and giving the views presented due consideration.

8 The Panel also notes in relation to the Officers’ Report that CCC and CDHB staff have not been involved in dealing with matters raised in
their respective submissions and that CCC and CDHB staff involvement in matters not raised in their submissions has also been limited to officers who had not been involved in the preparation of their organisation's submission.

Conclusion

9 The Hearings Panel is satisfied, subject to any matter submitters might raise, that any perceived conflicts of interest can be dealt with by this disclosure, and there is no need for any Panel member to recuse themselves from considering and determining any of the submissions.

10 If any submitter takes a different view, or wishes to raise additional matters, they are to alert the Hearings Panel as a matter of urgency.

DATED this 8th day of February 2019

Bill Wasley
Hearing Panel Chair
BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL

UNDER Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002

AND

IN THE MATTER of hearings on Our Space: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update 2018-2048

MINUTE 2 OF THE HEARING PANEL
Dated 7 March 2019

INTRODUCTION

1 The Hearing Panel would like to thank all those who have attended the hearing on Our Space 2018-2048 Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update and acknowledge the work that has gone into the preparation of presentations.

2 Officers will be presenting their Reply Report on Monday, 11 March 2019. This will be held in public and submitters are welcome to attend and hear the presentation from the Officers.

3 This Minute seeks specific consideration in the Officers’ Reply of a number of matters of particular interest to the Panel. It is not an exhaustive list and should not be taken to in any way limit the scope of the Officers’ Reply, or any further questions that the Panel may wish to pose to the Officers. There may also be questions of any Partner Officers.

HEARING PANEL QUESTIONS

4 In light of the additional information and presentations from submitters and the discussion as part of the hearing of submitters, we would like
Council Officers to consider whether any changes are required to Our Space on the following matters:

(a) The approach to sequencing in Our Space, including whether to show, if required, any FDA land as being GPA land on Figures 15 and 16.

(b) The assessment of commercial and industrial land underpinning Our Space, and any subsequent changes resulting, including in relation to the anticipated demand at the inland ports at Rolleston. In addition, advice on the appropriateness or otherwise regarding the methodology used for determining industrial and commercial land requirements, given concerns raised by submitters.

(c) The assessment of feasible development underpinning Our Space, and any subsequent changes resulting, especially in relation to land in GPAs and FDAs which might be TC2/3 land and the possibility that this might not be developed.

(d) The extent of monitoring and review outlined in Our Space and how this might relate to other related monitoring undertaken through other processes, including how this might inform a future understanding of whether Our Space outcomes are being achieved.

(e) The approach taken to assess rural residential and large lot demand and sufficiency and the rationale for the approach adopted.

(f) The approach to determining appropriate densities for GPA and FDA land in Our Space and any subsequent processes.

(g) The extent to which Our Space covers and addresses freight needs, including appropriate identification and protection of the strategic transport network and mitigation of potential increased congestion on this network arising from the proposals outlined in Our Space.

(h) The extent to which the proposed social and affordable housing action plan is outlined in Our Space, including the timeframe for its development.
(i) The coverage of the 10-minute neighbourhood concept and how this is explained in Our Space and implemented through subsequent actions, including its relation to the “8-80” concept promoted at the hearings.

(j) To simplify Our Space to ‘strip out’ any content not specifically relating to meeting NPS-UDC objectives.

(k) The extent to which natural hazards information is covered in Our Space and included as part of assessing the proposed directions outlined.

(l) The manner in which Figure 16 identifies proposed future growth areas and the potential for confusion of this Figure with Map A in the CRPS.

(m) How matters not addressed in the proposed Our Space approach might be identified and further detailed in relation to further investigation and resolution ahead of the planned CRPS full review in 2022.

(n) The role and scope of Our Space having regard to the requirements of the NPS-UDC.

5 The Panel would also like Officers to address any other matters that they wish to raise in relation to further amendments to Our Space or reasons why Officers do not believe relief sought by submitters should not be provided.

6 The Panel would also be assisted by further information with regard to the assertion by Christchurch International Airport and Lyttelton Port Company that they were not approach or consulted during the Our Space project.

OFFICER REPLY DAY

7 The presentation of the Officers’ Reply is scheduled for:

Time: 10am

Date: 11 March 2019

Location: Committee room 1, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch
ISSUED by the Hearing Panel

DATED this 7th day of March 2019

Bill Wasley
Hearing Panel Chair
on behalf of the Hearing Panel
BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL

UNDER Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002

AND

IN THE MATTER of hearings on Our Space: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update 2018-2048

MINUTE 3 OF THE HEARING PANEL
Dated 11 March 2019

Introduction

1 In our Minute 2, we requested that the authors of the Officers’ Report respond to a number of questions from the Hearing Panel following the hearing of submissions. We heard from Officers who presented their responses to us this morning and we are grateful for the work that has been done in preparation of that response.

2 We are mindful that Our Space is a collaborative document of the Greater Christchurch Partnership and that differing views have been expressed on behalf of the local authority partners in relation to some of the key issues for our consideration. These views have been expressed through written comments by Selwyn and Waimakariri District Council staff and the submission lodged by Christchurch City Council (CCC).

3 In light of submitter presentations and the final recommendations of Officers in response to our questions, we would like to understand whether these differing views remain.
Joint Statement

4 We request that the Chief Executives of each of the local authority partners liaise, and if possible, produce a Joint Statement that records their views on the Officer recommendations and where there is a difference of views, identifies how those outstanding matters may be addressed, for example, through further workstreams or other actions.

5 We would be assisted if those Chief Executives who are available could present that Joint Statement to us in the afternoon of Monday 11, March 2019 or during the morning of 12 March 2019. The Panel will accommodate the Chief Executives’ availability.

6 This will be a public session in Committee Room 1, Christchurch City Council Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch and submitters are welcome to attend.

ISSUED by the Hearing Panel

DATED this 11th day of March 2019

Bill Wasley
Hearing Panel Chair
on behalf of the Hearing Panel
APPENDIX 4 - Addendum to the Report and Recommendations of the Hearings Panel
OUR SPACE 2018-2048

GREATER CHRISTCHURCH SETTLEMENT PATTERN

Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga

A strategy prepared under the Local Government Act 2002 to give effect to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016

Addendum to Report and Recommendations of the Hearings Panel

Hearings Panel:

Bill Wasley (Chair)
Gail Gordon
Councillor Sara Templeton
Deputy Mayor Malcolm Lyall
Councillor Peter Skelton
Councillor Neville Atkinson
Jim Harland
INTRODUCTION


[2] Following receipt of the Hearings Panel’s recommendations, the GCP Committee requested that the Hearings Panel provide clarification on its recommendations in relation to the following matters:

a. The scope and intention of the change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2019 referred to in Action 9 of the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that only land required to meet an identified medium term shortfall in capacity will be rezoned in district plans.

b. The timeframe for the commencement of the evaluation of minimum densities referred to in the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that this work inform the district plan reviews.

c. The Hearing Panel’s response to the Christchurch City Council (CCC) submission in relation to the robustness of the Capacity Assessment.

d. The Hearing Panel’s response to the CCC submission in relation to the sequencing of development and the management of downstream effects within the transport network.

[3] In relation to the sequencing of development and the management of downstream effects within the transport network, the GCP Committee sought further clarification as to how these matters are intended to be addressed in Action 9 of Our Space.

[4] The Hearings Panel met on 31 May and 5 June 2019 to consider these requests. This addendum report provides the Hearing Panel’s clarification in respect of these matters. We have not reconsidered the conclusions reached as part of our deliberations. Rather, we have reflected on whether our recommendations, and reasons for those recommendations, are clearly articulated in Our Space and our Recommendations Report and if not, whether further clarification is required.

[5] We address each of the four requested matters of clarification below. Where we have recommended changes to Our Space for the purposes of clarification, we have set these out in Appendix A.

1. The scope and intention of the change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2019 referred to in Action 9 of the ‘Schedule of
future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that only land required to meet an identified medium term shortfall in capacity will be rezoned in district plans.

[6] We have reviewed the relevant sections of Our Space that refer to the change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) that is scheduled to be progressed by Environment Canterbury at the earliest opportunity this year.

[7] Our understanding from the material presented to us during the hearing is that the change will involve amendments to Map A to identify the Future Development Areas shown on Figure 15 in Our Space. These Future Development Areas are intended to meet both medium and long-term capacity needs. However, the change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS will also an include an associated policy to ensure that only land required to meet an identified medium-term shortfall in capacity will be rezoned in district plans.

[8] The change will enable Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council to rezone land within the Future Development Areas to meet identified medium term capacity needs only. This means that Waimakariri District Council would be able to rezone land within the Future Development Areas in their upcoming district plan review to meet the medium-term capacity shortfall identified in Table 3 of Our Space. Land would not be rezoned to meet long term capacity needs. The policy is also intended to enable Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to rezone land in response to medium term capacity shortfalls identified in future periodic Capacity Assessments without needing to first seek a change to Map A of the CRPS.

[9] We consider that this could be clarified further in Our Space, particularly in relation to the policy mechanism that is intended to accompany the identification of Future Development Areas on Map A.

[10] We recommend making amendments to the following sections of Our Space to provide this clarification:

a. Section 3.2 Housing, page 24
b. Section 5.1 Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern, page 33
c. Section 5.3 Selwyn and Waimakariri Towns, page 39
d. Section 6.2, Further work and implementation, Schedule of future work, Action 9, p 58

[11] These recommended amendments are set out in full in Appendix A.
2. *The timeframe for the commencement of the evaluation of minimum densities referred to in the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that this work inform the district plan reviews.*

[12] It is our understanding from the material presented to us throughout the hearing, including the Joint Statement of the Chief Executives, that the evaluation of minimum densities referred to in the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space is intended to commence this year. Whilst that work is unlikely to be completed in time for the change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS scheduled for this year, the work will inform the district plan reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts and the full review of the CRPS.

[13] We note that Action 3 of the ‘Schedule of future work’ refers to a timeframe of 2022. We recommended that this be amended to 2019 to 2022 to more accurately reflect our understanding of the timeframe set out in the paragraph above. We also recommended that the linked processes be amended to include the district plan reviews.

[14] This recommended amendment is set out in full in Appendix A.

[15] We have also reflected on our recommended amendment to Section 5.3 on page 40 of Our Space where it states:

In the meantime, it is expected that new urban housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn will achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare in Green Field Priority Areas, or where any further development area is subsequently zoned.

[16] We wish to reiterate that the expectation is that new urban housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn will achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare. We have also identified an error in the above statement and recommend that it is amended to clarify our intention that the statement applies only to Future Development Areas that are subsequently zoned.

[17] This recommended amendment is set out in full in Appendix A.


[18] We addressed the Capacity Assessment throughout our Recommendations Report and in particular, addressed the CCC’s concern in relation to a misalignment in Our Space between the figures used for housing development capacity over the
medium term and the need for intervention.\footnote{We referred to the Officers Recommendations and recommended amendments to Table 3 to address these concerns.}

[19] We consider that the uncertainties associated with feasible development capacity figures will be further addressed by further and ongoing refinement of the feasibility tools and the use of a common methodology in the next Capacity Assessment which is scheduled to be completed by December 2020. This is provided for by the following actions in Our Space:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Bodies</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Investigate the opportunity for a single growth model for Greater Christchurch that evaluates the demand, supply, feasibility and sufficiency of residential and business development capacity.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linked processes: Next Capacity Assessment and Council's Long Term Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review and recalibrate the Christchurch Transport Model and Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic Model.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan, NZTA</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linked processes: Next Capacity Assessment and Council's Long Term Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prepare a new Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment that provides up-to-date information on current and future housing and business trends.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan, Ngai Tahu</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linked processes: National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, and Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[20] This was supported by the Greater Christchurch Chief Executives who in their advice to the Hearings Panel recommended that the partners agree to a consistent methodology being used by all Greater Christchurch local authorities when completing required capacity assessments. For clarification an amendment has been made to Action 4 by the deletion of ‘investigate the opportunity for’ and replacement with ‘Develop and agree’. This was an agreed position of the Panel however the change was not made in Our Space.

[21] Ongoing improvements to the evidence base provided by the Capacity Assessment and ongoing monitoring are anticipated by the NPS-UDC. On that basis, we are satisfied with the Officer’s recommendations and consider that the Capacity Assessment is adequate for the present purpose, noting that if future Capacity Assessments show a shortfall in capacity, the local authorities will be required to respond by providing further development capacity and enabling development.

\footnote{Paragraphs [111] to [124]}
Given the CRPS policy mechanism described above that will ensure that land within Future Development Areas is only rezoned in district plans to meet medium term capacity needs we consider the planning response to the Capacity Assessment to be appropriate.

4. The Hearing Panel’s response to the CCC submission in relation to the sequencing of development and the management of downstream effects within the transport network.

[22] The management of downstream effects within the transport network was raised in the CCC submission in the context of sequencing land. Officers addressed the provision of greater certainty on sequencing of housing development in Appendix F of their report. They identified three options for consideration by the Panel with regard to sequencing:

a. Retain the current approach as outlined in Our Space, or
b. Provide additional direction in the final Our Space without the benefit of detailed structure planning and/or outline development plans of proposed future development urban areas, and/or

c. Provide additional direction in the proposed 2019 change to the CRPS (with or without the benefit of detailed structure planning and/or outline development plans of proposed future development areas).

[23] We accepted the Officers’ recommended amendments to Our Space to:

a. Section 3.2, paragraph 5, p 12 to be clearer that the medium term targets represent the development capacity to be zoned or otherwise enabled by each territorial authority and that unless already enabled, additional development capacity required over the long term only need be identified, in order to provide greater planning certainty and ensure efficient infrastructure planning and delivery across Greater Christchurch.

b. Section 5.5, p26 and Section 6 Action 9 p 34 to make it clear that detailed structure planning to determine the sequencing of future development areas will need to have regard to existing CRPS policy provisions to ensure a consolidated urban form, proximity to activity centres, efficient infrastructure, and cohesion of new development with existing communities.

c. Section 5.5, p 26 and Section 6, Action 8 p 34 to outline the intent of draft policy provisions to be considered as part of a proposed change to the CRPS to demonstrate how future development areas are sequenced by territorial authorities in accordance with housing targets incorporated in the CRPS and sufficiency conclusions agreed as part of periodic capacity assessments.

[24] As set out above, we recommend further changes to further clarify the intent of the policy to be considered as part of the change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS.

[25] We agreed with Officers that Our Space should not determine the sequencing priority between future development areas and existing undeveloped greenfield areas or identify those parts of the future development areas to meet medium term
housing targets as this is best considered as part of the detailed structure planning and development infrastructure servicing to be undertaken by relevant territorial authorities.

[26] We note that there is a suite of CRPS polices that apply to new development in Greater Christchurch regarding any off site effects and requiring the integration of land-use and transport matters. Policy 6.3.3 requires that development proceed in accordance with an outline development plan. In addition, Policy 6.3.4 promotes transport effectiveness, and Policy 6.3.5 relates to the achievement of land-use and transport integration by “ensuring that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development are co-ordinated with development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure…” in order to, among other things, “ensure new development does not occur until provision for appropriate infrastructure is in place.”

[27] We further note that the review and recalibration of the Christchurch Transport Model and Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic Model is scheduled for 2019 to 2020 and will inform the next Capacity Assessment and the Council’s Long Term Plans.² We have also recommended a number of amendments to Our Space in relation to the specific transport challenges faced by the Greater Christchurch local authorities.

[28] We are satisfied that the approach in Our Space is appropriate given the evidence presented to us at the hearing, the actions identified in the ‘Schedule of future work’ and the requirement for local authorities to address this matter in subsequent resource management and local government act processes. However, we do consider that further clarification could be made to Action 9 to ensure that readers are clear that the downstream effects on the Greater Christchurch transport network will be considered as part of district council structure planning and that the new policy will sit within the existing objective and policy framework of Chapter 6 of the CRPS which already addresses the sequencing of development and its co-ordination with the development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure.

[29] As a further point of clarification, we recommend that the definition of ‘development infrastructure’ be included in Section 3.2 in relation to housing targets on page 24 to make it clear that the development infrastructure required to service additional

² Our Space, Action 5.
capacity that will be identified in each council's infrastructure strategy includes land transport.
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Jim Harland is a non-voting member of the Hearing panel. His signature acknowledges that he has participated in deliberations as a non-voting member of the Panel and supports the recommendations set out in this Report.
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APPENDICES

[30] Appendix A: Hearing Panel recommended amendments to Our Space to provide clarification on matters requested by Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee
PROPOSED CHANGES TO OUR SPACE – 31 May and 5 June 2019

Proposed changes to Hearing Panel Recommendations Report version are shown in red underline and strikethrough

1. The scope and intention of the change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2019 referred to in Action 9 of the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that only land required to meet an identified medium term shortfall in capacity will be rezoned in district plans.

Section 3.2 Housing, page 24:

In this context, the targets set out in Table 2 for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri represent the development capacity that each council will, over the medium term, zone and otherwise, seek to enable through their relevant planning processes and mechanisms (district plans, structure plans, outline development plans and infrastructure strategies) and over the long term, identify in relevant plans and strategies, to meet the demand for housing in Greater Christchurch over the medium and long term.14 A change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2019 will include a policy that will enable land required to meet an identified medium term capacity need to be rezoned in district plans. Unless already enabled, additional development capacity required over the long term will only be shown on Map A of the Regional Policy Statement as a Future Development Area, identified in relevant plans and strategies, and the development infrastructure required to service it will be identified in each council’s infrastructure strategy.

14 Table 2 will be inserted in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch). Relevant local authority targets will also be inserted into the district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri.

Section 5.1 Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern, page 33:

To implement this plan, the Partnership proposes considers that some new greenfield housing areas should be released or otherwise identified in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls for Selwyn and Waimakariri over the medium to long term.

Section 5.3 Selwyn and Waimakariri Towns, page 39:

Given the projected shortfalls in housing development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri to meet their future needs, a change to the CRPS is proposed to allow Chapter 6 and Map A the flexibility to respond to identified medium term capacity needs. Additional capacity will be directed in the first instance to the key towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi in support of the public transport enhancement opportunities mentioned elsewhere in this Update. This is likely to identify future development areas in the two districts that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary. Such a change would be prepared subsequent to this Update and would likely be notified in 2019.23 These new areas will provide much of the capacity required over both the medium and long term. A 2019 change to the CRPS would ensure that land can be rezoned to meet medium term capacity needs, and the longer term will be further considered as part of a comprehensive review of the CRPS scheduled for 2022. While it is intended Our Space provides direction to inform future Resource Management Act processes, Figure 16 is indicative only.

23 The Partnership is investigating whether to request using the new streamlined planning provision in the Resource Management Act 1991 to make this targeted change to the Regional Policy Statement.
Section 6.2, Further work and implementation, Schedule of future work, Action 9, p 59

a. Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to undertake a structure planning and review of District Plans over the next year for identified Future Development Areas in the 2019 CRPS Change set out in Action 9b below, at a minimum residential density of 12 households per hectare, informed by the evaluation undertaken as Action 3 above.

b. a. Prepare a Proposed Change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS for notification by September 2019 at the earliest opportunity to:

- Modify Map A to identify the Future Urban Development Areas shown in Figure 15, and include a policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS that enables land within the Future Development Areas to be rezoned in District Plans for urban development if there is a projected shortfall in housing development capacity in Table 3 of Our Space, or if the capacity assessment referred to in Action 6 (or subsequent periodic capacity assessments) identifies a projected shortfall in feasible development capacity.

- Enable territorial authorities to respond to changes in the sufficiency of development capacity over the medium term on a rolling basis as a result of periodic capacity assessments.

b. Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to undertake a structure planning (including the consideration of development infrastructure and the downstream effects on the Greater Christchurch transport network) and review of District Plans over the next year for the identified Future Development Areas in the 2019 CRPS Change set out in Action 9a above, to provide for the projected medium term shortfall shown in Table 3 or the capacity assessment referred to in Action 6 (or subsequent periodic capacity assessments), at a minimum residential density of 12 households per hectare, informed by the evaluation undertaken as Action 3 above.

The policy will sit within the existing objective and policy framework of Chapter 6 of the CRPS which applies to all local authorities in the Greater Christchurch Area, and which, in relation to the integration of land use and transport, includes policies 6.3.3, 6.3.4 and 6.3.5.¹

2. The timeframe for the commencement of the evaluation of minimum densities referred to in the ‘Schedule of future work’ in Schedule 6.2 of Our Space and whether it is intended that this work inform the district plan reviews.

Section 6.2, Further work and implementation, Schedule of future work, Action 3, p 57

| 3 | Undertake an evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum densities specified in the CRPS for each territorial authority including a review of what has been achieved to date, constraints and issues associated with achieving these minimum densities, and whether any changes to minimum densities is likely to be desirable and achievable across future development areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri districts. | SDC, WDC, CCC, ECan. | 2019-2022 |
|   | Linked processes: Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews |

¹ Policy 6.3.3 requires that development proceed in accordance with an outline development plan. In addition, Policy 6.3.4 promotes transport efficiency, and Policy 6.3.5 relates to the achievement of land-use and transport integration by “ensuring that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development are co-ordinated with development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure...”
Section 5.3, Selwyn and Waimakariri Towns, page 40:
Amend Section 5.3 as follows:
In the meantime, it is expected that new urban housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn will achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare \( \text{[x]} \) in Green Field Priority Areas, or where any Future Development Area is subsequently zoned.
[x] This expectation is that a minimum density of at least 12 households per hectare will be achieved.

3. The Hearing Panel’s response to the CCC submission in relation to the robustness of the Capacity Assessment.
Section 6.2, Further work and implementation, Schedule of future work, Action 4, p 58
Amend Action 4 as follows:

| 4 | Investigate the opportunity for Develop and agree a single growth model for Greater Christchurch that evaluates the demand, supply, feasibility and sufficiency of residential and business development capacity. Linked processes: Next Capacity Assessment and Council’s Long Term Plans | CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan | 2019 - 2020 |

- Further clarification also provided in addendum to Hearing Panel Recommendations Report.

4. The Hearing Panel’s response to the CCC submission in relation to the sequencing of development and the management of downstream effects within the transport network.
Section 6.2, Further work and implementation, Schedule of future work, Action 4, p 58
Amend Action 9 as set out above in response to recommendation 1.

Section 3.2 Housing, Targets, page 24:
Insert definition of ‘development infrastructure’ as a footnote:

Development infrastructure means network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater, and land transport as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003, to the extent that it is controlled by local authorities, and including the New Zealand Transport Agency.

- Further clarification also provided in addendum to Hearing Panel Recommendations Report.
OUR SPACE

Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update

Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga

Endorsed by the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee on 14 June 2019 and Recommended for Council Adoption
Mihi

Hārō ana te kāhu i te ipukarea o Tahu Pōtiki
gō rā ki te tihi o tōku pou tipua
Aoraki Matatū, Aoraki Mataoho
Ka mihi ki ngā maunga, ka mihi ki ngā awa
Tihei Mauri Ora

Tēnei te mihi ki ngā tātaitanga o te takiwa nei
Kia tākina te hono kia puawai te kaupapa
me ngā hua o te Mātāpono ki ū, kia mau
hui e! Tāiki e

The Kāhu soars the lands of Tahu Pōtiki
And settles on the summit of my ancestral mountain
Aoraki Steadfast, Aoraki Vigilant
It acknowledges all the mountains and rivers
Behold the essence of life

We acknowledge those with a vested connection to the land,
who ensure this bond on the collaboration of this document
and the values within to ensure its longevity
Together in Unity!
Message from the Strategy Partners

The Greater Christchurch Partnership continues to demonstrate the cross-agency collaboration and leadership required to effectively plan for and manage urban development across the Greater Christchurch area; working together to address those key strategic issues that span council and political boundaries. Te Tira Tū Tahi - One Group, Standing Together.

Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahangai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga represents a further building block to ensure our partnership approach to planning takes account how things have changed in recent years, and what demands and trends might shape the future of our urban areas during the next thirty years. Its particular focus is how best to accommodate housing and business land use needs in a way that integrates with transport and other infrastructure provision, building greater community resilience, and contributing to a sustainable future for Greater Christchurch that meets the needs and aspirations of our existing communities and future generations.

We first recognised the need to undertake this work when we adopted an update to the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy in 2016. This was then reinforced by the development of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, which requires councils with high growth urban areas to produce a ‘future development strategy’ demonstrating there will be sufficient development capacity to meet future needs. Our Space has been collaboratively prepared to satisfy this requirement for Greater Christchurch’s councils.

The strategic planning directions contained in this document have been strongly guided by the vision, goals and principles enshrined in the Urban Development Strategy, which continue to provide the roadmap for growth planning in Greater Christchurch. Our Space therefore does not seek to replace this comprehensive strategy, but rather builds on it by considering and updating many of our key settlement pattern matters. Other plans, strategies and initiatives referred to in this document also complement Our Space; helping provide a broader wellbeing approach that ensures Greater Christchurch remains an attractive place for people to live, learn, work, visit and invest.

We would like to acknowledge and thank those that have helped shape this document, and would encourage all to contribute to its implementation and the realisation of our shared vision for the future of Greater Christchurch.
Executive Summary

Greater Christchurch has responded to the initial challenges following the earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 and is now embracing the opportunities that lie ahead to help us realise our long term vision - mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei, for us and our children after us.

A growing urban area can bring future prosperity and enrich our lives and communities, but only if it is managed so we protect and enhance the aspects we value the most and that make it a unique place for people to choose to live, learn, work, visit and invest. Greater Christchurch is growing, with the population expected to grow to about 640,000 by 2048, some 150,000 more people than today.

Planning for future urban growth in Greater Christchurch must also be informed and guided by the principles that are relevant to the exercise by mana whenua of kaitiakitanga. Integral to the exercise of kaitiakitanga are the values of respect, reciprocity and sustainability. For mana whenua, it is vital that the effects associated with urban growth are managed so as to avoid the degradation of the natural environment – including our coastal environment, waterways and landscapes.

The Greater Christchurch Partnership has worked collaboratively for more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development across Greater Christchurch. This Partnership brings together the leadership roles of local government, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, the district health board and government agencies and is guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals outlined in the Urban Development Strategy (UDS).

This Update to the UDS addresses various aspects of that Strategy as it:

- focuses on the critical role of how our urban areas accommodate growth and how efficient infrastructure planning can support and guide development decisions;
- reaffirms and builds on existing plans that show we are already well-placed for future development over the next 30 years;
- balances the projected future demands of housing and business markets with the urban form that will best enable sustainable growth;
- recognises that how we live today will be quite different to 30 years from now, so we need to be responsive to these changes, grasping the opportunities afforded by Government policy and emerging technologies to make this transition.

In so doing, this Update demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity\(^1\) in the medium and long term while maintaining an urban form that helps achieve the UDS vision and strategic goals. Two challenges stand out in this regard:

1. How can future housing provision be affordable, high quality and cater for an aging population that is linked to a more general trend for more one-person and couple-only households?

2. And how can our urban areas grow, through redevelopment and new greenfield subdivisions, without increasing the congestion that would ensue if our current travel patterns remain?

The solutions to these and other challenges will come from a wide range of responses from public agencies, the private sector and communities. Many drivers of change are uncertain, so regular monitoring and review is critical.

This Update outlines the planning framework that integrates and guides other work and demonstrates the commitment of the partners to achieving its strategic goals. It has been informed by an assessment of where we are

\(^1\) Development capacity refers to the amount of land for development enabled in plans and supported by infrastructure. This development capacity can be provided either ‘outwards’ on greenfield land or ‘inwards’ by redeveloping existing urban areas (infill and intensification).
now and anticipated future demands, and aligns with recently adopted Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies of the constituent councils. Specifically it:

- sets out how targets for housing for the next 30 years will be met, accommodating an additional 150,000 people;
- identifies locations for housing growth, encouraging Central City and suburban centre living while providing for township growth in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi;
- reinforces the role of key centres in providing additional retail and office floorspace as required, in particular the Central City and, if needed, a transition of its surrounding light industrial zones;
- promotes a compact urban form, which provides for efficient transport and locates development in a manner that takes into account climate change and sea level rise;
- recognises the existing industrial land provision as sufficient to cater for industrial growth for some time yet;
- outlines a series of implementation actions and further work required to give effect to the Update.

It responds to the new Government Policy Statement on Land Transport, which has increased funding for mass public transit schemes, and meets the requirement of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) 2016 to prepare a future development strategy.

Many other plans, strategies and initiatives will complement this Update in improving our wider social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing. The Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) contains an ambitious vision to fully integrate the public transport system with the wider transport system and urban form, thereby increasing mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch. Development and implementation of recovery and regeneration plans for central Christchurch, the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor (currently being developed) and Kaiapoi address the future land uses of areas most affected by the earthquakes. Coastal hazards, climate change and Carbon Zero projects are underway to better understand the resilience and adaptation needs of Greater Christchurch. And economic and social enterprise strategies help position the City and the region to thrive and show we are open for business and innovation.

This Update is therefore an important piece of the jigsaw that provides certainty for the sustained and collective investment we can all make to the wellbeing of Greater Christchurch, Our Space.
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SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS Ngā Puka Taunaki

A. Greater Christchurch Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment
1. Introduction

The Greater Christchurch Partnership\(^2\) has worked collaboratively for more than a decade on planning and managing urban growth and development in Greater Christchurch to support the long term needs of people and communities. This includes the development of the Urban Development Strategy (UDS) in 2007, and the crucial role the Partnership and its constituent partners played coordinating and facilitating rebuild and recovery activities after the earthquakes.

The Partnership has now reviewed the settlement pattern for Greater Christchurch. This review (referred to as the Settlement Pattern Update or the Update) has been undertaken to satisfy the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) for high growth councils to produce a ‘future development strategy’ that shows there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity to support housing and business growth needs over the medium\(^3\) (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years) (see Section 2.4 for further detail on the NPS-UDC).

A collaborative approach makes sense because the urban areas and the transport networks across Greater Christchurch function as one interconnected system. Rather than developing an entirely new strategy the Update builds on the existing UDS to meet the NPS-UDC requirements, and this is encouraged in supporting guidance on implementing the NPS-UDC.

This Update comprises a review of the land use framework outlined for Greater Christchurch in the Land Use Recovery Plan and in key resource management documents, such as the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans. It considers how best to accommodate our future housing and business needs based on the comprehensive strategic planning framework that already exists for Greater Christchurch, being guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals established in the UDS and informed by a Capacity Assessment and relevant Long Term Plans and infrastructure strategies.\(^4\)

Our plan for supporting housing and business growth in Greater Christchurch has been shaped by key considerations relating to planning for sustainable urban development, including how we can:

- achieve our desired urban form while supporting our increasing housing and business needs;
- provide for the diversity of housing that meets the needs of a changing resident population;
- integrate land use and transport planning to ensure we create safe, accessible and liveable urban areas.

To ensure that the processes, priorities and outcomes of this Update align with Ngāi Tahu cultural aspirations for Greater Christchurch, both Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (as a member of the Partnership) and Ngā Papatipu Rūnanga have been closely involved with the preparation of this document. Particularly significant from a cultural perspective is the need to ensure adequate provision is made for the establishment of kāinga nohoanga settlements in which Ngāi Tahu whānau can live and work on customary Māori land. The Partnership recognises the need for the future role of kāinga nohoanga developments to be important considerations in our planning and decision making processes.

In this context, this Update outlines the Partnership’s planning directions for supporting urban growth in Greater Christchurch through to 2048. It highlights the key issues in terms of meeting our growth needs, and sets out the Partnership’s responses to these issues, with the aim of ensuring that Greater Christchurch remains an attractive place for people to live, learn, work, visit and invest, both now and in the future.

\(^2\) The Greater Christchurch Partnership has evolved to comprise Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Environment Canterbury, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, Canterbury District Health Board, New Zealand Transport Agency, Regenerate Christchurch and the Greater Christchurch Group of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

\(^3\) The medium term in this Update includes both the short (next three years) and medium term (between three and 10 years) periods defined by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

\(^4\) Having particular regard to Policy PR1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.
The remainder of this document covers the following:

- Section 2, Our Place, provides the context in which this Update has been developed;
- Section 3, Our Growth Needs, outlines the anticipated housing and business demands, and the extent to which this demand is already provided for in district plans;
- Section 4, Our Challenges, sets out the key issues and challenges that exist when considering our planning responses;
- Section 5, Our Plan, identifies the planning directions and responses that we believe are required to address the key land use and infrastructure issues for Greater Christchurch;
- Section 6, Our Next Steps, signals further work required to implement our planning responses and support our future decision making.
2. Our Place

2.1 Context and trends

Greater Christchurch is a defined geographical area that includes and surrounds Christchurch City, New Zealand’s second largest city and the largest city in the South Island (Figure 1).

Greater Christchurch currently has a population nearing half a million residents. Just under 80% of the Canterbury regional population and about 40% of the South Island population live in Greater Christchurch, emphasising its importance as a strategic regional centre and the primary economic hub of the South Island. Canterbury is the fastest growing region in New Zealand outside Auckland and more population growth is projected in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years than other high growth cities, such as Hamilton, Tauranga, Wellington and Queenstown.

Administratively, Greater Christchurch comprises parts of three territorial authorities: Christchurch City, Selwyn District and Waimakariri District. The communities and economies in these areas are intrinsically linked environmentally by the rivers, groundwater systems, coastal and other natural features that cross territorial authority boundaries, and by infrastructure, with large numbers of people commuting to work in the City, and facilities and services provided in one district often benefitting neighbouring communities.

The larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri that fall within Greater Christchurch include Rolleston, Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Lincoln, while smaller settlements include West Melton, Prebbleton, Tai Tapu, Springston, Tuahiwi, Woodend and Pegasus. Lyttelton and its harbour, Whakaraupō, also fall within the defined boundaries for Greater Christchurch, although the rest of Banks Peninsula does not.

The Canterbury earthquake sequence in 2010 and 2011 had a significant impact on Greater Christchurch’s population and employment. As shown in Figure 2, the population in Christchurch City dropped sharply in the first two years after the earthquakes and recovered to its pre-earthquake population only in 2017. In contrast, Selwyn and Waimakariri have experienced strong population growth since the earthquakes, augmenting the high growth rates seen in the two districts prior to the earthquakes.

The widespread earthquake damage to infrastructure networks and housing areas, especially in the Central City, the eastern areas of the City and in the Kaiapoi area, required many households to find new places to live. Much of this post-earthquake demand was supported by opening new housing areas that had been planned to meet longer term growth needs. Although the development around the urban fringes of the City and the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri has occurred at a faster rate than anticipated at the time the UDS was conceived, it has still been consistent with the longer term growth strategy for Greater Christchurch.

The earthquakes also damaged business premises in Greater Christchurch, especially in the central and eastern parts of the City, with many businesses forced to relocate either temporarily or, in some cases, permanently. Continued momentum behind the Central City recovery has meant businesses and workers are returning to this area, helping to
restore the central business district as the principal commercial hub for the region. Employment levels in the Central City continue to increase but are not yet back to levels that existed prior to the earthquakes.

Changes to the spatial distribution of housing and business activities in Greater Christchurch, coupled with the damage to roads and other infrastructure from the earthquakes, have had substantial impacts on the transport network. This includes altered travel patterns that have resulted in increased traffic volumes originating from the west of the City, as well as from Selwyn and Waimakariri. This has placed more demand on the road network along the western corridor, as well as on the northern and southern approaches to the Central City. Over the past decade there has been significant investment in the Greater Christchurch road network, which has helped accommodate this demand. Investment has included the building of the Christchurch Southern Motorway Stage 1, Western Bypass and four-laning of the State Highway 1 Western Corridor (between Hornby and Belfast). The Christchurch Southern Motorway Stage 2 (between Halswell Junction Road and Rolleston), and the Christchurch Northern Corridor are under construction and expected to be fully operational by 2021.

Disruptions to land use, the transport network, and travel patterns have led to increased travel by car and contributed to reduced public transport patronage in Greater Christchurch. However, with a growing number of businesses and workers returning to the Central City, the share of trips taken by public transport in Greater Christchurch is expected to grow, while major investment in the urban cycleway network continues to encourage active transport choices.

2.2 Cultural values and aspirations

The Greater Christchurch area is an outstanding cultural landscape for Ngāi Tahu whānui. It is the hapū of Te Ngāi Tūhùri, Ngāti Whake (Rāpaki) and Taumutu Rūnanga who hold mana whenua over this cultural landscape. Integral to its role as mana whenua is the inherited responsibility bestowed upon mandated individuals to act as kaitiaki, and to ensure that the principles of respect, reciprocity and sustainability are adhered to when making decisions that affect the environment in the area.

Central to the role and responsibilities of kaitiakitanga is the holistic concept known as Kī Uta Kī Tai (from the mountains to the sea). The concept of Kī Uta Kī Tai maintains that each of the constituent components of the natural environment are interconnected, and that an action in one location will have a flow on effect and impact on another location.

The concept of Kī Uta Kī Tai can apply equally to the built environment whereby decisions that we make about future urban growth will have repercussions for associated infrastructure and service requirements. Accordingly, this Update has sought to adopt an integrated and holistic approach that recognises the interconnected nature of the Greater Christchurch environment.

Contained within the Greater Christchurch cultural landscape is a mosaic of values, many of which date back to time immemorial and which serve as tangible reminders of the intergenerational relationship that Ngāi Tahu Whenua share with the natural environment. In preparing this Update, the Partnership recognizes that decisions we make about the future spatial distribution of housing and business activities in Greater Christchurch must align with traditional and contemporary cultural values. These values include:

- Wāhi ingoa (place names), which often represent people, historical events, geographical features and Natural flora and fauna;
- Ara tawhito (traditional trails), which were the arteries of important social and economic relationships;
- Ngā wai, which are the freshwater resources that are the life blood of Papatūānuku (Earth Mother) and the life giver of all things;
- Mahinga kai, which encompasses the customary (and contemporary) gathering of food and natural materials, and the places where these are gathered from;
- Mauri, which encompasses the essence that binds the physical and spiritual elements of all things together, generating and upholding life;
- Wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga sites, which includes both archaeological sites and natural features, and species that are sacred, treasured and revered by Ngāi Tahu whānui.
The key principles that govern the manner in which these values are to be managed are set out in the Mahāanui Iwi Management Plan. The Mahāanui Iwi Management Plan is an expression of kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga, and contains detailed policies that reflect the kaupapa of Ngāi Tahu whānui in respect of the management of natural and physical resources.

Although much of the cultural landscape that encompasses the Greater Christchurch area is now highly modified, its significance to Ngāi Tahu whānui is in no way diminished. The many traditional values that attach themselves to the cultural landscape maintain a contemporary significance. To this end, the preparation of this document has been undertaken in close partnership with both Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (as a member of the Partnership) and Ngā Papatipu Rūnanga who hold mana whenua over Greater Christchurch.

It is important to record that, for Ngāi Tahu, subdivision and land use change can increase the potential for effects on sites and areas of cultural significance. These effects may be concerned with land disturbance and the introduction of activities which are inappropriate in close proximity to, or causing the displacement or loss of wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga values. In addition, intensification of the built environment may increase demand for water supply, wastewater and stormwater disposal, adversely affecting surface and groundwater resources.

2.3 Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

The Urban Development Strategy (UDS) was produced by the Partnership in 2007 to provide the strategic direction for urban growth in Greater Christchurch. It promotes an integrated and intergenerational approach to planning for urban growth, and seeks to ensure that development is managed in a manner that protects environments, improves transport links, creates liveable areas and sustainably manages population growth. Formed after extensive consultation, the UDS seeks to consolidate development in and around well-defined urban and rural town centres.

The vision, principles and strategic goals in the UDS continue to guide the Partnership’s approach to enabling future growth, and have helped to shape the planning directions proposed in this Update.

Vision (kaupapa)

*Greater Christchurch has a vibrant inner city and suburban centres surrounded by thriving rural communities and towns, connected by efficient and sustainable infrastructure.*

*There is a wealth of public spaces ranging from bustling inner city streets to expansive open spaces and parks, which embrace natural systems, landscapes and heritage.*

*Innovative businesses are welcome and can thrive, supported by a wide range of attractive facilities and opportunities.*

*Prosperous communities can enjoy a variety of lifestyles in good health and safety, enriched by the diversity of cultures and the beautiful environment of Greater Christchurch.*

---

An update of the UDS in 2016 retained the vision for Greater Christchurch but revised the principles and strategic goals from the 2007 UDS to reflect the changes that had occurred since the earthquakes.
Principles and strategic goals (whainga)

The principles and strategic goals of the UDS expand on the vision by describing the key outcomes we seek to achieve under four themes: healthy communities, enhanced natural environments, prosperous economies and integrated and managed urban development. Given the emphasis of this Update on spatial planning matters, particular regard has been given to the strategic goals related to ‘integrated and managed urban development’, while also recognising the broader contribution that quality urban environments can bring to our overall quality of life.

Figure 3: UDS principles, themes and relevant strategic goals
2.4 National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) came into effect in December 2016, providing direction to decision-makers under the Resource Management Act 1991 in respect of planning for urban environments. It requires all councils that have part, or all, of a medium or high growth urban area within their district or region to produce a future development strategy which demonstrates that sufficient, feasible development capacity is available to support future housing and business growth. This includes over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years) periods.

The Christchurch urban area was defined by Statistics NZ in 2016 as a high growth urban area. Given the strategic planning arrangements that already exist between councils in Greater Christchurch through the Partnership, it was agreed that a review of Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern should be done collaboratively, and in doing so, meet the statutory requirements of the NPS-UDC. Accordingly, the Partnership has determined that the Greater Christchurch area shown in Figure 1 should be the geographic area of focus for the Update and the relevant urban environment for the purposes of the NPS-UDC requirements. This Update therefore meets the requirements of Policies PC12 and PC13 of the NPS-UDC (related to producing a ‘future development strategy’) by:

- demonstrating that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity over the medium and long term;
- identifying the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity in new urban environments and intensification opportunities within existing urban environments;
- balancing the certainty regarding the provision of future development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development;
- being informed by a Capacity Assessment, the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies required under the Local Government Act 2002, and any other relevant strategies, plans and documents;
- having particular regard to NPS-UDC Policy PA1.

To inform the spatial planning decisions outlined in this Update, the Partnership has developed an evidence base that provides information about current and future housing and business trends in Greater Christchurch. This has included monitoring urban development indicators and preparing a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment, which are both required by the NPS-UDC.

Figure 4: NPS-UDC policies and their interrelationship

---

6 The Christchurch urban area is identified by Statistics NZ as including the towns of Prebbleton in Selwyn and Kaiapoi in Waimakariri.

7 The Urban Development Indicators Monitoring Reports and Capacity Assessment produced by the Partnership can be accessed at www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz.
The Capacity Assessment estimates the demand for and supply of housing and business land to indicate whether there is sufficient, feasible development capacity currently planned in Greater Christchurch to meet our growth needs for the next 30 years.

In undertaking this work, the NPS-UDC requires councils to estimate the sufficiency of development capacity to meet future demand taking into account relevant regional and district plan provisions, actual and likely availability of development infrastructure, the current feasibility and rate of take up of capacity, and the market response in terms of what has been built, where this has occurred and at what price.\(^8\)

This Update summarises the findings of the Capacity Assessment, identifies any sufficiency issues and provides our planning and policy response.

![Figure 5: Aspects of development capacity](image)

2.5 Where does this Update fit?

National context

This Update has been prepared within the legislative context of the Resource Management Act 1991, Local Government Act 2002 and Land Transport Management Act 2003. It has also been undertaken at a time when the Government is strengthening its approach to urban development and regional economic growth, and reviewing the mix of instruments available to effect change in New Zealand’s cities. This includes a review of how local government can effectively finance infrastructure improvements to support future growth, which is a critical challenge facing most high growth urban areas.

The Urban Growth Agenda is the Government’s response to the challenges confronting New Zealand’s cities, especially in terms of worsening housing affordability. It seeks to address the fundamentals of land supply, development capacity and infrastructure provision by removing any undue constraints, with the initial focus of the programme on:

- enabling responsive infrastructure provision and appropriate cost allocation;
- enabling strategic planning to increase development opportunities and support quality built environments;

\(^8\) Requirement of Policy PB3 of the NPS-UDC.
• building stronger partnerships between local and central government as a means to undertaking pro-growth and integrated spatial planning;
• ensuring the price of transport infrastructure promotes access to the network and efficient urban form; and
• ensuring the regulatory, institutional and funding settings under the Resource Management Act, Local Government Act and Land Transport Management Act are collectively supporting the objectives of the Urban Growth Agenda.

The Government’s commitment to this Urban Growth Agenda has been reinforced by the creation of a new Ministry of Housing and Urban Development. There are also important interdependencies between the Urban Growth Agenda and other Government initiatives, such as establishing a national Urban Development Authority, the Kiwibuild programme to build 100,000 affordable homes for first time buyers, the Housing First programme to house and support people who have been homeless for a long time and face multiple needs, the Public Housing Plan to increase the supply of social housing and proposed changes to the Residential Tenancies Act 1986 to improve the conditions for people renting.

The new Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has also influenced this Update. The GPS makes clear that the transformation of the land transport system is a priority for the Government, signalling its commitment to:

• a mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment;
• incorporating technology and innovation into the design and delivery of land transport investment;
• integrating land use and transport planning and delivery.

Future updates to the GPS are likely to seek to establish local and central government agreements on transport’s role in the future development of metropolitan areas such as Greater Christchurch. It will consider the role of transport as an enabler, connector and shaper of New Zealand’s cities, and opportunities for investment in rapid transit options (e.g. light rail and dedicated bus routes) to support transit-oriented development in major urban areas.

Other considerations at the national level include the emerging National Policy Statement on Versatile Land and High Class Soils and the Zero Carbon Bill, with the latter aiming to achieve net zero emissions in New Zealand by 2050.
Local and regional context

A range of plans, strategies and programmes have been developed, or are being developed, at the local and regional level that will influence how Greater Christchurch grows and changes in the future. It is important this Update aligns and integrates with these initiatives to support a cohesive approach to planning. Key considerations encompass transport plans, regeneration plans and strategies, health programmes, climate change and hazard management programmes, and other plans, strategies and programmes being delivered by councils and iwi in relation to growth management.

The implementation of some of the planning responses in this Update will also require changes to resource management documents, including to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri. This will involve, at a minimum, the insertion of housing targets for each local authority.

Figure 6: National, regional and local context for the Settlement Pattern Update
3. Our Growth Needs

Guidance produced by the Ministry for the Environment and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment to help councils meet the evidence and monitoring policies of the NPS-UDC acknowledges that the ‘future is inherently uncertain and impossible to accurately predict, especially over the long term’.  

3.1 Population and household growth

The risks associated with planning for an uncertain future can be managed by utilising the most up-to-date and robust population and household projections, and considering possible growth scenarios. In this way, Statistics NZ provides three possible projection scenarios: low, medium and high growth. As shown in Figure 7, the variances in these scenarios are relatively high for the territorial authorities in Greater Christchurch, partly due to the disruptions and associated uncertainties created by the Canterbury earthquake sequence in 2010 and 2011.

Statistics NZ’s projection scenarios were considered against historic trends and local circumstances to determine the most appropriate scenario to adopt for each territorial authority, and consequently for Greater Christchurch. These provide estimates of the demand for housing (and indirectly for business land) over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years).

Figure 7: Population growth scenarios for Greater Christchurch

To reflect the recent growth trends in Greater Christchurch, the Partnership agreed to adopt the medium projection for Christchurch City, and the medium-high projection for both Selwyn and Waimakariri, as the basis for the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment. This approach sought to balance a desire to be ‘ahead of the curve’ when planning for growth, with ensuring that the financing and provision of new infrastructure is timely to support future growth needs. It is possible, should local trends and circumstances change, that subsequent Capacity Assessments adopt different projection scenarios for Greater Christchurch.

---

8 National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, June 2017, p26
Based on the adopted scenario, the population in Greater Christchurch is projected to grow to about 640,000 by 2048, being 150,000 more residents than in 2018. As outlined in Table 1, this population growth translates to about 74,000 new households in Greater Christchurch by 2048, with 54% of this growth in Christchurch City, 28% in Selwyn and 18% in Waimakariri.

Although not specifically planned for as part of this Update, the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy suggests the need for net migration in the Canterbury region to be higher than historic rates to help sustain a strong regional economy. Should new policy settings be adopted by the Government in the effort to achieve more aspirational population growth either nationally or regionally, the Partnership would need to consider the implications of an even higher growth scenario as part of future updates and reviews of the UDS.

3.2 Housing

Demand

Based on the adopted growth scenario for Greater Christchurch, projected population and household growth will generate demand for about 74,000 new dwellings over the next 30 years. When the margins (or buffers) required by the NPS-UDC are added to this housing demand, the number of new dwellings that need to be planned for in Greater Christchurch increases to almost 87,000, as set out in Table 2. These margins provide flexibility to allow for situations when developments are not brought to the market, meaning extra development capacity is required to ensure future needs are met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medium Term (2018 - 2028)</th>
<th>Long Term (2028 - 2048)</th>
<th>Total 30 Year Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>14,500 (17,400)</td>
<td>25,200 (29,000)</td>
<td>39,700 (46,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>7,200 (8,600)</td>
<td>13,500 (15,600)</td>
<td>20,700 (24,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>5,200 (6,300)</td>
<td>8,400 (9,700)</td>
<td>13,600 (16,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>26,900 (32,300)</td>
<td>47,100 (54,300)</td>
<td>74,000 (86,600)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bracketed numbers include the additional planning margins required by NPS-UDC Policies PC1 to PC4. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest 100.

A comprehensive assessment of the future housing demand profile for Greater Christchurch was commissioned as part of the Capacity Assessment, and revealed common trends likely for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri over the next 30 years. Of significance are the projected increases in the elderly population and decreases in the average household sizes across Greater Christchurch, and the implications of these changes for the types of dwellings required to meet future needs.

While standalone homes on large sections will continue to make an important contribution towards meeting future housing demand, the shifting demographic and household profile in Greater Christchurch means a growing share of demand is expected to be met by smaller housing types, such as apartments and townhouses. Much of the growing demand for smaller housing types will be focused in the City and provided through the private rental market, while some demand for such housing types will also be evident in the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri by 2048.

Due to the close location of Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri, these local housing markets share a number of similarities, for example three to four bedroom dwellings make up about two thirds of the overall housing stock for each territorial authority. Although some demand for housing will be transferable between these local markets, this is not always the case given individuals and families make decisions on where they want to live based on their own needs and wants at the time of buying a house. Such factors include lifestyle, and proximity to amenities, education

---

12 Margins include an additional 20% over the medium term and 15% over the long term as outlined in Policies PC1 to PC4 of the NPS-UDC.
13 Livingston Associates, Housing Demand in Greater Christchurch, November 2017
14 Census 2013: Number of bedrooms for occupied private dwellings in Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri.
and employment. In the future, these factors are also likely to alter due to demographic changes, meaning the three housing markets will need to adapt to the changing profile of future housing demand.

**Figure 8: Housing demand by Council area and housing type across Greater Christchurch**

What key factors will influence our future and changing housing demand profile?

- **Increase in the share of households with aged 65 years +**
  - Projected to grow from currently 24% to 35% by 2048

- **Growth in multi-person households**
  - Number of households projected to increase by 30% by 2048

- **Growth in single person households**
  - Number of households projected to increase by 50% by 2048

- **Decrease in home ownership rates**
  - 71% of housing demand in the City will be met by private rentals, 33% in Selwyn and 36% in Waimakariri

- **Smaller average household sizes**
  - Household sizes projected to decrease from 2.5 to 2.4 in the City, 2.9 to 2.6 in Selwyn and 2.6 to 2.4 in Waimakariri

- **Share of all new households that will need housing under $350,000 to buy or $200/week to rent to be affordable**
  - 62% of new households in the City, 35% in Selwyn and 58% in Waimakariri

- **Share of housing demand likely to be met by multi-unit dwellings**
  - 60% of housing demand in the City, 7% in Selwyn and 25% in Waimakariri

- **Increase in share of households with a long term health condition or disability**

**Targets**

The NPS-UDC directs councils to set minimum targets for housing development capacity for both the medium and long term periods. These targets are informed by the projected demands for housing identified in the Capacity Assessment. Through this Update, Councils need to demonstrate how sufficient, feasible development capacity will be provided and serviced to accommodate the number of new dwellings planned for each territorial authority over these periods and set out how these targets will be met.

Having considered the most appropriate housing targets for Greater Christchurch, the Partnership believes that targets that simply duplicate the projected demands for each territorial authority would not take account of our unique post-earthquake circumstances, and over the longer term, may not align with the strategic goals of the UDS to increasingly support growth by redeveloping and intensifying existing urban areas.

However, the development trends that currently characterise Greater Christchurch will also not change overnight, with the market and people’s preferences needing time to respond to the new opportunities being created by
regeneration and place-making initiatives underway in the Central City, suburban centres and surrounding local
neighbourhoods in Christchurch City.

The targets for housing development capacity therefore represent a transitional approach that align with projected
demands over the medium term, but allow for a greater share of new households in Greater Christchurch to be
supported through redevelopment in the City over the long term.13 The regional targets for Greater Christchurch
correspond to projected demand, it is only the territorial authority apportionment of these targets over the long term
that represents a transitional approach.

In this context, the targets set out in Table 2 for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri represent the development
capacity that each council will, over the medium term, zone and otherwise, enable through their relevant planning
processes and mechanisms (district plans, structure plans, outline development plans and infrastructure strategies)
and over the long term, identify in relevant plans and strategies, to meet the demand for housing in Greater
Christchurch over the medium and long term.14 A change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2019 will
include a policy that will enable land required to meet an identified medium term capacity need to be rezoned in
district plans. Unless already enabled, additional development capacity required over the long term will only be
shown on Map A of the Regional Policy Statement as a Future Development Area, identified in relevant plans and
strategies, and the development infrastructure15 required to service it will be identified in each council’s infrastructure
strategy.

These targets will need to be revisited every 3 years following the completion of scheduled Capacity Assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medium Term (2018 - 2028)</th>
<th>Long Term (2028 - 2048)</th>
<th>Total 30 Year Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>17,400 (54%)</td>
<td>38,550 (71%)</td>
<td>55,950 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>8,600 (27%)</td>
<td>8,690 (16%)</td>
<td>17,290 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>6,300 (19%)</td>
<td>7,060 (13%)</td>
<td>13,360 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>32,300</td>
<td>54,300</td>
<td>86,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures included in the table represent number of dwellings. Bracketed figures represent the share of dwellings for that period.

**Sufficiency**

Collectively, the district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri already allow for a substantial number of
dewllings to be built in and around their urban areas. This development capacity is provided through greenfield
housing areas (new subdivisions) and the redevelopment of existing housing areas. Some additional capacity also
exists in rural locations surrounding the main towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri. Most of the capacity in Greater
Christchurch is currently provided in the City, with only about 13% provided in Selwyn and 6% in Waimakariri.

The Capacity Assessment included extensive work to assess the commercial feasibility of housing development
capacity in Greater Christchurch. This work highlighted that assessing feasibility can be extremely complex and that
further work is required to better understand and then respond to the challenges of improving feasibility, especially in
relation to the redevelopment market. Key areas for further investigation include understanding the influences on and
of land values, sales prices and build and land development costs, and how these factors could change over time to
improve the relative feasibility of housing developments.

---

13 The longer term share of new households to be provided within Christchurch City reflects those outlined in the UDS 2007.
14 Table 2 will be inserted into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch). Relevant
   local authority targets will also be inserted into the district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri.
15 Development infrastructure means network infrastructure for water supply, wastewater, stormwater, and land transport as defined in the Land
   Transport Management Act 2003, to the extent that it is controlled by local authorities, and including New Zealand Transport Agency.
In this context, the feasibility tests undertaken as part of the Capacity Assessment produced a wide range of results for Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri depending on the adopted set of assumptions and inputs. Further work to improve the modelling tools used for Capacity Assessment findings will occur as part of the next assessment in 2020.

Based on the housing targets, the overall amount of feasible housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch is sufficient to meet demand over the medium term. However, there is insufficient development capacity in certain locations within Greater Christchurch in the medium term and overall when you consider the long term housing demand.

At the territorial authority level, given the range of reported feasibility, capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri may not be sufficient to meet demand over the medium term, while the significant capacity in the City is expected to be sufficient over the next 30 years, even with a higher share of growth apportioned to the City over the long term period (see Table 3).

These projected shortfalls in housing development capacity must be resolved to enable our urban areas to develop and change, and respond to the needs of both current and future generations. How the Partnership will respond to the projected capacity shortfalls in Greater Christchurch is addressed in Sections 5 and 6.

Table 3: Sufficiency of Housing Development Capacity in Greater Christchurch against Housing Targets, 2018 - 2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Development Capacity</th>
<th>Housing Target</th>
<th>Sufficiency of Housing Development Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Term (2018 - 2028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>59,950 *</td>
<td>+ 38,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>9,725 **</td>
<td>+1,825 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>4,200 **</td>
<td>-1,600 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>73,875</td>
<td>+39,100 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Capacity figures included in the table represent number of dwellings (numbers have been rounded to the nearest 25).

In the medium term, capacity for around 3,500 dwellings in Christchurch is constrained by the provision of necessary infrastructure.

Sufficiency of housing development capacity will be reviewed and published as further feasibility modelling and investigation is completed.

These housing targets include the additional capacity margins required by the NPS-UDC as shown in Table 1.

* Alternative modelled scenarios documented in the Capacity Assessment, which are based on less favourable assumptions, identified development capacity for approximately 52,675 or 36,400 dwellings.

** These capacity figures are derived from a qualitative assessment of greenfield land only. An alternative modelled scenario, including existing zoned land and incorporating changes in prices and costs over time, identified development capacity for the long term of approximately 9,200 dwellings in Selwyn and 6,100 dwellings in Waimakariri.

*** These sufficiency figures have been adjusted to discount the demand over the medium and long term likely to be met through uptake of development in rural zoned areas (averaging 70 dwellings/year for Selwyn and 50 dwellings/year for Waimakariri). Demand met through capacity in rural areas will be reviewed following the review of rural zoning as part of respective District Plan Reviews in Selwyn and Waimakariri.

Further and ongoing refinement of the feasibility tools will be undertaken by constituent partner councils and incorporated as part of the next capacity assessment due in 2020. This assessment will also benefit from more up-to-date data and can be used as the basis for making any zoning changes to address development capacity shortfalls as part of the District Plan Reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri.
3.3 Business

Demand

Significant business growth is projected in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years. This increase is driven predominantly by population and household growth and consequently the highest growth sectors are those providing retail goods (contributing 17% of employment growth), health/education (contributing 42% of growth) and services (19% of growth). Given the strong population growth driver, the structure and quantum of employment growth projected by the Capacity Assessment could be different if the population growth projected by Statistics NZ does not eventuate.

The tourism sector is also expected to contribute to a significant proportion of the growth over the period (accommodation contributing 16% of growth) whilst employment in the primary and industrial sectors is expected to remain relatively stable, contrasting with historic negative trends observed for these sectors.

In total, an additional 67,000 employment opportunities are projected by 2048, with most of these located within Christchurch City (89%) and creating additional demands for land and floorspace.

Figure 9: Projected employment growth

![Projected Employment Growth Diagram]

---
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Sufficiency

The Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri district plans already make generous provision for meeting the long term needs for industrial land, and future commercial space is also mostly provided for, at least over the medium term.\(^\text{17}\) Over the longer term, the Capacity Assessment identifies potential shortfalls in commercial space, notably in areas projected to experience significant residential growth, including the Central City, the south-west and north-west parts of the City, and the main centres in Selwyn and Waimakariri.

The sufficiency of industrial and commercial development capacity to meet projected demand is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Sufficiency of Industrial and Commercial Development Capacity in Greater Christchurch, 2018 – 2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sufficiency of Industrial Development Capacity</th>
<th>Sufficiency of Commercial Development Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>+ 665</td>
<td>+ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>+ 205 to + 230</td>
<td>+ 190 to + 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>+ 60 to + 110</td>
<td>+ 45 to + 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>+ 930 to + 1,010</td>
<td>+ 420 to + 505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures included in the table represent land in hectares (rounded to the nearest 5 hectares from the Capacity Assessment). Ranges reflect the uncertainty that additional demand for business land and floorspace can be accommodated by under-utilised business land. Commercial development capacity includes both commercial office land and commercial retail land.

Business land is inherently more flexible than housing land, with a wide range of business uses enabled on most business sites. As a consequence, the Capacity Assessment identified that most industrial and commercial zoned land in Greater Christchurch was commercially feasible for at least one type of business use. Given that longer term demands for business space can be affected by a wide range of factors, regular monitoring and review of uptake and other market indicators, as well as sensitivity testing of modelled assumptions, will be important to confirm actual levels of demand and ensure appropriate planning responses are made at the necessary times.

\(^{17}\) Reference to commercial space includes both commercial office space and commercial retail space.
4. Our Challenges

4.1 Key growth issues for Greater Christchurch

Arising from the context outlined in Section 2 and the evidence base from the Capacity Assessment summarised in Section 3, the Partnership recognises that there are some key issues that need to be considered as part of our planning directions and responses. These key issues for Greater Christchurch are discussed below.

Delivering new dwellings through redevelopment and intensification

Delivering higher density housing is essential to supporting the needs and preferences of a growing share of the population, and for achieving the consolidated urban form that most effectively accommodates growth. Although the uptake of redevelopment opportunities in Greater Christchurch is not yet back to pre-earthquake levels, the scale of redevelopment has started to trend upwards and is getting close to the intensification targets set in the UDS and Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. To unlock further redevelopment opportunities, the new Christchurch District Plan has ‘up-zoned’ areas to allow for medium and high density housing redevelopments, and streamlined consenting approval processes. However, there are challenges to delivering redevelopment in Greater Christchurch requiring the development sector to be appropriately supported to help bring such developments to the market and ensure the rate of new dwellings delivered through intensification strengthens.

Meeting housing needs and preferences for current and future residents

In comparison to other New Zealand cities, the cost of housing in Greater Christchurch is relatively affordable, however the provision of social and affordable housing will become an increasingly critical issue. Enabling higher density housing developments at different price points will be vital to meeting the projected increase in demand for smaller, more affordable dwellings. District plan provisions play an important role in helping to deliver a broad range of housing types, while other targeted programmes by constituent partner councils aim to support the development sector in delivering higher density housing to the market. Public sector investment can also play a role in boosting the attraction of areas for such developments, especially in the Central City, key activity centres and district town centres.

Recognising post-earthquake trends and anticipating future drivers

Since the earthquakes in 2010 and 2011, the location and pace of housing and population growth have been different to that anticipated at the time the UDS was produced in 2007. The increasing uptake of redevelopment in Christchurch City during the 2000s has since slowed, while development of greenfield land enabled by the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) has been advanced rapidly. These trends partly reflect the unique situation in which a significant number of households had to be urgently reaccommodated following the earthquakes. A key challenge is therefore to understand whether the demands driving these trends will continue in the future or shift back to pre-earthquake trends, and whether any policy intervention will be required. This highlights the importance of both monitoring, to understand any key changes, and the role of planning and policy directions in this Update to enable the market to meet future demands.

Integrating land use and transport planning to shape desired urban form

Integrated land use and transport planning is a key principle that underpins the strategic direction for urban growth in Greater Christchurch. However, the key challenge of achieving sufficient and equitable infrastructure funding remains. In this context, the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has offered new opportunities for investing in our transport system, with the possible development of a local and central government agreement on transport’s role in the future development of Greater Christchurch signaled in the GPS. Discussions with the Government and infrastructure providers will be important in delivering the types of improvements to our transport network that will help enable our desired urban form. Aligning development with good access to a range of transport modes will reduce the reliance on private vehicles, and provide associated social, environmental and economic benefits for all people and communities.
Living with, and mitigating climate change impacts

The way we plan Greater Christchurch has a big impact on how we use and consume resources, including those that have an impact on climate change, and also how we respond to effects associated with climate change. Providing opportunities for modal shift to active forms of transport, increased uptake of public transport, reducing trip distances, and promoting new non-fuel burning transport technologies all minimise the impact the residents have in terms of their contribution to greenhouse gas emissions. How we enable carbon offsetting activities to work towards zero net carbon emissions also needs to be a consideration in our planning frameworks. Planning for development in the right places ensures that as a wider community, the adverse effects from the impacts of climate change can be appropriately avoided or mitigated, and potentially lead to long term resilience and security for food production. This includes making the right choices that take into account sea-level rise, as well as changing weather patterns and their contribution to severe weather events, including flooding and drought, so that future generations do not bear the cost of our decision-making.

Valuing the relationship between our urban areas and the environment

Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern principles from the UDS promote a sustainable urban form that protects our natural environment, rural character and versatile soils. They also align with the Ngāi Tahu value of kaitiakitanga, and recognise the mauri of waterways and cultural landscapes. Where new greenfield development will be required to help meet our future needs, there are constraints as to where development can and should occur across Greater Christchurch. Coastal and flood hazards areas, groundwater aquifers, outstanding natural landscapes, versatile soils and airport noise contours all create limitations on where new development can be located. Figure 10 outlines some of these relevant constraints (some data layers are currently being refined as part of District Plan Reviews). Other constraints exist but some can and have been mitigated ahead of development occurring, such as ground improvements in areas with geotechnical constraints or requiring raised floor levels in areas with lower flood risk. In this context, it is important to ensure that our plan for growth recognises that the vitality of our urban areas is intrinsically linked to that of our environment, and that our urban areas need to be increasingly resilient to changes in our natural environment and better integrate natural systems within the urban landscape.18

Fostering an equitable planning approach across our communities

Although the focus of this Update is to demonstrate sufficient development capacity for growth, the wider strategic goals of the UDS will not be realised without considering the needs of more disadvantaged areas and communities. One key element of Christchurch City Council and Regenerate Christchurch’s work programme is supporting regeneration in eastern Christchurch, with the post-earthquake movements of people and businesses westward heightening some pre-existing disparities. Targeted place-making investments by the public sector can give confidence to private sector housing redevelopment which typically favours more affluent neighbourhoods, driven by the more attractive returns from higher sales prices.

Underlying all these challenges will be how Greater Christchurch responds to known or potential shocks and stresses to the economy, society and our environment. For example, understanding, preparing, mitigating and adapting to climate change is a central part of the Partnership’s Resilient Greater Christchurch plan. Furthermore, global financial fluctuations and the pervasive impact of new technology can fundamentally change growth projections, labour force requirements and how we function as a society. This Update is conscious of the role settlement planning can contribute to a more sustainable and resilient future but recognises that, to be effective, change needs to be a shared responsibility across all sectors and appropriately supported nationally and internationally.

---
18 The Resilient Greater Christchurch Plan sets out how Greater Christchurch can be stronger, smarter and more resilient to the physical, social and economic challenges that are a growing part of the 21st century. It can be accessed at http://greaterchristchurch.org.nz/projects/resilient-greater-christchurch/
Figure 10: Example constraints on development across Greater Christchurch
4.2 Priorities for this Update

This Update focuses on those key strategic planning directions that need to be undertaken collaboratively through the Partnership to address the land use and infrastructure issues identified in the Capacity Assessment. It recognises that providing development capacity is not just about land supply so also considers other more detailed planning and policy actions that will need to be implemented to realise our broader growth aspirations.

The priority areas for the Update include:

- Achieving the desired urban form and principles of the UDS, and the coordinated planning and decision-making required under the NPS-UDC, and addressing:
  - Projected shortfalls of housing development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri;
  - Projected shortfalls of commercial development capacity across Greater Christchurch;
- Unlocking redevelopment opportunities across Greater Christchurch, but especially in the central city, key activity centres, district town centres and along core transport corridors;
- Ensuring that future housing provides a range of dwelling types to meet the changing demand profile in Greater Christchurch, including the projected higher demand for smaller, more affordable units, and the future demand of Ngāi Tahu whānau to establish kāinga nohoanga settlements on their ancestral land;
- Integrating land use and transport planning to ensure future urban growth is effectively and efficiently supported by the transport network, including delivering a significantly enhanced public transport system;
- Ensuring public and private investments support the desired pattern of urban growth.

Our response to these priorities for Greater Christchurch is described in Section 5, Our Plan. Further actions to be undertaken by constituent partners following this Update are set out in Section 6, Our Next Steps, recognising that although the long term is addressed in this Update, additional work is required to ensure our planning directions for the longer term are appropriately investigated and implemented, and effectively respond to emerging drivers of change for Greater Christchurch.
5. Our Plan

5.1 Greater Christchurch’s settlement pattern

The Partnership’s plan for supporting urban growth over the next 30 years is strongly guided by the vision and strategic goals from the UDS, and the extensive planning framework that has already been developed for Greater Christchurch to support long term growth. It focuses on responding to the priorities detailed in Section 4, Our Challenges, and seeks to provide greater certainty over the medium term (next 10 years) than the long term (10 to 30 years). This will allow the Partnership to further consider the most appropriate planning directions and responses to our longer term issues.

Our plan aims to maintain the UDS principle of consolidating urban development in and around Christchurch City, and the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri. It balances the strong demand for housing in towns outside the City with the anticipated return to stronger levels of demand for higher density housing in the City. To deliver new housing of the right type and location to meet demand, both now and in the future, it is important that a suitable range of greenfield and redevelopment opportunities are provided to the market.

This takes into account the need to provide for efficient movement of people and goods, so that transport efficiency is optimised. This in turn will have an impact on Christchurch’s overall contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and the efficient use of energy resources. The impact of having a compact urban form increases the ability to contribute to the uptake of public transport opportunities, as well as reduced trip distances that enable active modes of transport. Choices also need to be made to ensure that development takes place in the right places, so that we contribute to intergenerational equity and ensure that our future generations inherit as city that functions efficiently and is resilient to future impacts from climate change and resource scarcity.

In this context, the Partnership identifies that, by setting the housing targets shown in section 3.2, 65% of Greater Christchurch’s housing growth through to 2048 should be supported in Christchurch City, with the remaining 20% in Selwyn and 15% in Waimakariri.

This settlement pattern approach features a slightly lower share of growth in the City than envisaged by the UDS, with the higher share in the districts a reflection of the strong housing demand that has characterised these areas. Our plan seeks to ensure that sufficient housing capacity is provided in both Selwyn and Waimakariri to enable growth in district towns, while also transitioning to more growth being provided through redevelopment in the City over the longer term.

To implement this plan, the Partnership considers that some new greenfield housing areas should be released or otherwise identified in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi to help address projected housing capacity shortfalls for Selwyn and Waimakariri over the medium to long term. The location of these greenfield areas is consistent with the long term growth strategy from the UDS. Increasing take up of redevelopment opportunities will also be essential to achieve the housing targets for the City and realise the consolidated urban form aspirations for Greater Christchurch.

Christchurch City Council is developing programmes to support redevelopment in the City, with the initial focus on the Central City.

Our plan for supporting business growth over the next 30 years is to focus on boosting the self-sufficiency of growing areas and respond to the needs of different commercial and industrial sectors.

While industrial space requirements are already well catered for in Greater Christchurch, new commercial space is required to support the needs of our growing population. The Partnership will continue to focus commercial developments predominately in the Central City, reinforcing it as the principal commercial hub of the Canterbury region, while also supporting developments in key activity centres, town centres and neighbourhood centres as part of supporting thriving local communities. Opportunities to facilitate redevelopment of brownfield land will continue to be investigated.19

19 Brownfield land refers to abandoned or underutilised business land with potential for redevelopment.
Underpinning this settlement pattern approach is the vision for a transformation of the transport network that fosters much greater public and active transport usage, and reduced reliance on the private vehicle.

Achieving this vision will require commitment from the Government to invest in the necessary improvements to our transport system, which could include investing in rapid transit services, recognising the key role of transport in shaping urban form and creating liveable urban areas.

**Figure 11: Where will housing growth be located?**

How will the range of housing needs be met?

As well as providing for overall projected household growth this Update encourages a balance between new housing enabled through redevelopment opportunities within existing urban areas and development capacity, in greenfield locations in Christchurch, Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts. The approximate breakdown between these different locations for the period 2018 to 2048 is shown in Figure 12.

**Figure 12: Meeting housing demand through redevelopment and in greenfield locations**
How will we address housing affordability challenges?

Housing need relates to more than just ensuring our district plans provide sufficient development capacity. As outlined in Section 3, Our Needs, and Section 4, Our Challenges, an increasing number of households will face affordability pressures in either renting or owning their home.

Many of the potential initiatives to provide affordable housing choices across a housing continuum will need to be advanced outside of the land use focus of this Update. The Partnership is however committed to working collaboratively to develop an action plan and establish partnerships to enable social and affordable housing provision across Greater Christchurch.

Figure 13: Potential components of a social and affordable housing action plan for Greater Christchurch
### What will urban growth look like in different areas of Greater Christchurch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central City</strong></td>
<td>Continued investment in the central city significantly advances its regeneration and renewal, and improves its attraction as a vibrant and thriving Central City area. Its vitality as the main commercial hub for Greater Christchurch and the Canterbury region is bolstered by the completion of anchor projects and public realm improvements. Older industrial areas located in and around the central city are available to transition to meet demand for retail and office space, while commercial areas are remodelled and used more efficiently to maximise floorspace. New residential developments that enable 20,000 people to live in the central city are facilitated by a comprehensive programme of support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Activity Centres</strong></td>
<td>New residential and commercial opportunities become available in and around the key activity centres in Papanui, Shirley, Linwood, New Brighton, Belfast/Northwood, Riccarton, North Halswell, Spreydon and Hornby, meeting the demands arising from the growing population. Brownfield sites are increasingly redeveloped to support new land uses linked to the surrounding neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburbs and Outer Urban Areas</strong></td>
<td>The wellbeing and resilience of communities in the eastern suburbs are greatly improved as a result of major regeneration projects, including the restoration, enhancement and development of the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor. New communities become established in the northern and southwestern parts of the City, especially in and around the Halswell area. Industrial developments are mainly taken up along core freight routes to Lyttelton Port, Christchurch Airport and the rest of the South Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rolleston and Lincoln</strong></td>
<td>Rolleston continues to grow as the principal centre in Selwyn, with a range of new developments supporting a vibrant town centre and the choice of housing broadening to reflect the changing demand profile of the growing town. Industrial and large format retail expand around the I-Zone Southern Business Hub, benefiting from improved connections across State Highway 1. Lincoln develops while retaining its village and university character, with opportunities emerging from new academic and business partnerships through the Lincoln Hub initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rangiora and Kaiapoi</strong></td>
<td>Rangiora remains the principal centre in Waimakariri, continuing its town centre rejuvenation and expanding mostly eastwards to support household growth. Greenfield developments are balanced with opportunities to redevelop some of the town’s older housing stock. New commercial space integrates with the existing town centre, while new industrial developments are focused in the Southbrook area. Mixed use business areas identified through regeneration planning integrate with a growing town centre in Kaiapoi, with new housing supported by extending the town to the north. New housing and business developments in Ravenswood enables growth and better connections between Woodend and Pegasus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customary Maori Lands</strong></td>
<td>Kāinga nohoanga settlements on customary Māori land build stronger Ngāi Tahu networks and relationships, enabling more Ngāi Tahu whānau to live in more traditional housing arrangements, including clusters of housing with a range of housing types, linked to marae, social and community facilities and locally appropriate customary employment activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Christchurch City

By 2048, over half a million people will call Christchurch City home, and the City will provide over 85% of the employment opportunities in Greater Christchurch. The Christchurch District Plan, supported by the Christchurch City Council’s Long Term Plan, provides substantial opportunities to redevelop and intensify existing urban areas to meet both housing and business needs. This includes in and around the Central City, key activity centres, larger neighbourhood centres and nodes located along core public transport corridors.

The Council is developing programmes to support investment and housing redevelopment, with the initial focus on the Central City. A Central City Action Plan developed together with those who already live and do business in the Central City, provides support over the next two to three years as anchor projects and major attractions are being completed and opened. Another priority action of the Council is the Central City Residential Programme which aims to increase the residential population of the Central City from 6,000 in 2018 to 20,000 in 2028. More people means more activity and more spending which will build confidence in Christchurch’s city centre. This in turn will stimulate new investment, attract residents and deliver on the city’s post-earthquake potential. The Programme is a long term commitment to achieve six overall goals:

- More people - More people choose to live within the Central City;
- Housing choice - There is housing choice that meets the diverse needs of a wide range of households;
- Liveable neighbourhoods - Central City neighbourhoods are rated highly liveable by their residents.
- Encourage delivery - The risks of development are reduced, feasibility is improved;
- Support delivery - Effective support and advice is provided to and used by Central City housing developers;
- Accelerate delivery - Delivery of Central City housing is accelerated and sustained.

Priority actions have been identified for the first three years of the Programme. These actions will put in place the processes, tools and mechanisms to increase and sustain housing delivery for the full 10 years of the Programme, and identify the early, high-potential opportunities to increase housing delivery. The geographical focus for the Programme is the Central City, however it is expected that key programme learnings and initiatives will apply to other Key Activity Centres and along transport corridors targeted for medium density development. A focus of the Council will be working with developers and local communities to support new development that is both commercially viable and of a quality to achieve high standards of liveability.

The new greenfield areas zoned in the District Plan have been carefully chosen to avoid and protect areas of value, such as the Port Hills, the protection of our drinking water sources from unconfined aquifers, efficient operation of our airport (noise contours), preservation of productive rural land and avoidance of risk from natural hazards.

A further focus of the Council will be to advance appropriate elements of the social and affordable housing action plan outlined in Section 5.1, through partnership with central government, housing developers and community housing providers.

There will also be growth in employment opportunities. Over the next 30 years the central city will gain an additional 40,000 jobs, resulting in over 75,000 people working in the central city, many more than pre-quake. Employment is concentrated in a select number of areas – existing industrial and commercially zoned land and expansion of existing centres in the long term if required. Surplus industrial land is available to transition to commercial uses, particularly if needed to support central city growth.

Half of all the jobs in Christchurch are and will likely continue to be located in the corridor between the Central City and Hornby, and nearby suburbs, including Sydenham, Addington, Riccarton, Ilam, Sockburn, and Wigram. Providing rapid transit (busways or light rail) along this corridor will make it easier for people to reach these employment opportunities and also catalyse housing development, so more people can have the opportunity to live closer to where they work. The Northern Corridor (between the Central City and Belfast via Papanui) is another opportunity where the provision of rapid transit could stimulate redevelopment. Over time other corridors such as to the airport, to Linwood and Cashmere could be considered for rapid transit to stimulate redevelopment. Outside these corridors

---

25 The significant commercial shortfall identified by the capacity assessment for the long term, will be further sensitivity tested in the next capacity assessment.
commercial activity will continue to be located within the existing network of commercial centres particularly key activity centres.21

Figure 14: Christchurch Spatial Plan

Christchurch City is the principal centre of Greater Christchurch and contains most of the population, but the surrounding districts have also been growing quickly. Less than half of the residents of the surrounding districts work within the districts, resulting in significant commuter flows from the surrounding districts into Christchurch City. Over 100,000 vehicle trips each day travel between the districts and the City, putting pressure on the City’s transport network.

As our region grows this will increase the delays on the transport network. Encouraging more of the growth to occur in Christchurch City, where the employment opportunities are, will be vital to manage the effects of growth and reduce transport network pressures. The city will work to reduce the number of vehicles that travel into the city, particularly single occupancy vehicles, but improve transport options such as active and public transport, to enable people to move around the city easily. Improvements to public transport services and infrastructure, along with associated demand management and road pricing are being considered as part of transport planning and development of business cases.

21 Riccarton, Hornby, Northlands/Papanui, Linwood/Eastgate, North Halswell, Belfast/Northwood, New Brighton and Barrington/Spreydon.
5.3 Selwyn and Waimakariri towns

The current district plans for Selwyn and Waimakariri provide for greenfield housing areas in alignment with the settlement pattern outlined for Greater Christchurch in Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).\textsuperscript{22} This map was inserted into the CRPS following the adoption of the Land Use Recovery Plan and covers the post-earthquake recovery period through to 2028.

The Partnership has previously considered the longer term growth needs of Greater Christchurch through to 2041, with the extent of planned greenfield areas around Christchurch City and the main towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri to support future housing growth delineated by the Projected Infrastructure Boundary on Map A.

Given the projected shortfalls in housing development capacity in Selwyn and Waimakariri to meet their future needs, a change to the CRPS is proposed to allow Chapter 6 and Map A the flexibility to respond to identified medium term capacity needs. Additional capacity will be directed in the first instance to the key towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi in support of the public transport enhancement opportunities mentioned elsewhere in this Update. This is likely to identify future development areas in the two districts that are within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary. Such a change would be prepared subsequent to this Update and would likely be notified in 2019.\textsuperscript{23} These new areas will provide much of the capacity required over both the medium and long term. A 2019 change to the CRPS would ensure that land can be rezoned to meet medium term capacity needs, and the longer term will be further considered as part of a comprehensive review of the CRPS scheduled for 2022. While it is intended Our Space provides direction to inform future Resource Management Act processes, Figure 16 is indicative only.

To most efficiently utilise land within identified future development areas, consideration will also be given to appropriate residential densities. An evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum densities specified in the CRPS for each territorial authority including a review of what has been achieved to date, constraints and issues associated with achieving these minimum densities, and whether any changes to minimum densities is likely to be desirable and achievable across future development areas will be undertaken in 2019.

\textsuperscript{22} Additional housing development in Rolleston has already been enabled through two Special Housing Areas.

\textsuperscript{23} The Partnership is investigating whether to request using the new streamlined planning provision in the Resource Management Act 1991 to make this targeted change to the Regional Policy Statement.
The tables below show the density scenarios and anticipated yields from future development areas should density be managed differently in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts.

### Table 5: Selwyn: Long term shortfall : 5,475

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical additional capacity enabled in existing urban areas*</th>
<th>Density scenarios and anticipated yields from FDAs*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density 10 hh/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Waimakariri: Long term shortfall : 7,675

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical additional capacity enabled in existing urban areas*</th>
<th>Density scenarios and anticipated yields from FDAs*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density 10 hh/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Subject to enabling this additional capacity via the District Plan Review and using other mechanisms outside of the District Plan to encourage infill/intensification development. Whilst more theoretical capacity may be enabled through District Plan Reviews, robustly calculating feasibility is also limited by a lack of comparable development that provides data (e.g. house sales) within zoned areas.

^ This is derived from a total ‘gross’ hectare and does not take into account infrastructure requirements and structure planning that may reduce the developable area and total dwelling count.

In the meantime, it is expected that new urban housing in Waimakariri and Selwyn will achieve a minimum net density of 12 households per hectare where any Future Development Area is subsequently zoned. For this purpose, net density has the same meaning as set out in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. This will also provide strong guidance for the development of District Plans for both Waimakariri and Selwyn districts.

The housing demand figures in Table 1 captures some additional growth from rural areas. This is from area units that are either part rural or all rurally zoned being included in the demand figures. However, most of this rural future demand will continue to be met by rural developments in rural zones with some moving to urban areas.

Selwyn District and Waimakariri District are undertaking reviews of their respective District Plans. Both reviews will also assess additional provisions to encourage and enable redevelopment within existing urban areas and close to town centres. This is in response to the projected changes in housing demand over the next thirty years, and the role that redevelopment plays to deliver smaller, more affordable housing types that will increasingly be needed to meet future demand. Until these reviews are complete, an understanding of whether any remaining development capacity shortfalls remain is uncertain and can be better understood as part of future capacity assessments in 2020 and every three years thereafter.25

For Selwyn, this Update supports the purpose and direction of Selwyn 2031 by promoting a sustainable, consolidated centres-based urban growth pattern that supports the changing population and their housing needs. This, in turn, allows for greater public transport usage. The District Plan Review is supporting this by not actively seeking to rezone additional land for living or business outside of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary. This Update

24 This expectation is that a minimum density of at least 12 households per hectare will be achieved.
25 Some potential yields from different development scenarios were investigated as part of the options assessment outlined in Section 5.7.
will help provide a further evidence base for updates to Selwyn 2031 and other strategic documents to accommodate long-term growth through high quality urban environments. Any potential additional provision of business and housing land within the Greater Christchurch area in Selwyn will be strongly guided by this evidence and the current structure plans and town centre studies, ongoing market indicator monitoring and the evolution of the policy framework through the district plan review process.

For Waimakariri, the Council is at the early stages of planning to develop Structure Plans for east and west Rangiora and east Kaiapoi to identify how best to respond to the residential shortfall in capacity for the medium to long term. This is along with considering the long term capacity requirements of Ravenswood/Pegasus and Woodend, outlined in Waimakariri 2048: District Development Strategy.

The Council is also focusing on adopting the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan and updating the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy to continue to improve the self-sufficiency of these townships. Once these planning documents have been completed, additional zoning requirements to meet capacity shortfalls in both residential and commercial will be considered as part of the District Plan Review. This will be supported by monitoring ongoing market indicators and detailed commercial assessments.

*Figure 15: Proposed Future Development Areas in Rolleston, Kaiapoi and Rangiora*
Figure 16: Proposed locations of future development areas in Greater Christchurch.

While it is intended Our Space provides some direction to inform future RMA processes, Figure 16 is indicative only.
5.4 Land for cultural purposes

Important for mana whenua is the future ability to establish kāinga nohoanga settlements on their ancestral land. The concept of kāinga nohoanga embodies the following types of residential activities:

- Provision for whānau where extended families can live in close proximity to one another and build strong networks and relationships;
- Allowance for the construction of a mixture of housing types and densities;
- Provision for dwellings to be located in close proximity to traditional structures, such as marae, and the enablement of customary activities.

Kāinga nohoanga is not only about creating housing opportunities on tribal land. It is also about providing the commercial, social and community facilities and opportunities that allow Ngāi Tahu whānui to fully occupy and use ancestral land, recognising and enabling the principles for which the land was originally set aside.

Historically, there have been many barriers to the development of Māori customary land, including rural zoning (thereby preventing more intensive residential developments) and the lack of provision of services.

Substantial changes were made to the Waimakariri District Plan following the statutory directions included in the Land Use Recovery Plan. Further work between mana whenua and local authorities is creating a more permissive environment for the creation of kāinga nohoanga, although much work remains to be done.

Additional challenges facing the development by mana whenua of their ancestral land are the issues of climate change and sea level rise. It is likely over coming years that some Māori customary land will be more difficult to service with some areas becoming inundated, rendering them unusable for customary purposes. In these circumstances, it will be necessary for new land to be acquired and classified as Māori land under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.

Recently, significant progress has been made in both the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, the Christchurch District Plan and the review of the Selwyn District Plan towards creating a planning framework that is better equipped to enable kāinga nohoanga to be developed on Māori customary land, provided any adverse effects are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated (particularly those effects that have the potential to emanate beyond the boundary of the kāinga nohoanga development/zone).

At present, there are only two parcels of land within the existing greater Christchurch urban area that are classified as Māori customary land (in accordance with the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993); namely, MR873 at Tuahiwi and MR875 at Rāpaki. In the future, however, it is possible that new areas within the Greater Christchurch urban area may be classified as Māori customary land, provided such land has been appropriately designated as such under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.

While it is not anticipated that future kāinga nohoanga developments would be a major contributor to the overall housing capacity within greater Christchurch, they are nonetheless viewed by Ngāi Tahu whānui as playing an important future role in enabling mana whenua to live, work and play on their ancestral land in a manner that is consistent with the purposes for which such land was originally set aside pursuant to Kemp’s Deed of 1848.

It is anticipated that an integrated and collaborative approach between district councils and Ngāi Tahu whānui would be taken to any necessary upgrades of infrastructure that are deemed necessary to service future kāinga nohoanga developments, including reticulated sewerage, wastewater disposal and the supply of drinking water.
5.5 Sequencing and staging of growth

At a local level the Capacity Assessment outlined which areas signalled for growth are already supported by trunk infrastructure.28 This primarily relates to wastewater networks. Infrastructure strategies associated with the recent completed 2018-2028 Long Term Plans have documented the planned infrastructure works scheduled to be completed over the medium and long term to unlock remaining growth areas. These integrate and align with structure plans for main towns covering the development phasing associated with the efficient roll-out of infrastructure.

At a Greater Christchurch level sequencing is important to align with cross-boundary investments, especially those relating to the transport network. Collaborative planning undertaken when developing infrastructure strategies and regional land transport plans will be the mechanism to address and resolve any potential misalignment.

Future growth areas identified in Figure 15 and 16 will require more detailed planning, technical assessments and consultation with landowners to determine more specific staging of development. Existing policies in Chapter 6 of the CRPS already provide clear direction which these detailed planning processes must give effect to, particularly Policies 6.3.2 to 6.3.7. They ensure the staging of development considers how to support good urban design, align with infrastructure needs and integrate with existing urban areas. Associated policy wording is proposed to complement a change to the CRPS Map A. This will enable District Plan reviews for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to, over the medium term, zone and otherwise enable development capacity in accordance with meeting the medium term housing targets incorporated in the CRPS. Reviews of targets and the sufficiency of development capacity are part of periodic capacity assessments and enable the CRPS and district plans to remain responsive to demonstrated need.

All greenfield growth areas within Christchurch City are already zoned. Redevelopment is largely not constrained by infrastructure so the location and timing of development will be principally governed by the market. The role of the City Council and other influencers is therefore to encourage and support the market to respond to opportunities most likely to support Central City and suburban centre growth and increase the scale and range of housing available close to key public transport routes.

5.6 Transport and other infrastructure

Integrated land use and transport planning

Over the next 30 years, Greater Christchurch is projected to see significant population growth, meaning more people will be making more trips across the transport network. If traffic volumes increase at the same rate as the population, there will be more congestion and longer journey times. Further major investment in the road network is not scheduled. For Greater Christchurch to remain productive, the integration of land use and transport planning is therefore essential to managing our future urban growth.

Transport infrastructure, services and mode choices are important for enabling and supporting population and housing growth in new and existing urban areas, while the location of growth affects how well the transport system performs. Given transport and land use are so strongly connected, all decisions need to consider their impact on the other.

In this context, the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) has provided new opportunities for how we can plan for growth as it represents a fundamental shift in the strategic direction for transport in New Zealand. It seeks to transition to a more holistic, mode-neutral approach to transport investment, with an increased focus on achieving a range of social and environmental outcomes. It also places more emphasis on the crucial role of transport in shaping urban form, creating liveable cities and reducing the need to travel by private vehicle.

It will be important to ensure that transport is integrated with land use but also that all the components of the network are joined in a way that makes it easier to make choices on how to travel. Greater Christchurch already has a well-integrated network that has very high accessibility. This means that for a majority of areas there is a choice of

28 Outlined in Section 4.2 and 8.3 of the Capacity Assessment and further detailed in supporting technical reports.
options for walking, cycling, public transport or using a private car, with strong integration between these different modes of travel.

Recent investments in the cycleway network have provided more opportunities to encourage safer cycling trips around Christchurch City and between centres, while technological advances through electric bikes will mean that this mode will become increasingly accessible as a means of travel.

However, with significant population growth within the City and in the surrounding districts, the current freedom and independence we enjoy in travelling around will in future become more difficult unless there is a significant shift in how we think about and approach transport.

Transport business cases underway will consider the multi-modal transport programme that will address such matters. These include specific investigations to determine the appropriate investment required to support an enhanced public transport system and improvements along key transport corridors, including those that are part of the strategic transport network and support freight movements. This programme will be developed on the basis of the strategic directions from the UDS, and would contribute to the strategic goals related to an integrated and managed urban development.

In particular, it will help create a more efficient, reliable, safe and resilient transport system that promotes the use of active and public transport, and improves accessibility for all people in Greater Christchurch. Integrating land use and transport is particularly important for rapid transit and supporting an efficient public transport network. Each can have a positive influence on the others by improving the accessibility of an area and supporting growth and housing density around rapid transit corridors and stations. This is essential to maximise the benefits from the large investment required to build and operate rapid transit.

**Future of public transport**

The strategic priorities underpinning the GPS align with the work being undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee to deliver a step change in Greater Christchurch’s public transport, as described in the Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP). The RPTP contains an ambitious vision to fully integrate the public transport system with the wider transport system and urban form, thereby increasing mobility and accessibility across Greater Christchurch.

**Vision for Greater Christchurch’s public transport system**

Public transport is innovative and successful and sits at the heart of a transport network that supports a thriving, liveable Greater Christchurch. The public transport system is accessible and convenient, with high quality, zero emission vehicles and facilities. The system gets people where they want to go – as a result it is well used and valued by the people of Greater Christchurch.

As part of achieving this vision by 2048, the RPTP envisions two rapid transit corridors that will offer high speed public transport services to the north and south-west of Christchurch City, significantly enhancing links with the growing towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. By investing in rapid transit services (such as light rail, rapid bus ways or automated trackless trains) and encouraging higher density development along high demand corridors, more people will be able to access jobs, services, recreation and education without necessarily having to rely on a private vehicle. Ensuring public transport is increasingly usable for all people has major social, environmental and economic benefits.
The improvements outlined in the RPTP include service enhancements across the network, infrastructure improvements on key routes, on-demand services (such as demand responsive transport, bike sharing, ride sharing and car sharing) and being well equipped to adopt new opportunities arising in information technology, intelligent transport systems, zero-emission vehicles and autonomous vehicles.

Realising this vision for our public transport system will require an increase in investment. The Government has signalled through the GPS that the overall level of capital investment available for public transport will be greater, reflecting the strategic focus of shifting trips in New Zealand’s cities from private vehicles to more efficient, low cost modes of transport.

Further conversations with the Government will explore how additional funding could help us to achieve our vision for public transport more quickly, supporting our aspirations for a consolidated urban form and multi-modal journeys.

**Freight transport**

Greater Christchurch is also a major freight hub for Canterbury and the South Island, with two inland ports, the Port of Lyttelton and Christchurch International Airport acting as major gateways for produce and people. The strategic road and rail networks in Greater Christchurch also play a significant role in the distribution of freight within the sub-region, as well as to neighbouring regions and the rest of New Zealand.

An important part of managing the transport network is to ensure that freight can be moved efficiently to and through Greater Christchurch will require effective management of congestion on the main freight routes. It is crucial that the strategic infrastructure and networks across Greater Christchurch are able to meet future demand and are protected from any adverse effects of growth. This is a key aspect of the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) and transport business cases to support future transport investments.

**Future programme and investment**

While the Partnership is working towards improving transport choice, more work is needed to get people thinking about how they travel differently, whether it be by public transport, walking, cycling or as a passenger in a private car.

Such a transport programme would include:
- Improved public transport network and services including mass transit corridors;
- Development of walking and cycling networks;
- Travel demand management initiatives;
- Completion of funded strategic road network improvements, including the Northern Corridor and Southern Motorway;
- Embracing new technology changes

How to improve integrated land use and transport planning was a key deliberation when deciding how future urban development should be accommodated in Greater Christchurch. Part of the rationale for the locations for growth was therefore to ensure future growth is appropriately aligned with long term transport planning and investment, meaning more people will be living in areas that are accessible to a mix of transport modes.

The existing and future Christchurch transport network is shown in Figure 18. Investment in this future will be considerable (approximately $1.56b capital and additional annual operating costs) over the next 30 years and needs to be well aligned to a supportive land use. It will require collaboration and investment by the Greater Christchurch Partnership and Central Government as well as the community to achieve this outcome.

Reduced reliance on private vehicles as a result of increased land use and transport integration will have associated congestion, safety, access, environmental and cost benefits for people and communities across Greater Christchurch.
Figure 18: Greater Christchurch transport network – existing, planned or proposed routes and modes

Routes for proposed rapid transit, other public transport services and cycling are all indicative unless already adopted in relevant Council plans.
Other development infrastructure

Infrastructure networks required to enable new development principally relates to transport and the three waters: water supply, wastewater and stormwater. Based on extensive strategic planning undertaken through the Partnership over the last decade to identify future locations for housing and business growth, the constituent partner councils have been able to plan for and invest in the infrastructure needed to support development in these areas. This means most areas proposed in this Update for future development are already sufficiently serviced to be considered ‘shovel ready’.

Most of the areas not currently serviced with sufficient infrastructure network capacity will be following the completion of planned upgrades. This includes in parts of the northern, south-western and eastern areas of Christchurch City. These capacity constraints are addressed in Christchurch City Council’s Long Term Plan and will be resolved by 2028.

Councils’ infrastructure strategies outline how sufficient infrastructure network capacity will be provided for to ensure future growth is effectively and efficiently accommodated. Although Christchurch City Council’s Infrastructure Strategy is based on a lower projected growth for the next 30 years than is considered in this Update, the Council has processes, plans and initiatives that can appropriately manage infrastructure capacity requirements to ensure that the housing growth targets proposed in this Update are met. More detailed infrastructure modelling of areas proposed for commercial redevelopment will follow once specific locations are identified.

In the same way, the Selwyn Infrastructure Strategy also uses a lower projected growth for the next 30 years than is considered in this Update. However, all zoned land as well as land within the Proposed Infrastructure Boundary and Special Housing Areas have been factored into the strategy. Further, any additional up-zoning or greenfield capacity to cater for projected growth, will need to be factored into the infrastructure works programme once the next phase of strategic planning has been undertaken.

Discussions with other infrastructure providers indicate that the availability of such infrastructure as electricity and telecommunications is either available or will be available to service all housing and business growth needs in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years. The provision of social and community facilities, including schools, healthcare and community halls, have also been well planned for as part of the post-earthquake recovery planning for Greater Christchurch, and are therefore not considered to represent a constraint on future development. Existing planning provisions in the CRPS and district plans ensure growth does not compromise the efficient operation of strategic infrastructure.

It will be important that constituent partner councils continue to engage with infrastructure providers to ensure growth is effectively and efficiently supported over the next 30 years by delivery of necessary infrastructure.

5.7 Why is this our proposed approach?

Aligning with the strategic growth directions from the UDS

This Update furthers the achievement of economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing outcomes outlined in the UDS and summarised in Section 2.3. It sets out a settlement pattern and a consolidation approach to urban development that is more sustainable than might result from a more laissez faire scenario. It responds to anticipated changes in demand while supporting wider programmes of action to address challenges, such as climate change, that require solutions beyond just urban planning.

The locations for growth outlined in Section 5, Our Plan and the housing targets (detailed in Section 3.2) reflect a balanced approach to achieving the consolidated growth directions of the UDS while responding to current and projected market demands. The settlement pattern supports a key aim of the UDS to create a vibrant and thriving Central City.

23 Some industrial zoned land in Christchurch City is not proposed to be serviced.
It fosters an increasing Central City population and enables the Central City and surrounding business land to transition over time to provide for increased office and retail floorspace, maximising the existing public and private investments made throughout a period of recovery.

This approach meets the requirements of the NPS-UDC, being informed by the Capacity Assessment and having had particular regard to NPS-UDC Policy PA1, but has also been guided by the UDS, CRPS, District Plans and the Long Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategies required under the LGA. The Partnership is conscious of the need to balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development. Ongoing requirements in the NPS-UDS for evidence and monitoring to support planning decisions will enable periodic review and consider any required amendments to this approach.

Consolidated growth enables towns and centres to more easily provide the local facilities and services that communities need and maximises the efficiency of key transport routes and other infrastructure services. Supporting the growth and vitality of key activity centres is engrained in the UDS and the CRPS Chapter 6 gives strong policy direction to territorial authority plans. Figure 19 encapsulates this concept and outlines the types of services, amenities and factors that councils and other agencies can provide for in these areas.

The settlement pattern enables around two-thirds of new households to be accommodated within the Christchurch City area and allows for the larger towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to continue to grow.

*Figure 19: Concept of a 10-minute neighbourhood for key centres*
This provides a good level of housing choice across Greater Christchurch and recognises that within a single housing market there are many and varied reasons for where and how people choose to live.

Taken together, new subdivisions in greenfield locations across all three council areas will account for around 55% of the identified housing capacity. ‘Intensification’, being development in existing urban areas through infill and redevelopment, is expected to provide for the remaining 45%, primarily in Christchurch City but not exclusively. This broadly corresponds with intensification targets already outlined in the CRPS and Christchurch District Plan.

As outlined in Section 3, Our Growth Needs, much of this housing capacity is already provided for in District Plans. The responses outlined in this document centre on the remaining housing shortfalls shown in Table 3 (around 15,500 dwellings) for Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts to meet housing targets being considered in context with wider strategic planning.

Directing future housing growth to development capacity already signalled by the Projected Infrastructure Boundary in Map A of the CRPS represents the most efficient and effective option for accommodating these shortfalls. For some time now the Councils have factored these areas into respective 30 year infrastructure strategies associated with Long Term Plans. These plans have already benefited from extensive community input, as did the earlier UDS engagement and subsequent resource management and recovery consultation processes that led to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Further more detailed assessment of these future growth areas will be required, and undertaken as part of district plan reviews, and can address any new requirements relating to managing risks of natural hazards and mitigating impacts on versatile soils.

Reflecting changing housing needs

As outlined in Sections 2, 3 and 4 demographic change will mean an increasing percentage of our population will be over 65 and average household size will continue to decline. The cost of housing, both home ownership and renting, will continue to represent a significant component of household expenditure.

New households will have different housing preferences and affordability constraints, but to better align the total housing stock across Greater Christchurch with the overall household composition, new development would need to favour smaller and more affordable housing types.

Smaller and multi-unit dwellings that take advantage of more efficient building construction techniques and adopt new home ownership and rental models can aid the provision of more affordable homes. Housing should meet the needs of our population at all stages of life. Locating new development closer to the provision of local facilities and community services can also improve access to the health needs of a population that is both aging and has increasing long term conditions and disabilities, and reduce the transport costs associated with overall household expenditure.

Increasingly more households are also beginning to take advantage new technology and on demand services to enable a more inner-city lifestyle, closer to the social and cultural amenities offered in and around the centre of Christchurch. The implementation of the 8011 Central City Housing Programme will determine the scale of demand in this market segment and the role public agencies and private sector developers can play to provide for this housing type.

These trends have therefore informed the transitional approach adopted when setting housing targets in Table 2.

Supporting future public transport investment

The future investment in our public transport system highlighted in Section 5.6 will influence and be influenced by how our City and surrounding towns accommodate future growth. For such investment to be sustainable it needs to foster significant increases in public transport patronage.

A settlement pattern approach that encourages greater urban densities, particularly along key public transport corridors provides the greatest opportunity for people to live in close proximity to proposed new rapid transit routes, increasing the likelihood and attractiveness for people to adopt these transport modes.
What about other options?

In arriving at this settlement pattern, three alternative options were investigated.

One option investigated providing for growth based directly on the population and household projections derived from Statistics NZ data (Option A). Another option considered a scenario whereby a greater proportion of additional household growth was directed to the Christchurch City area over the next 10 years, anticipating a more rapid return to the levels of redevelopment in the City experienced prior to the earthquakes (Option B).

Compared to this Update (Option C), Option A would require increased capacity to be provided in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts for the period 2028-2048, totalling nearly 10,000 additional dwellings.

Compared to our plan (Option C), Option B would reduce the housing provision necessary to be identified in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts over the next 10 years by around 5,500 dwellings (resulting in a total of 15,000 dwellings less than Option A over the 30 year period), relying on the range of housing options available in Christchurch City to meet housing demand not able to be accommodated in the main towns of the Districts.

Aside from further mitigating many of the local effects identified for Option A, assessment of Option B focused on the significant departure from current market housing conditions.

Option B would require average annual building consents for additional dwellings to be 1750/yr for Christchurch City with an increasing proportion met through redevelopment. While consents for new housing in Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts appear to have softened over the last year (partly due to a general decrease in the level of building consents across Greater Christchurch during 2018), in Selwyn they are still tracking closer to the high growth rate.

Further explanation and assessment of these options, and the reasons why Option C was considered the selected option, is covered in a separate options assessment document.
6. Our Next Steps

6.1 Responsive planning

With many of the primary drivers and influencers of urban development in Greater Christchurch being in a state of change, a responsive approach to planning is necessary to ensure that future opportunities to shape our urban areas and achieve our desired outcomes are realised. This will require monitoring and evaluation, continued relationship building and commitment to this partnership. Key drivers of change at the local, national and global level include:

- Shifting post-earthquake trends in the residential, commercial and industrial markets, as well as the development sector, as the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch continues to mature;
- Emerging Government policy in relation to urban growth and development, transport, regional economic growth, and local government funding and financing, which will provide new opportunities for our approach to planning;
- Changing population and household profiles, and composition of the local economy, which will influence the type of housing and employment that is required in the future to meet the needs and preferences of residents;
- Evolving technologies (such as mass automation, digital workspaces) and their increasing adoption, which will influence how our urban areas function, especially in terms of how people work and travel (such as autonomous vehicles);
- Delivering large-scale regeneration projects that will significantly affect surrounding local areas and communities, and Greater Christchurch overall, including for the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor, Kaiapoi area and Central City;
- Growing need to manage and adapt to the natural hazard risk facing our coastal communities given the anticipated sea level rise, and related coastal inundation and groundwater level effects, over the next 30 years and beyond.

Given these drivers of change, this Update has been prepared to provide greater certainty over the medium term in regard to how development capacity issues will be addressed (Section 4, Our Challenges) and more flexibility over the long term to enable the Partnership to further consider the most appropriate planning directions and responses.

In response to this Update, the Regional Council and District Councils will insert the relevant housing targets directly into their respective plans, in accordance with NPS-UDC Policies PCS to PC11.

Figure 20: Scheduled implementation and review process 2019-2022
6.2 Further work and implementation

The Partnership is committed to undertaking further work to assess, consider and address some of the priority growth issues for Greater Christchurch. These actions include workstreams already planned by constituent partners and those that are now proposed to respond to the priorities identified in this Update. The aim of this future work is to ensure our long term planning directions for Greater Christchurch are appropriately investigated and implemented.

The key actions from this Update have been grouped under three broad themes:

- Strengthen our partnership approach;
- Improve our tools and evidence base;
- Build on our planned direction for growth.

Many of the actions that will be undertaken to implement this Update are linked to pre-arranged planning processes, in that they will be undertaken as part of these processes or help inform them. Such processes include the district plan reviews underway for Selwyn and Waimakariri, the full review of the CRPS scheduled for notification in 2022, and the statutory requirement from the NPS-UDC for another Capacity Assessment to be prepared in 2020.

Schedule of future work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead Partners</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work with the Government to further explore opportunities to develop an agreement on the priority actions and investments that will contribute towards an agreed set of growth and wellbeing outcomes for Greater Christchurch. <strong>Linked processes: Second stage of the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport</strong></td>
<td>All GCP Partners</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work with Government and social and affordable housing providers to better address current and future housing needs across Greater Christchurch, developing an action plan to increase provision. Investigate the most suitable locations and opportunities for new housing ownerships models (such as shared ownership, co-housing, etc). This would be prepared in accordance with the following timeframes</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• an MOU with the GCP and Network July 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A project plan and project lead resource August 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A good practice and/or barriers research component October 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A forum and or consultation component December 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A draft action plan February 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integration and alignment with District Plan Reviews April 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integration and alignment with Annual Plans June 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Linked processes: Next Capacity Assessment, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews and Council’s Long Term Plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undertake an evaluation of the appropriateness of existing minimum densities specified in the CRPS for each territorial authority including a review of what has been achieved to date, constraints and issues associated with achieving these minimum densities, and whether any changes to minimum densities is likely to be desirable and achievable across future development areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri districts. <strong>Linked processes: Canterbury Regional Policy Statement review, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews</strong></td>
<td>SDC, WDC, CCC, ECan.</td>
<td>2019-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Responsible Bodies</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develop and agree a single growth model for Greater Christchurch that evaluates the demand, supply, feasibility and sufficiency of residential and business development capacity.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review and recalibrate the Christchurch Transport Model and Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic Model.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan, NZTA</td>
<td>2019 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prepare a new Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment that provides up-to-date information on current and future housing and business trends.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC, ECan, Ngai Tahu</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BUILD ON OUR PLANNED DIRECTION FOR GROWTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Insert relevant housing targets directly into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and District Plans, in accordance with NPS-UDC Policies PCS to PC11.</td>
<td>ECan, CCC, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improve the alignment and integration of constituent partner council’s infrastructure strategies through a coordinated approach that is guided by an overarching sub-regional approach to infrastructure planning and delivery.</td>
<td>CCC, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019 - 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a. Prepare a Proposed Change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS at the earliest opportunity to:</td>
<td>ECan, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• modify Map A to identify the Future Urban Development Areas shown in Figure 15, and include a policy in Chapter 6 of the CRPS that enables land within the Future Development Areas to be rezoned in District Plans for urban development if there is a projected shortfall in housing development capacity in Table 3 of Our Space, or if the capacity assessment referred to in Action 6 (or subsequent periodic capacity assessments) identifies a projected shortfall in feasible development capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• enable territorial authorities to respond to changes in the sufficiency of development capacity over the medium term on a rolling basis as a result of periodic capacity assessments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to undertake structure planning (including the consideration of development infrastructure and the downstream effects on the Greater Christchurch transport network) and review of District Plans over the next year for the identified Future Development Areas in the 2019 CRPS Change set out in Action 9a above, to provide for the projected medium term shortfall shown in Table 3 or the capacity assessment referred to in Action 6 (or subsequent periodic capacity assessments), at a minimum residential density of 12 households per hectare, informed by the evaluation undertaken as Action 3 above.</td>
<td>ECan, SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The policy will sit within the existing objective and policy framework of Chapter 6 of the CRPS which applies to all local authorities in the Greater Christchurch Area, and which, in relation to the integration of land use and transport, includes policies 6.3.3, 6.3.4 and 6.3.5. 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Linked processes: Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Undertake detailed planning work for (in accordance with directions outlined in CRPS Chapter 6 and the proposed change identified in Action 9) the relevant Greater Christchurch towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri, including:</td>
<td>SDC, WDC</td>
<td>2019 - 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluating zoning options to further promote consolidated townships;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Policy 6.3.3 requires that development proceed in accordance with an outline development plan. In addition, Policy 6.3.4 promotes transport effectiveness, and Policy 6.3.5 relates to the achievement of land-use and transport integration by “ensuring that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development are co-ordinated with development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure...”
- Investigating opportunities to encourage the provision and uptake of a range of housing typologies to meet future demands, including considering options for redevelopment, intensification and kāinga nohoanga;
- Reviewing town centre masterplans and strategies, and exploring options to increase land supply for existing key activity centres

**Linked processes:** Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11 | Facilitate the redevelopment of existing urban areas in Christchurch City through the:  
- Implementation of the 8011 Central City Residential Programme;  
- Development and implementation of a redevelopment programme for medium density housing areas around key activity centres and along public transport corridors;  
- Investigation of opportunities for transition of brownfield land for commercial and mixed use redevelopment | CCC | 2019 - 2028 |
| 12 | Undertake a review of Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch) of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement as part of the scheduled full review, being informed by further planning work being undertaken by Councils and responding to any identified needs in the next Capacity Assessment due to be completed in 2020. Environment Canterbury will, prior to notification, engage with submitters on Our Space who sought the inclusion of land for business or housing development in relation to the appropriateness of including the subject land within Map A of Chapter 6. | ECan | 2022 |

**Linked processes:** Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews

In relation to Action 12, the following schedule of work is proposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Plan and agreed scope for review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Completion of efficiency and effectiveness (RMA s35) review  
Completion of efficiency and effectiveness (RMA s35) review  
Collation of existing evidence base and identification of information gaps (based on District Plan reviews and structure planning completed)  
- Additional technical evidence completed (if required) – for chapter 6 specifically  
- Density  
- Transport  
- Natural Hazards – including climate change and additional land areas required from  
- Southshore project  
- Settlement pattern  
Initial engagement with strategic partners  
Agreed partner and stakeholder engagement plan – pre-notification engagement |
| Year 3 | 2021/2022 |
| Draft Chapter 6 prepared for clause 3 Schedule 1 RMA consultation  
Section 32 Report completed  
Notification of Proposed Chapter 6 as part of full RPS review June 2022 |
| Year 4 | 2022/2023 |
| Submission and Further Submission  
Preparation of Officers’ Report  
Hearing  
Decision expected in June 2023 |
6.3 Collaborative partnerships

Opportunities and challenges facing Greater Christchurch in relation to how we will achieve our desired urban growth outcomes cross the administrative boundaries of Christchurch City, Selwyn and Waimakariri, and encompass a range of economic, social, cultural and environmental matters. Collaboration between local and regional councils, government agencies and Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu will therefore continue to be essential to successfully plan for growth.

The Partnership is committed to showing visible leadership and using a collaborative approach to address the growth issues identified for Greater Christchurch. Governance and implementation of this Update will be coordinated through groups at various levels of the Partnership, with the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee responsible for its overall delivery. Although the implementation of this Update will principally be the domain of the constituent partner councils, other government agencies, mana whenua, the private sector, the third sector and the community also have a key role to play in ensuring we realise our shared vision for the future.

Coordinated action between public and private sector infrastructure providers, and the development sector, will be of particular importance to enabling the type and scale of development needed to accommodate our growth needs. It will be crucial that future investments are aligned with our planned direction for growth, which will require strong working relationships between constituent partner councils, infrastructure providers, developers and the property sector.

Building on the close ties already developed through the earthquake recovery, a strong working partnership with the Government will also be pivotal to unlocking the opportunities and addressing the challenges for Greater Christchurch. The Partnership will work closely with relevant agencies and ministries to explore how the Government could support urban development in Greater Christchurch in a way that both aligns with our future aspirations and the Government’s bold intentions for New Zealand’s cities, as signalled in the Urban Growth Agenda.

Partnering with the Government will include exploring the opportunity for developing an agreement on transport’s role in shaping the future of Greater Christchurch, recognising that transport can be a key place-maker for urban areas. This partnership opportunity has already been signalled in the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.

6.4 Research and monitoring

The Partnership has produced an extensive evidence base to better understand housing and business trends in Greater Christchurch, and inform the planning decisions set out in this Update. This has included monitoring a range of urban development indicators and preparing a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment.

It will be critical that the data and information used as the basis for future strategic planning continues to be refined to support a robust and up-to-date evidence base.

Examples of matters that will require further investigation include:

- Reviewing the 2018 Census results to identify any changes to the population, including to demographic and household profiles, and consider the suitability of the population projections used to underpin our strategic planning;
- Examining the key demand and supply-side factors influencing the housing market, such as preferences by location, constraints on the redevelopment market and the extent of interactions between local housing market areas;
- Interrogating the factors influencing the relative feasibility of developments in different local housing market areas, including testing these factors with local experts and considering how they may change over time;
- Investigating the key drivers for business and employment development in relevant towns in Selwyn and Waimakariri, and the viable options for increasing the self-sufficiency of these growing towns.

The Partnership publishes quarterly monitoring reports to track a series of core urban development indicators for Greater Christchurch. To improve our understanding of local market trends, the scope of these monitoring reports will be reviewed and expanded where appropriate to incorporate additional indicators. Monitoring trends and changes in
Greater Christchurch’s residential, commercial and industrial markets are particularly important given the disruptions caused by the earthquakes, and the new normal that is being established as the recovery and regeneration effort progresses. It is important that this monitoring integrates with other monitoring processes at local and regional levels that will collectively help assess the achievement of the strategic goals of the UDS.
He muka harakeke, he whītau tangata.

The harakeke is woven with the human strand – binding people and places together.
ATTACHMENT C – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT PLAN – HOUSING TARGETS

Amend the introduction to Chapter 3 Strategic Directions as follows:

3.1 Introduction
a.…..
b.…..

b.v. Facilitate an increase in the supply of housing, including by:
A. confirming the immediate residential intensification changes included in the Land Use Recovery Plan; and
B. ensuring that the District Plan has capacity to accommodate up to a minimum of 55,950 23,700 additional dwellings by 2028 2048 (as compared with the number of households in the 2012 post-earthquake period); and
C. addressing further intensification opportunities, in line with the Land Use Recovery Plan principle of supporting the Central City and Key Activity Centres; and
D. having regard to constraints on environmental and infrastructure capacity, particularly with regard to natural hazards; and
E. providing for a wide range of housing types and locations;

Amend Chapter 3 Strategic Directions Objective 3.3.4 as follows:

3.3.4 Objective - Housing capacity and choice
a. For the period 2012 to 2028 2018-2048, an minimum of 55,950 23,700 additional dwellings are enabled through a combination of residential intensification, brownfield and greenfield development, made up of:
   i. 17,400 dwellings between 2018 and 2028, and
   ii. 38,550 dwellings between 2028 and 2048; and
b. There is a range of housing opportunities available to meet the diverse and changing population and housing needs of Christchurch residents, including:
   i. choice in housing types, densities and locations; and
   ii. affordable, community and social housing and papakāinga.

We will also need to amend Policy 14.2.1.9 as follows:

14.2.1.9 Policy - Monitoring
a. Evaluate the effectiveness of the District Plan’s residential provisions by monitoring the supply of additional housing through residential intensification, greenfield and brownfield development (including housing types, sizes and densities), and its contribution to:
   i. meeting regional growth targets for greater Christchurch in the Land Use Recovery Plan Greater Christchurch Settlement Plan Update and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement;
   ii. achieving an minimum of 55,950 23,700 additional dwellings by 2028 2048 (Objective 3.3.4(a));
   iii. meeting the diverse and changing population and housing needs for Christchurch residents, in the immediate recovery period and longer term;
   iv. improving housing affordability; and
   v. meeting the housing intensification targets specified in Objective 3.3.7(a)(iv).
b. Undertake the monitoring and evaluation at such intervals as to inform any other monitoring requirements of other statutory instruments, and make the results publicly available.
c. Have regard to the information from this monitoring when determining priority areas for residential intensification and provision for new and upgraded infrastructure.
### ATTACHMENT D: issues raised in Council submission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue raised in Council submission</th>
<th>Progression on issue since the Council submission was lodged</th>
<th>Extent of outstanding matter/s</th>
<th>Opportunity to further address this issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Uncertainty of housing sufficiency conclusions | - Rural demand has been removed from the supply figures. | - The recent trends emerging are showing that growth in Selwyn and Waimakariri is not occurring as fast as has been predicted in *Our Space*  
- Rural demand should be removed from the demand figures so the sufficiency figures solely pertain to the urban environment. | The 2020 Capacity Assessment will provide an opportunity to review the sufficiency conclusions in light of the recent trends that are emerging, and to remove rural demand. |
| Social and affordable housing | - *Our Space* includes actions for the Greater Christchurch partners to work together on an action plan for social and affordable housing. | - Further action on social housing is not a requirement under the NPS-UDC | Development and implementation of the action plan for social and affordable housing |
| Sequencing greenfield land release to manage transport effects and city regeneration | - *Our Space* has been clarified to make it clear that greenfield land will only be released to meet a medium-term need  
- Structure planning of Future Development Areas will consider downstream transport effects | - The extent to which greenfield land releases will be sequenced to manage transport effects and city regeneration | Further consideration of downstream transport effects can occur through structure planning of Future Development Areas, and the upcoming Regional Policy Statement Review. |
| Increasing minimum densities, to reduce urban expansion and thus the impact on versatile soils and climate change from increased travel emissions | - The minimum density for the Future Development Areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri has been set at 12 dwellings per hectare. Higher than the 10 dwellings per hectare minimum density for the | - 12 dwellings per hectare is still a lower minimum density than the 15 dwellings per hectare required in Christchurch  
- A minimum density of 12 dwellings per hectare for Waimakariri is not sufficient to meet its long-term housing targets, unless there is | *Our Space* proposes that an investigation into raising minimum densities is undertaken to inform the Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plan Reviews. Christchurch City Council can have input into the investigations and the District Plan |

*Item No.: 21 Page 498*
## ATTACHMENT D: ISSUES RAISED IN COUNCIL SUBMISSION

|current Greenfield Priority Areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri. | significant intensification in Waimakariri. | Reviews, to try and resolve this issue. The Government is also considering releasing a draft National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land later this year, which will provide some direction on the development of versatile soils. |
22. District Plan amendment - Lyttelton parking - draft section 65 proposal for consultation

Reference: 19/637634
Presenter(s): Katie McFadden, Senior Policy Analyst
Ivan Thomson, Principal Advisor Planning

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to obtain authorisation to take the next step in seeking a Ministerial change to the Christchurch District Plan under section 71 of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 (GCR Act), for the parking rule in Lyttelton. This step is to seek the views of ECan, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils, and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (the strategic partners), and the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC) and Regenerate Christchurch. The Council’s draft proposal for the change to the District Plan is included as Attachment A.

1.2 The proposal is to amend the District Plan to remove the minimum on-site parking rule for developments in the Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone, in Lyttelton.

2. Executive Summary

2.1 The on-site parking requirements for local and neighbourhood commercial centres in the District Plan are inhibiting the development of the Lyttelton town centre, and the regeneration of the area post-Earthquakes. These requirements came about through the Replacement District Plan process, in which the Independent Hearings Panel did not consider the particular circumstances of Lyttelton in comparison with other centres. The minimum parking requirements are inappropriate for developments in Lyttelton due to the particular character of the commercial area and the topography, size and dimensions of the sites, which have not traditionally provided on-site parking.

2.2 A change to the District Plan to remove the current parking requirements for developments in the Lyttelton Commercial Zone would encourage and enable development and remove a major impediment to the regeneration of the area.

2.3 At the 11 April 2019 Council meeting, elected members accepted a recommendation from the Regulatory Performance Committee to initiate a process to request the Minister to use section 71 of the GCR Act to amend the District Plan.

2.4 Council staff have initiated this process by engaging with affected stakeholders. This has been a positive process, with the majority of stakeholders in support of the proposal (see paragraph 5.2). Staff have prepared a concise draft proposal in accordance with section 65 of the GCR Act. The next step under section 66 of the GCR Act is for the Council to seek the views of the strategic partners, DPMC, and Regenerate Christchurch. Staff therefore request Council’s authorisation to seek the views of those agencies.
3. **Staff Recommendations**

That the Council:

1. Approves the draft proposal ([Attachment A](#)), including the proposed changes to the District Plan and supporting information, to be given to strategic partners, the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, and Regenerate Christchurch, to seek their views under section 66 of the GCR Act.

2. Requests that staff then prepare a final proposal (providing that strategic partners support the section 71 process and have provided advice), with a summary of feedback and any amendments to the proposal, in order for the proposal to be submitted to the Minister as soon as practicable.

3. Delegates authority for the Chief Executive to approve this final proposal for submission to the Minister, unless the amendments made as a consequence of feedback result in rules of substantially different effect, in which case the final proposal will be reported to Council for approval.

4. **Context/Background**

**Issue or Opportunity**

4.1 The notified Christchurch Replacement District Plan did not require developments in local and neighbourhood commercial centres (including Lyttelton) to provide a minimum number of on-site car parks. However, following the hearings on submissions during the Christchurch Replacement District Plan process, the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) did not carry through the exemption into its decisions on the final Plan. All development within all local and neighbourhood centres must therefore comply with the rules regarding the minimum and maximum numbers of car parks required under Clause 7.4.3.1 of the District Plan.

4.2 The particular circumstances of Lyttelton were not considered by the IHP, including the specific regeneration needs of Lyttelton, or its unique topography and the size and dimensions of the sites for development. The car parking requirements are now causing issues for a number of potential developments in Lyttelton, where development plans are unable to meet the permitted activity parking requirements.

4.3 This issue requires urgent redress as a number of developments in Lyttelton are affected, and the Council may receive resource consent applications for these in the near future. Landowners have, at various stages, raised the issue of parking requirements (and the related length and cost of resource consent processes) as an impediment to development in the centre. In general, the regeneration of Lyttelton has been slow, with developers slow to invest and a number of sites still vacant. The parking requirements are exacerbating this situation.

4.4 The proposal is amend the District Plan to remove the minimum on-site parking rule for developments in the Lyttelton Commercial Zone (excepting where developments include more than two residential units), using the powers available to the Minister for Greater Christchurch Regeneration, under the GCR Act. This would ultimately facilitate and encourage the ongoing regeneration of Lyttelton.

4.5 The proposal would remove District Plan requirements that are neither appropriate nor practicable in Lyttelton. This would effectively be a return to the situation in Lyttelton prior to the Earthquakes, where most commercial sites did not provide parking.
Strategic Alignment

4.6 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

4.6.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy

- Level of Service: 17.0.1.7 Advice to Council on high priority policy and planning issues that affect the City. Advice is aligned with and delivers on the governance expectations as evidenced through the Council Strategic Framework - Policy advice to Council on emerging issues.

Decision Making Authority

4.7 Council has previously made decisions on the use of GCR Act processes, and staff are therefore seeking the approval of Council to proceed with the next step of the current proposal.

Previous Decisions

4.8 3 April 2019 – Regulatory Performance Committee – recommendation from the Regulatory Performance Committee to initiate a process to request the Minister to use section 71 of the GCR Act to amend the Christchurch District Plan.

4.9 11 April 2019 – Council meeting – approval from elected members to proceed with the GCR Act process, and request the Chief Executive to prepare a draft section 65 proposal, and report directly to Council prior to engagement with strategic partners.

Assessment of Significance and Engagement

4.10 The decisions in this report are of medium significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

4.11 The decisions relate only to the Lyttelton Commercial Zone and its environs, and the proposed changes would have no impact elsewhere. The impact on affected landowners and residents in the area would be positive overall, with moderate environmental, social and cultural implications. There is minimal cost to Council, ratepayers and the wider community, and the change would not impact on Council’s capacity to carry out its role and functions.

4.12 Feedback has been sought from stakeholders. Their response has been largely in support of the proposed changes, with a few queries raised around residential development and its likely effect on on-street parking (see section 5 of this report for more detail). This feedback has been taken account of by excluding residential activity containing more than two residential units (on the same site) from the proposed plan change. This should balance the need to encourage commercial development, with managing the impact on the general parking situation in Lyttelton.

Next steps in the GCR Act process

4.13 Under section 65 of the GCR Act, if the Council wishes to propose that the Minister for Greater Christchurch Regeneration uses her powers under section 71, it must prepare a draft proposal requesting this exercise of powers. This report must also be submitted to Regenerate Christchurch. The report must contain an explanation about how the exercise of power would meet one or more of the purposes of the GCR Act, and why the exercise of power is necessary and preferable to any alternatives.

4.14 Prior to submitting the final proposal, section 66 of the GCR Act requires the proponent to seek the views of strategic partners – Environment Canterbury, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, and Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu - on the draft section 65 proposal, along with DPMC and Regenerate Christchurch. Staff have been working with officials at DPMC to ensure the draft report meets all the statutory requirements and includes the necessary details.
4.15 Provided Council approves seeking the views of these councils and agencies, and once feedback has been received, staff will review feedback and amend the proposal as necessary. Staff will then seek approval from the Chief Executive (or the Council, if any changes made result in rules of substantially different effect) for the revised version of the proposal to be sent to the Minister and Regenerate Christchurch. Once the final proposal has been submitted to the Minister, it can no longer be amended.

4.16 The Minister will publicly notify the proposal for written comments, and then either accept or reject it.

5. **Community Views and Preferences**

5.1 In May and June, Council staff engaged with affected stakeholders in the Lyttelton area, including residents and businesses. This included a flier drop, inviting written feedback and conducting two public drop-in sessions.

5.2 Overall, feedback was positive and supported the intent of the proposed plan change, to encourage development. Of 31 written pieces of feedback, 27 were generally supportive, three were generally opposed, and one supported the proposal in part. The few who attended the public drop-in sessions broadly supported the proposal. A table of the feedback received is included as Attachment B.

5.3 There were a few major themes running through the feedback, as follows:

5.3.1 General concern regarding perceived parking issues in Lyttelton, and how the proposal might exacerbate these. Feedback was mixed regarding the extent of the parking problem - some do not believe that there is an issue, others that the issue is mainly confined to weekends and primarily Saturdays, while others said that there is a constant issue with supply of carparks. There does seem to be consensus that there is a problem on a Saturday morning during market hours, in particular.

5.3.2 The lack of enforcement of parking rules in the area was also raised, which means people are able to park in prime car parks for well beyond the time periods allowed, and many people take advantage of this. Addressing this situation would be one way to alleviate any adverse impacts on on-street parking from the plan change.

5.3.3 A number of submitters raised the possibility of the development of a parking building on one of the larger, flatter sites in the area (for example, on Norwich Quay), to offset the effects that this plan change might have on the on-street parking supply.

5.3.4 A few submitters were concerned that parking for residents who live in the Lyttelton Commercial Zone may be affected by the change. For example, where properties along London Street do not have on-site parking and residents need to park on the street. A number of people who provided written feedback and attended the public drop-in sessions felt that developments containing residential units should be required to provide off-street parking for those units (or at least in some cases over a certain threshold).

5.3.5 There is a perception that London Street can become quite congested due to parking (and loading) along the street. A couple of submitters suggested that London Street is made a pedestrian-only zone.

5.3.6 A number of people highlighted the fact that as well as encouraging development, the proposed change would support the use of active, shared and public transport. In doing so, it would reinforce one of the Council’s core strategic priorities.
5.4 Staff have considered all feedback and have amended the proposed plan change as deemed appropriate. Some of the feedback received cannot be fully addressed through this specific plan change; these concerns would need to be addressed in the future, through operational policies and ongoing monitoring of the parking situation.

5.5 Staff considered the following specific changes, as a result of the feedback received:

- **5.5.1** Requiring residential units in the Lyttelton Commercial Zone to provide for parking, where the development includes more than two units
- **5.5.2** Reducing the area to which the proposed change applies, e.g. to apply only to London Street, rather than the entire Lyttelton Commercial Zone
- **5.5.3** Restricting the size of development to which the change would apply, i.e. only smaller developments would fall within scope of the plan change

5.6 Staff have decided on balance that the first option is the most appropriate, alongside potential operational changes being applied in the future. The proposed rule change has therefore been drafted to exclude developments that include more than two residential units, which would need to comply with the parking requirements for the extra residential units only.

5.7 Staff consider that the changes made are the most appropriate in light of the original proposal, and the narrow scope of the proposed plan change. It is fair in that it is still in keeping with the original proposal, and it presents less risk than attempting to exclude individual properties from the exemption.

5.8 Alongside this amendment, traffic operations staff will monitor the parking situation over the coming months and years, and will consider requests for residents-only parking and respond to any enforcement issues that arise. In theory, Council staff support the development of a parking building in the area to deal with any overflow, although the Council itself has no plans to develop one at this stage. The potential for existing sites to provide public parking could be further explored.

### 6. Options Analysis

**Options Considered**

6.1 The draft proposal that the Council gives to the councils and agencies for their views under section 66 should ideally reflect the Council’s preferred position. The following are the two reasonably practicable options with regard to that preferred position:

- Circulate draft proposal to the strategic partners, DPMC, and Regenerate Christchurch for feedback, with amended rule change
- Circulate draft proposal to the strategic partners, DPMC, and Regenerate Christchurch for feedback, with original proposed rule change

6.2 The following options were considered but ruled out

- No longer proceeding with the GCR Act process – this goes against the previous Council decision

**Options Descriptions**

6.3 **Preferred Option: Option 1** – circulate draft proposal to the strategic partners, DPMC, and Regenerate Christchurch for feedback, with *amended rule change*

6.3.1 **Option Description:** Following Council approval, staff would circulate the attached draft proposal to the strategic partners, DPMC, and Regenerate Christchurch for feedback, as required under the GCR Act. This draft includes the amendment made as a
result of feedback received from the community. See section 5 of this report for more detail on the changes.

6.3.2 Following this, and depending on the feedback received, staff would finalise the proposal, making any appropriate modifications, and then seek approval to submit the final proposal for a change to the District Plan to the Minister and Regenerate Christchurch.

6.3.3 Option Advantages

- This option takes account of feedback received during consultation with the community. It balances the goal of encouraging development with the need to mitigate potential adverse impacts for on-street parking.
- This would mitigate the risk of parking overspill in the Lyttelton town centre and adjoining residential streets.

6.3.4 Option Disadvantages

- This would have a different outcome to what was originally consulted on (although it is still in keeping with the original).
- Developments containing multiple residential units may feel disadvantaged. The decision could have the effect of discouraging housing in the Lyttelton Commercial Zone, other than relatively minor developments.

6.4 Option 2 – circulate draft proposal to the strategic partners, DPMC, and Regenerate Christchurch for feedback, with original proposed rule change

6.4.1 Option Description: Following Council approval, staff would circulate a draft proposal to the strategic partners, DPMC, and Regenerate Christchurch for feedback, as required under the GCR Act. This draft would be the original proposal, which would exempt all development from the minimum parking requirements (including all residential development).

6.4.2 The process following this would be the same as outlined above.

6.4.3 Option Advantages

- This would be consistent with what the Council approved in its previous decision to proceed with the GCR Act process for this plan change.
- This option would be more enabling of a wide range of development, and simpler than the amended proposed plan change option.

6.4.4 Option Disadvantages

- This option would potentially allow large-scale residential developments to proceed without having to provide any parking spaces. It could be argued that this goes beyond the intent of the plan change, which seeks to encourage the development and revitalisation of the town centre.
- Residential development of a medium to large scale could cause issues with overspill parking in surrounding streets. This option would not address this risk.
- This option would cause minor delays as staff redraft the section 65 proposal.

Analysis Criteria

6.5 The analysis criteria used for the assessment of options are social and community impacts, encouraging development and achieving regeneration outcomes, mitigating adverse effects
on parking, impact on mana whenua and alignment with Council plans, policies and strategic objectives. Further detail can be found in the ‘Options Matrix’ table in section 10 of this report.

7. Legal Implications
   7.1 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.
   7.2 This report has been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.
   7.3 The legal considerations are described throughout this report.

8. Risks
   8.1 Informal consultation has been undertaken early on in this process to mitigate one of the main risks related to using a section 71 process – negative perceptions arising from the limited consultation requirements. Staff have canvassed public opinion and have taken feedback into account in considering any changes to the proposal.
   8.2 There may be reduced appetite on the part of the Minister to use her powers under section 71, now that the Council can make changes to the District Plan under normal RMA processes. Staff are continuing to work closely with DPMC and strategic partners to ensure that the process runs smoothly and they understand the advice that is likely to be provided to the Minister.
   8.3 As outlined above, if this plan change is successful, it may impact the availability of on-street parking in the Lyttelton town centre and the adjoining residential neighbourhood. The extent of this would depend on the type and scale of development that occurs. Staff are looking to mitigate this risk through amending the original proposed plan change to exempt developments with more than two residential units, as outlined above. The Council will monitor the on-street parking situation in Lyttelton, and consider revising operational parking policies once the ongoing situation is better understood.

9. Next Steps
   9.1 If the recommended approach is endorsed, staff will proceed as follows:
   9.1.1 Circulate the amended draft proposal to the strategic partners, DPMC, and Regenerate Christchurch for feedback.
   9.1.2 Taking into account the feedback received, finalise the proposal and seek the Chief Executive's approval to submit it to the Minister and Regenerate Christchurch. The Minister will then decide whether to publicly notify it for written comments.
# 10. Options Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 – circulate draft proposal with amended rule change</th>
<th>Option 2 – circulate draft proposal with original proposed rule change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td><strong>Cost to Implement</strong></td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Ongoing</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Existing operational District Plan budget</td>
<td>Existing operational District Plan budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Rates</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Criteria 1 – Encourages development and achieves regeneration outcomes
- **Encourages commercial and other non-residential activities as the means to encourage regeneration, supported by small-scale residential.**
- **Enables a wider scale of development, i.e. including residential development.**

## Criteria 2 - Mitigating adverse effects on parking
- **Mitigates the risk of this by requiring that medium to large-scale developments provide parking for residential units over and above the first two units.**
- **Does not address this issue, and could potentially cause a high demand for on-street parking in the town centre and surrounding residential areas.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Criteria</th>
<th>Option 1 – circulate draft proposal</th>
<th>Option 2 – amend draft proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Mana Whenua</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Alignment to Council Plans & Policies
- **Christchurch Transport Strategic Plan** – encourages flexible parking requirements to reduce the dependency on travel by private motor vehicles; supporting local businesses and communities by rebuilding suburban centres.
- **Suburban Parking Policy** – this policy may be used to mitigate effects of this rule change e.g. time restrictions and residential exemptions

## Strategic priorities
- **Enabling active citizenship**
- **Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable 21st century city**
- **Increased active, public and shared transport opportunities and use**
- The proposal in general supports these strategic priorities, as it encourages development and the associated economic, social and cultural benefits.
- The proposal also supports the strategic priority focused on transport by supporting the use of active, shared and public transport through the reduction of parking requirements.
Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.
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Removal of Minimum Car Parking Spaces Provision for the Lyttelton Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone

Proposal to exercise power under section 71 of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016

Proposal to amend Chapter 7 – Transport of the Christchurch District Plan to provide an exemption to the minimum car parking spaces requirements for the Lyttelton commercial centre

July 2019
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1 The Proposal

1.1 The proposal is to amend the Christchurch District Plan (the District Plan) to remove the minimum on-site parking rule for developments in the Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone, in Lyttelton (the Lyttelton Commercial Zone). This rule is inhibiting a number of developments in the Lyttelton Commercial Zone, and therefore the wider regeneration of the town centre.

1.2 The notified Christchurch Replacement District Plan exempted developments in local and neighbourhood commercial centres (including Lyttelton) from providing a minimum number of on-site car parks. However, following the hearings on submissions during the Christchurch Replacement District Plan process, the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) did not carry through the exemption into its decisions on the final Plan. The particular circumstances surrounding Lyttelton were not considered by the IHP. The District Plan now requires that all development within all local and neighbourhood centres complies with the rules for the minimum and maximum number of carparks required under Clause 7.4.3.1.1

1.3 Christchurch City Council (the Council) staff have been engaging with landowners regarding various development proposals in Lyttelton. These discussions highlighted issues with meeting the minimum parking requirements for a number of sites in the Lyttelton Commercial Zone due to its topography and the size and dimensions of the sites. As a result of the minimum parking rule, developers have no choice but to undertake costly and time-consuming consenting processes. They also drew attention to existing on-street parking concerns.

1.4 This issue requires urgent attention as there are a number of potential developments in the Lyttelton Commercial Zone for which the Council may receive resource consent applications in the near future. Without an amendment to the District Plan, the ability for landowners to develop their sites is affected. Post-Earthquake regeneration in Lyttelton has been slow, with developers slow to invest and a number of sites still vacant. This proposal seeks to address one of the more significant factors contributing to this.

1.5 The proposed amendment to the District Plan would remove the requirement to provide on-site parking, which is neither necessary nor practicable (in most cases) in Lyttelton. This would represent a return to the situation pre-Earthquake, where most commercial sites did not provide, or provided very little, on-site parking.

1.6 The decision being sought is that the Minister decides to exercise her powers under section 67 of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 (GCR Act) to proceed with this proposal, to invite public comment, and then to consider whether to exercise her powers under section 71 to approve the amendment.

1.7 This proposal fulfills the requirements of section 65 of the GCR Act (Proposal for exercise of power in section 71), by providing the following:

---

1 The relevant provisions affecting this proposal can be found at: https://districtplan.ccc.govt.nz/pages/plan/book.aspx?exhibit=DistrictPlan
a) an explanation of what the exercise of power is intended to achieve;
b) a description of which instrument the exercise of power will apply to, and for how long;
c) an explanation of how the Council expects the exercise of the power to meet one or more of the purposes of the Act;
d) an explanation of why the Council considers the exercise of the power is necessary and preferable to any alternatives to the exercise of power;
e) a draft of the notice that would be published under section 68 if the proposal were approved; and
f) a draft of the notice that would be published under section 71 if the power were exercised.

2 Site details and context

2.1 Lyttelton is a port town and its major commercial and recreation attraction is the Port of Lyttelton, the largest port in the South Island. Lyttelton has a strong community, which is actively involved in implementing projects in the area, including running the Farmers’ Market every Saturday on London Street. The town centre includes a range of land uses, including independent retailers, hospitality, and small-scale offices.

2.2 Lyttelton was badly affected by the Canterbury Earthquakes. While there were few, if any, vacant sites in the Lyttelton town centre prior to the February 2011 Earthquake, approximately 23 percent of that land (around 8,768m²) is now vacant and yet to be redeveloped. This is a significant amount of vacant land compared to an average of about 2,583m² in other neighbourhood commercial centres. A third of buildings on London Street and surrounds sustained extensive damage during the Earthquakes. A number of sites in Lyttelton have seen reinvestment and redevelopment since the Earthquakes. Within the Commercial Zone, this includes a few commercial buildings along Norwich Street and two restaurants along London Street. However, there remain a number of vacant sites, with private sector investment in the area not at the level expected. There is still some way to go before the commercial centre reaches its full development potential. Landowners have, at various stages, raised the issue of parking requirements (and the related length and cost of resource consent processes) as an impediment to development in the centre.

2.3 The proposed rule amendment will apply only to sites located within the Lyttelton Commercial Zone, which is generally bounded by or adjacent to London Street, Norwich Quay, Oxford Street and Canterbury Street. The map below shows the centre (CBP areas outlined in pink) and its zoning context. The Lyttelton Commercial Zone is classified as a neighbourhood centre within the hierarchy of commercial centres identified in the District Plan.

---

2 Commercial Centre Fact Sheets 2016
2.4 The District Plan requires new land use activities in the Lyttelton Commercial Zone to provide a minimum number of on-site car parks. The number of car parks required depends on, for example, the type of activity (for example, retail, commercial services, education), the likely number of trips it will attract, and the number of people being catered for.¹

2.5 Attempts to comply even partially with the on-site parking requirements will have adverse environmental effects, such as breaking up the continuous line of building facades along the street frontage. This would be inconsistent with the historic character and identity of Lyttelton’s town centre and contrary to the recommendations in the urban design guidelines for the Lyttelton Town Centre (Appendix 15.15.6 - Design guidelines – Lyttelton Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone of the District Plan). The guidelines seek to maintain the character of the centre through appropriate form and scale of built development. Maintaining this character leaves little or no room for vehicular access and on-site car parking.

Potential effects for on-street parking in Lyttelton

2.6 A potential consequence of this proposal is ‘overspill’ parking occurring in the town centre and surrounding residential streets. This is a situation that already exists and existed prior to the earthquakes. However, depending on the final configuration of activities and land ownership following redevelopment, there is some potential for additional off-street parking

¹ Christchurch District Plan Appendix 7.5.1
demand, not all of which will be met as part of the development. This latent demand will therefore need to be met elsewhere in the vicinity.

2.7 In order to assess the potential effects of the proposal, on-street parking surveys were carried out during May and June 2019, in and around London Street. These surveys sought to gain information on areas where parking appears to be already under pressure, and on areas where there appears to be capacity to accommodate more on-street parking. A separate report is attached as Appendix 3. The overall findings were:

   a) Overall there appears to be roadside parking available most days in the surveyed area, apart from on London Street between Canterbury and Oxford Streets.

   b) On the days surveyed, parking is most constrained around lunchtimes.

   c) At the busiest times there appears to be around 130 road-side spaces vacant, in the area surveyed.

2.8 A desktop assessment was also undertaken to calculate the potential demand for on-street parking that could eventuate from developing existing vacant sites, if businesses were not required to provide on-site parking. Based on broad assumptions about types of activities that could be established, and parking reduction factors that would be applicable, the assessment calculated that demand for approximately 120 extra spaces might potentially be generated. The majority of this latent demand comes from five sites, and most of these sites have the potential to provide some on-site parking. In theory this number of parking spaces can be accommodated through the availability of on-street parking, accepting that much of that parking is time restricted and would not be available for long-term parking.

2.9 Whilst there is likely to be parking overspill should the proposal be adopted, the research undertaken indicates that the safety and efficiency surrounding road network would not be significantly adversely affected. This of course depends on the scale and intensity of new development compared to that which existed prior to the earthquakes (on-street parking in residential areas did not appear to be an issue prior to the Canterbury Earthquakes).

2.10 The biggest demand for parking is on market day (Saturday), which is an existing situation that results in extensive ‘overspill’ into residential areas. There is little that can be done to reduce this impact other than to close or scale back the market, neither of which is desirable in terms of promoting business in the commercial area.

2.11 If issues do emerge over time, the Council will need to respond through parking management approaches such as residential parking schemes, giving priority to short-term parking, and stricter enforcement. Lyttelton has a good bus service that can be used by commuters and many local employees will be within walking distance of their place of work. It will be important for the on-street parking situation to be continually monitored.
3 What is the exercise of power intended to achieve (section 65(2)(a))?  

3.1 The exercise of powers under section 71 of the GCR Act would expedite amendments to Chapter 7 of the CDP, to remove the obligation to provide on-site car parks in the Lyttelton CBP Zone. The use of Section 71 could complete the process within six months of it being initiated, providing greater certainty and alleviating costs for land owners and potential developers.

3.2 The objective of this proposal is to contribute to the regeneration of Greater Christchurch through the development of the Lyttelton town centre. Lyttelton’s post-Earthquake development is demonstrably slow and a number of opportunities for redevelopment of sites in the town centre have not been taken advantage of. The town is about to receive a significant number of visitors once the new cruise ship berth opens in November 2020, and this increases the urgency of the need to address the situation.

3.3 The amendment, which will exempt development from providing on-site parking, will expedite the development of community infrastructure such as the Museum and Harbour Light Theatre site. Both of these developments will have positive effects on the community and the economic wellbeing of the area, by attracting visitors and providing entertainment and education for the local population.

3.4 Although this amendment to the District Plan will remove a significant impediment to development, it is likely that most developers would still need to submit applications for resource consent for urban design requirements relating to Lyttelton. The urban design requirements have been designed to generally enable development while ensuring a high standard of design. Rather than impeding development, they are aimed at ensuring it can occur, and that it respects the local character and built form. Applications are unlikely to be notified for urban design reasons.

3.5 It is not intended that the exercise of powers would inhibit the provision of on-site parking where possible and necessary. It may be possible for some developments to provide a small number of parking spaces. It is also possible that a developer may consider incorporating a parking building or similar, where topography and site size and dimensions allow, for example along Norwich Quay where sites are generally larger and flatter.

3.6 It is also not intended that the exercise of powers would allow developments that are intending to provide a substantial number of residential units to be exempt from providing parking for these units. While aiming to encourage development, significant residential development will exacerbate potential overspill parking issues, and increase the likelihood that residents would regularly park in the commercial areas, i.e. along shop fronts. This is a situation that needs to be avoided if the overall regeneration of the commercial centre is to be successful. This issue was raised as part of early public engagement on the proposal, and has been taken into account in drafting the proposed plan change, which excludes developments that contain more than two residential units, as outlined below.
4 Which instruments will the exercise of the power apply to (section 65(2)(b))

4.1 Through the exercise of powers under section 71 of the GCR Act, the Council is seeking to make permanent amendments to one rule in Chapter 7 - Transport, in the District Plan. This would apply unless and until those District Plan provisions are subsequently changed by lawful process.

4.2 The proposed amendment would exempt new activities in the Lyttelton section of the Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone from having to meet these requirements. However developments that include more than two residential units would need to comply with the parking requirements for the residential units only.

4.3 The proposal involves a straightforward amendment to the District Plan. There are no amendments to objectives and policies, consequential changes, or amendments to higher order documents. The specific amendments are outlined below in bold:

4.4 7.4.2.1 Permitted activities

a. The activities listed below are permitted activities if they meet the activity specific standards set out in this table and the standards in Rule 7.4.3.

b. Activities may also be controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary, non-complying or prohibited as specified in Rules 7.4.2.2, 7.4.2.3, 7.4.2.4, 7.4.2.5, and 7.4.2.6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity specific standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>For activities located in the Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone in Lyttelton, the requirements of Rule 7.4.3.1 apply only to residential activity containing more than two residential units on the same site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.1 Option 1 - for the exemption to apply to the entire Lyttelton Commercial Zone. However, this includes at least one site that is relatively large and flat, with the potential to attract a lot of visitors while at the same providing some on-site parking.

4.5.2 Option 2 – limiting the exemption to sites with frontage on London Street, where the most urgent concern is. However, this would not cover all sites for which the minimum parking requirements are a problem. For example, there are sites on Oxford and Canterbury Streets where meeting the minimum standards is likely to be just as problematic.

4.5.3 Option 3 - for the exemption to cover all of the Lyttelton Commercial Zone other than a few selected sites, of sufficient size and suitable shape to enable on-site car parking to be accommodated. An example would be the site owned by Independent Fisheries Limited, on the corner of Canterbury Street and Norwich Quay. However, the threshold in deciding which sites should be exempted could be seen as arbitrary and the configuration of the sites could change in the future, which would create complications.

4.6 Council considers that providing an exception from the minimum on-site car parking requirements for all of the Lyttelton Commercial Zone would be the simplest and fairest approach. It is also the approach that retains the position of the Council prior to the hearings and decisions on the Replacement District Plan.

4.7 Consideration was also given to the appropriateness of residential development in the Lyttelton Commercial Zone coming under this exemption. The Council has considered it appropriate to exclude developments that propose to provide more than two residential units, as well as boarding houses and student hostel accommodation. This would reduce the likelihood that residents will park in front of businesses that require those spaces for customers, as well as reduce the potential for parking overspill more generally.

5 How the Council expects the exercise of the power to meet one or more of the purposes of this Act (section 65(2)(c))

5.1 The GCR Act supports the regeneration of greater Christchurch through five specified purposes, as set out in section 3(1), including s3(1)(a) ‘enabling a focused and expedited regeneration process’, s3(1)(b) ‘facilitating the ongoing planning and regeneration of greater Christchurch’, s3(1)(c) ‘enabling community input into decisions on the exercise of powers under section 71’, and recognising local leadership.

5.2 Section 3(2) defines ‘regeneration’ and ‘urban renewal’ as:

regeneration means—

a. rebuilding, in response to the Canterbury earthquakes or otherwise, including—

(i) extending, repairing, improving, subdividing, or converting land:

(ii) extending, repairing, improving, converting, or removing infrastructure, buildings, and other property:
b. improving the environmental, economic, social, and cultural well-being, and the resilience, of communities through—

(i) urban renewal and development:

(ii) restoration and enhancement (including residual recovery activity)

urban renewal means the revitalisation or improvement of an urban area, and includes—

a. rebuilding:

b. the provision and enhancement of community facilities and public open space.

5.3 Encouraging the redevelopment of the Lyttelton Commercial Zone by removing the on-site car parking requirements will contribute to ‘regeneration’ of greater Christchurch. The exercise of section 71 powers will support this ‘regeneration’ through meeting the following purposes of the GCR Act.

a. Enabling a focused and expedited regeneration process (section 3(1)(a))

The proposed exercise of powers under the GCR Act to remove the on-site parking requirements from the District Plan will remove one of the more significant impediments to regeneration in the Lyttelton town centre. It will enable focused and expedited regeneration in the town centre, through helping to progress a number of specific developments. As per the definition of regeneration in the Act, this will improve ‘the environmental, economic, social, and cultural well-being, and the resilience, of communities through urban renewal and development, and restoration and enhancement (including residual recovery activity)’ of the historic character of the Lyttelton town centre.

Developers will have greater certainty about the outcome of consenting processes, and these processes will likely be less costly. Where developers have been choosing to abandon or delay their plans, they will have greater impetus to move forward, and a clearer understanding of the requirements relating to parking. Enabling development is one of the primary means we can use to encourage a faster regeneration of the area.

b. Facilitating the on-going planning and regeneration of Greater Christchurch (section 3(1)(b))

Removing parking impediments will better enable ‘rebuilding, in response to the Canterbury earthquakes’; urban renewal development in the Lyttelton commercial area; the restoration of commercial, residential and community centres; and enhancement of opportunities for amenity improvements. These outcomes will improve community wellbeing, and will facilitate the recovery of Lyttelton by complementing the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan and assisting with implementing actions in the Lyttelton Master Plan*. The change will also make the area

---

* For example Action E4, Redeveloping Council-owned land; M4, Public Realm improvements; MS, London Street Parking Review
more attractive to residents and visitors, including visitors arriving on cruise ships. The removal of parking requirements will promote residential and business (mixed use) development and draw more people including businesses into the area.

c. **Enabling community input into decisions on the exercise of powers under section 71 (section 3(1)(c))**

The GCR Act provides that community input on the decision to exercise powers under section 71 will be provided in the following ways:

1) Seeking the views of the strategic partners, Regenerate Christchurch, the Chief Executive of DPMC, and the chief executive

2) If the Minister decides to proceed with the proposal, a public notice published by the Minister inviting written comments on the proposal, which the Minister must take into account before making the final decision on exercising the power

3) In considering whether to exercise the power in section 71, the Minister must—
   (a) take into account the comments provided under section 68(c); and
   (b) have particular regard to any views of the strategic partners and Regenerate Christchurch that are expressed in the comments provided under section 68(c)

Engagement with affected stakeholders (residents and the local business community) has already provided an opportunity to comment on the proposal. This engagement has included two public drop-in sessions, and written feedback. Feedback, which was overall supportive of the proposal, has been taken into account in the drafting of this report and the proposed plan change.

d. **Recognising local leadership and providing them a role in local decision making (section 3(1)(d))**

The Christchurch City Council, as statutory administrator of the District Plan, has recognised that there is an issue with the current provisions relating to parking requirements for Lyttelton, and has developed this proposal to exercise power under section 71 of the GCR Act to resolve this. Accepting this proposal would recognise and support the local leadership of the Council on this issue.

6 **Why does the Council consider the exercise of the power is necessary and preferable to any alternatives (section 65(2)(d))?**

6.1 Under section 11(2) of the GCRA, “A Minister or a chief executive may exercise or claim a power, right, or privilege under this Act where he or she reasonably considers it necessary.”

6.2 The Court of Appeal noted that the expression used in this statutory test is not, as is commonly the case, “reasonably necessary”. The “reasonably” qualifies “consider”, not “necessary”. It must be objectively reasonable for the Minister to consider it necessary to use the power. This was in the context of considering the application of section 10(2) of the

---


6 *Independent Fisheries at* [22].
Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 (which is similarly worded), to decisions of the Minister.

6.3 The question, then, is whether it can be reasonable for the Minister to consider it necessary to use section 71 powers to achieve one or more of the purposes of the Act, taking into account any alternative powers that are available.

6.4 The necessity for using the GCR Act to make the amendments to the District Plan arises from:

- The urgent need to address the issues surrounding the regeneration and redevelopment of the Lyttelton town centre in particular, as opposed to any other neighbourhood centre. These issues are in part created by the current on-site parking provision requirements in the District Plan. The requirements are causing uncertainty, costs and delays for potential commercial developments, and a plan change that is narrow in focus and scope is needed to address the particular issues faced.
- The importance of expediting the redevelopment of sites that have been vacant since the Earthquakes. This redevelopment, which is currently moving very slowly or not at all in some cases, will stimulate the local economy, contribute to the urban design and amenity of London Street and surrounds, and help meet the social needs of the community.
- This process would be the most efficient way to deal with these issues. Any other possible alternative would not address the problem in the direct, focused and efficient way that is required to encourage the regeneration outcomes outlined in section 5 above. The narrow scope of this change is also best approached using a section 71 process.

Options for amending the District Plan - consideration of alternatives

6.5 The Council has considered the viability of alternative processes to make these changes to the District Plan. None of these are able to achieve a resolution to this issue with the same efficiency, timeliness and certainty. As the only changes sought are amendments to Clause 7.4.3.1 (minimum and maximum number and dimensions of car parking spaces required), a section 71 proposal provides more control and certainty of scope. This is because the Minister is only able to accept or decline the proposal following public comment, and the decision is made by the Minister rather than a hearings panel (for example). This would provide more certainty of outcome and is less likely to result in protracted planning processes.

6.6 Due to the early revocation of the Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch Replacement District Plan) Order in Council 2014, the Council is now able to undertake changes to the District Plan under normal Resource Management Act 1991 processes. Therefore, the below consideration of viable alternatives takes into account relevant RMA processes.

Plan change under schedule 1, Part 1 of the RMA

6.7 The Council would prepare a plan change, notify for public submissions and further submissions, and hold a hearing if required. This process is well understood and is the ‘standard’ process under the RMA. However, it can be a lengthy process due to the number of steps, and the potential for the plan change to be appealed. The use of the standard plan change process would take at least 12 months, and appeals to the Environment Court could
add a further 6-12 months to this process. There is the potential for high costs to be involved in this process (including notification, processing submissions, hearings and litigation). Depending on the number and complexity of submissions, and the length of the hearings process, costs could exceed $100,000, excluding private costs. The amount could be even more if the decision is appealed.

6.8 This process would not address the issues facing Lyttelton redevelopment with the urgency, focus and efficiency that a section 71 process would achieve. The process is likely to be costly in terms of time, money, and staff resource. It would not alleviate uncertainty for developers who are looking to advance the development of their sites in the near future, and would not support the regeneration of the area.

6.9 A standard plan change process is not appropriate for such a narrow and focused plan change as proposed. It is likely that this would be the preferred method if a planning process was to consider wider exemptions to minimum parking requirements for other neighbourhood/local centres.

Streamlined planning process under the RMA

6.10 This process allows councils to make a request to the Minister for the Environment to use a streamlined planning process, enabling councils to be more responsive to urgent issues and community needs. However, the proposed change is unlikely to meet any of the criteria outlined in section 80C(2) of the RMA for the use of this process.

6.11 There is no opportunity for appeals when using the streamlined process, and timeframes may be shorter than the standard process. This process is largely untested in Christchurch, and is generally intended to be used for issues that carry significantly more weight than the one at hand.

6.12 Even if any of the criteria in section 80C(2) were deemed to be relevant, using a direction from the Minister to make what is a minor amendment in national terms would be an inefficient use of his powers, and likely contrary to the intent of the legislation. Conversely, using local legislation (the GCR Act) to address a local regeneration issue is more appropriate, and is aligned with the purposes of the GCR Act. For the reasons outlined above, the Council would not be able to use the streamlined planning process for this plan change.

Resource consent based on current Christchurch District Plan provisions

6.13 This alternative is to retain the status quo. Developers would need to gain resource consent for the parking they are proposing to supply (if any). They will continue with their current processes and provide analysis and rationale on why they cannot comply with the on-site parking requirements, and the effects of this. This current approach determines on a case-by-case basis whether each development is responding appropriately. This has not been tested to date, and it may prove difficult to consent larger developments, in particular.
6.14 Using a resource consent process does not address the wider issue for the regeneration of the town centre in an integrated manner, nor present a clear planning framework for all development to respond to. Pursuing this course of action might call into question the integrity of the District Plan, if rules are not delivering anticipated outcomes or are unnecessarily creating the need for ongoing consents.

*Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016: Regeneration Plan or an amendment to the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP)*

6.15 Like the section 71 proposal, a Regeneration Plan under the GCR Act would enable the Minister to consider amendments to District Plan. A Regeneration Plan, however, is better suited to more complex development proposals, and potentially a number of land uses and zones.

6.16 The amendment is limited to the Lyttelton Commercial Zone and is of much more discrete scope than would be expected with a Regeneration Plan. In this instance, therefore, a Regeneration Plan process is not considered as a necessary alternative.

6.17 Section 12(1)(b) of the GCR Act enables proposals for amendments to the LURP that would direct the Council to amend the District Plan. As with a Regeneration Plan, however, it is a two-stage process that requires the preparation of a draft outline of amendments and then draft amendments. This is a process suited to more complex issues or rezoning of a wider area. The section 11 necessity tests for the Minister to reasonably consider it necessary to use the GCR Act apply to this process as well. Overall, making the amendments to the District Plan through an amendment to the LURP is considered inefficient and unnecessarily complex.

**Conclusion**

6.18 As a result of this assessment the Council considers that the Minister (for Greater Christchurch Regeneration) can reasonably consider it necessary to use her powers under section 71 to amend the District Plan, which would achieve the purposes of the GCR Act. None of the alternatives explored above are as effective and efficient in these particular circumstances, and they would not serve to advance regeneration in Lyttelton. The standard plan change process is the only alternative that would achieve the desired outcome, however it would take significantly longer than a section 71 process, thereby undermining regeneration and recovery goals and failing to provide certainty to developers on projects.

7 **Draft of Notices to be published if the Minister approves the proposal**

7.1 A draft of the notice that would be published under section 68, should the Minister decide to proceed with the proposal, is set out in Appendix 1.

7.2 A draft of the notice that would be published under section 71, should the Minister approve the proposal, is also set out in Appendix 2.
Appendix 1 – Draft section 68 Public Notice

Public Notice:

OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENT

REMOVAL OF MINIMUM ON-SITE PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE LYTTELTON COMMERCIAL BANKS PENINSULA ZONE: PROPOSAL TO EXERCISE THE POWER UNDER SECTION 71 OF THE GREATER CHRISTCHURCH REGENERATION ACT 2016 TO AMEND THE CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT PLAN

This proposal applies to the Lyttelton Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone, generally bounded by or adjacent to London Street, Norwich Quay, Oxford Street and Canterbury Street.

Pursuant to section 68 of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 (GCR Act) the Minister for Greater Christchurch Regeneration, invites written comment on the Proposal to exercise her powers under section 71 of the GCR Act to amend the Christchurch District Plan to:

- Amend Rule 7.4.2.1 Permitted activities, in Chapter 7 – Transport in the Christchurch District Plan, to remove the minimum on-site parking requirements for developments in the Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone in Lyttelton, where that development does not contain more than two residential units. For activities that include more than two residential units, the minimum parking standards would not apply to the first two units.

The Proposal may be inspected on the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet’s website at [website] and copies are available for inspection at: Christchurch City Council service centres and libraries, and the main office of Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils from x [month] 2019, during normal business hours.

Written comments on the Proposal may be made to the Greater Christchurch Group of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet by no later than [date].

Written comments may be made online at [website]

Or emailed to [email address]

Or posted to [address]

Dated this the day of [month] 2018.

HON [XX], Minister for Greater Christchurch Regeneration.
Appendix 2 – Draft section 71 Gazette Notice

Gazette Notice:

**DECISION ON REMOVAL OF MINIMUM ON-SITE PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE LYTTELTON COMMERCIAL BANKS PENINSULA ZONE: PROPOSAL TO EXERCISE THE POWER UNDER SECTION 71 OF THE GREATER CHRISTCHURCH REGENERATION ACT 2016 TO AMEND THE CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT PLAN**

Pursuant to sections 69 and 71 of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 the Minister for Greater Christchurch Regeneration, has exercised her powers to approve the Proposal to amend the Christchurch District Plan as it applies to Lyttelton Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone, generally bounded by or adjacent to London Street, Norwich Quay, Oxford Street and Canterbury Street to:

- Amend Rule 7.4.2.1 Permitted activities, in Chapter 7 – Transport in the Christchurch District Plan, to remove the minimum on-site parking requirements for developments in the Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone in Lyttelton, where that development does not contain more than two residential units. For activities that include more than two residential units, the minimum parking standards would not apply to the first two units.

The date on which the exercise of the power took effect was on the xxth day of [month] 201x.

HON [XX], Minister for Greater Christchurch Regeneration.
Appendix 3 – Parking survey report

LYTTELTON ON-STREET CAR PARKING SURVEY REPORT

JULY 1, 2019
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
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Executive Summary
This car parking survey has been carried out by the Christchurch City Council, and seeks to evaluate the available weekday on-street car parking capacity in Lyttelton. The overall supply of on-street carparks within the immediate area of the Lyttelton town centre is 427. At the busiest time, approximately 130 of these carparks are available. However it was found that London Street, particularly the section between Oxford and Canterbury Streets, is at or near capacity at most times during the day. Therefore, other Lyttelton streets have most of the available on-street carparks and have between 30-60% available capacity throughout various parts of the day.

Methodology
Car parking survey methodology
- The survey was carried out over three days in May 2019, on Tuesday 7th, Friday 10th and Wednesday 22nd. Surveys were carried out at four times during the day, at 10:00am, 12:30pm, 3:00pm, and 4:30pm.
- Car parks were categorised into five types: unrestricted, 120 minutes, 60 minutes, 10 minutes, 5 minutes, and disability parks. Cars parked in illegal areas were not considered.
- The survey was carried out by one person walking around the survey area (Figure 1) and counting and recording the number of vacant carpark spaces available.
- Each survey took approximately 30-45 minutes to complete.
- Available carparks were counted as they appeared at the time of count, even if a car was about to pull into the park or about to leave.

Figure 1 - map of the area surveyed for car parking availability in Lyttelton (note: this particular photo was taken on a market day and is not related to the dates and times of the survey).
Data limitations

- The length of time needed to carry out a survey was 30-45 minutes. Therefore the actual time the survey was carried out is likely to vary slightly between streets and on different days than the time stated. For example, when a survey was started at 10:00am, each part of the survey area will have been surveyed within 30-45 minutes of the start time, between 10:00am and 10:45am.

- While the survey was carried out on three different days over a period of 15 days to increase the sample size, it does not provide a full representation of the car parking situation in Lyttelton. Factors like seasonal variability are likely to have an impact on car parking availability.

- This survey does not account for car parking availability on the weekends. During these peak periods (particularly the Saturday market), car parking in Lyttelton is likely to be at or near capacity.

Graph limitations

- Table 1, Figure 2, and Figure 3 show overall carpark supply, combining unrestricted, 120 minutes, 60 minutes, 10 minutes, 5 minutes and disability parks. By not differentiating between these different types of parking, it provides a more generalised presentation of the data.

- In Table 1 and Figure 2 the parking data has been grouped into entire streets with the exception of London Street. This also provides a more generalised presentation of the data, as it will not show which parts of the street are close to parking capacity and which parts are not. London Street was split into two sections to show the situation in more detail for the main retail area.

- Averaging car parking availability over 3 days can disguise the variability in the supply of available car parks. To mitigate this, error bars were added to the graphs to show the maximum and minimum number of available car parks observed throughout the survey.

Conditions

- On the first Tuesday of the survey it was raining/drizzling in the morning. This cleared in the afternoon but was still overcast.

- The Wednesday and Friday were fine sunny days.

- No other significant events were observed in Lyttelton during the days the survey was carried out.

- The surveys were carried out during a normal school week, and school traffic was therefore a factor in the survey.
Results

Car parking availability within Lyttelton streets

![Bar chart showing car parking availability at different times of the day](chart.png)

Figure 2 - On-street car parking availability at different times of the day compared to the overall supply of car parks.

Table 1 - Average percentage of available car parks for the main streets in Lyttelton at different times of the day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Available Carpark Capacity (10:00am)</th>
<th>Available Carpark Capacity (12:30pm)</th>
<th>Available Carpark Capacity (3:00pm)</th>
<th>Available Carpark Capacity (4:30pm)</th>
<th>Carpark Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street (Norwich to Exeter)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester (Oxford to Dublin)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (Canterbury to Dublin)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (Oxford to Canterbury)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich (East Oxford to Dublin)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin (Norwich to Winchester)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury (Norwich to Winchester)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner (Oxford to Watsons)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The street with the highest consistent demand for car parking is London Street (Oxford to Canterbury) (Figure 2). Within this area the average available capacity at the four times of the day surveyed was never greater than 16% and at 12:30pm it was as low as 7% (Table 1), and on one day it was very close to full capacity at this time (Figure 2). The other section of London Street (Canterbury to Dublin) has the second highest demand for on-street car parking (Figure 2). However the demand is less consistent than on London Street (Oxford to Canterbury), with average available car parking capacity increasing later in the day, to 26% at 3:00pm and 31% at 4:30pm (Table 1).

Oxford Street and Sumner Road are the only streets that have their least available capacity at 3:00pm (Figure 2). During this time Oxford Street has an average of 33% of total parking available and Sumner has 40% (Table 1). Dublin Street usually has a significant proportion of carparks available at all of the four times and does not vary much throughout the day compared to the other streets (Figure 2). Norwich Quay and Canterbury Street both have quite significant decreases in available car parking capacity at 12:30pm (Figure 2). Norwich Quay goes from having 45-60% capacity at the three other times observed to an average of 27% at 12:30pm (Table 1). Canterbury Street goes from having around 40-55% available capacity to an average of 28% at 12:30pm (Table 1). Winchester Street has less than 45% available capacity at each of the survey times. Its busiest time is at 10:00am, which is unique for this survey (Figure 2).

**Overall car parking availability in Lyttelton and types of car parks**

![Graph showing Lyttelton on-street carpark availability at different times of the day](image)

*Figure 3 - Average number of available carparks in Lyttelton’s main streets at different times of the day*
Table 2 - Average percentage of available on-street car parks in Lyttelton at different times of the day divided into types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car parking type</th>
<th>Number of Carparks</th>
<th>Available Carpark Capacity (10:00am)</th>
<th>Available Carpark Capacity (12:30pm)</th>
<th>Available Carpark Capacity (3:00pm)</th>
<th>Available Carpark Capacity (4:30am)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P5/ Bus stop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P60 (only Mon-Fri 8-5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P120 (except school times P3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted (except 2 residential)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of on-street car parks available in the surveyed area is 427. This is divided into unrestricted, 120 minutes, 60 minutes, 10 minutes, 5 minutes and disability parks. Of these, 314 are classified as unrestricted, and 81 are 60-minute time limited spaces (Table 2). The rest of the car parking types make up the remaining 32 car parks. On average, car park availability for unrestricted on-street car parks is between 36-51% over the various times of the day (Table 2). The second-largest group of car parks (P60) averages 8-21% available capacity over the various times of the day surveyed (Table 2).

Over the four different times the survey was carried out, the least available capacity occurred at 12:30pm when there was on average around 130 available car parks (Figure 3). However the number of available car parks was quite variable between the different days. At 12:30pm, available car parks ranged from 107 to 147 depending on the day (Figure 3). At all of the other times there was an average of over 150 car parks available and at 4:30pm there were almost 200 car parks available (Figure 3).
There are three disabled carparks in Lyttelton. There is one each on the north and south side of London Street (Oxford to Canterbury), and one on the east side of Oxford Street in between London Street and Norwich Quay. The demand for disabled car parking in Lyttelton over the three day survey shows that on no occasion were all the disabled carparks being used. On the Tuesday and Friday there were always at least two carparks available at all times. On the Wednesday at 12:30pm and 3:00pm there was only one free disabled parking space (Figure 4).

**Conclusion**

**Key Points**

- London Street (Oxford to Canterbury) has, on average, 7-16% available capacity from 10:00am – 4:30pm.
- London Street (Canterbury to Dublin) is also near capacity at 12:30pm, however does not remain as close to capacity throughout the day as the other section of London Street.
- All of the other streets never have less than 25% average available capacity during these times of the day, and many of them have much more than this.
- 12:30pm is when there are the least on-street carparks available overall. At this time there was an average of approximately 130 available carparks. On the busiest day there were only 107 available carparks at this time.
- Disability parking was not observed to reach capacity during this survey.
- The majority of carparks within Lyttelton are unrestricted (314 out of 427).
- Restricted carparks generally have less available capacity than unrestricted carparks.
Submissions on District Plan change - minimum onsite parking in Lyttelton.

Consultation open: 20 May 2019 - 10 June 2019

### Submission number | First name | Last name | Name of organisation | Feedback on the proposal
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
25442 | Tim & Emily | Riley |  | While it will be great to see further redevelopment and regeneration of the town centre, there is already a significant lack of on-street parking available to service the existing developments. This lack has become more evident with the recent opening of the road to Sumner. Proceeding with further developments without onsite parking will exacerbate this problem. We believe a solution to the parking problem is needed before this change to the rules can be implemented, such as an open car park or car park building.

25441 | Peter | Rough | Lyttelton Historical Museum Society Inc | I am writing this submission as Chair of the Development Sub-committee of the Lyttelton Historical Museum Society Inc. The Society is the owner of 33/35 London Street and it is the Society’s intention to build a four-level museum on the site, which will cover 85% of the site’s surface area.

To date we have had concept and preliminary design proposals prepared by architects Warren and Mahoney. Approximately two thirds of the proposal’s frontage on London Street will be taken up by the entrance to the museum and remaining one third will be taken up by commercial premises thus ensuring the museum building will present an ‘active frontage’ in accordance with what Council planners have indicated would be a desirable outcome.

It is our intention to maximise the use of the site for the purposes of a museum. A delivery area/loading bay is planned for the rear of the building with access via an existing laneway off Canterbury Street over Council-owned land associated with Lyttelton Library. (We have had favourable preliminary discussions with Council staff on this matter.)

We do not have a need for staff parking on the site and we consider that to provide visitor parking would be a token gesture and seriously curtail useable space for the museum, potentially compromise the London Street facade and, if off London Street, result in the loss of at least two existing angle car parks in the street in order to provide for on-site vehicular access. To provide underground parking such as occurred in the previous building on the site, would seriously compromise the amount of space left over in the remaining three levels of our proposal for a viable museum.

On behalf of the Society I support the proposal to change the rules of the District Plan by removing the minimum onsite parking requirement applying to development in the Lyttelton town centre. To have to provide onsite parking as part of the museum development would seriously compromise our proposal on what is a relatively small site, and if the parking was to occur off our site’s London Street frontage it would likely result in unattractive visual and physical changes to the streetscape of the main commercial block in London Street where building frontages almost invariably occupy most of their site’s street frontage.

It is my opinion that there would be some merit if residential developments on London Street were required to provide off-street parking, but it would perhaps be untoward to require that in every case. Larger sites for which residential development is part of a proposal, such as Colletts Corner, could perhaps accommodate some onsite parking without compromising the streetscape of London Street. Parking could be underground, given the topography of the site, with potential access off Oxford Street. Taking this site into consideration it could perhaps be that the existing rule be changed to remove the minimum onsite parking requirement except in circumstances where a site is over a certain size (to be determined).

With regard to general parking issues in Lyttelton and perceived problems (by some people) at certain times, such as on market days and the Winter Festival, etc, from discussions I and museum colleagues had with Lyttelton Port Company (LPC) personnel it was indicated to us that the LPC has a long-term plan to make available waterfront land east of Te Ana Marina for public access and use, following reclamation development east of the existing coal stockpile area. It would seem to me that there could be considerable opportunity for car parking on the waterfront and if a proposed pedestrian link via a proposed footbridge over Norwich Quay was constructed, to facilitate ease of access between the waterfront and the town, peak-time parking problems would be relieved. With this possibility on the horizon it would a shame to compromise the existing...
streetscape character of London Street’s main commercial block by continuing with and enforcing the current minimum onsite parking requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25406</td>
<td>Lynnette Baird</td>
<td>For London Street (between Oxford and Canterbury) I agree with the proposal to remove off street parking requirements for new developments; primarily from a safety aspect of having no vehicle crossings along the London Street foot path, and to be fair, most (but not all) sites along this stretch of street are too narrow to accommodate vehicle access plus a building. However, for sites that could reasonably develop off street parking: as a particular example, No. 3 to No. 9 London Street where multiple small sites are being merged and developed into one complex - access from Oxford Street to a basement level carpark is not an unreasonable expectation. Removing off street requirements only serves to benefit the developer who seeks to maximise their returns from the development, but it pushes demand for parking onto the residential areas. This is neither reasonable or acceptable. I feel the right to remove carparking requirements from a development, should remain at the discretion of the Council (under the Resource Consent process), and that decision should be based on the confines of the land being developed, on a case by case basis. I do not believe an area wide (whole zone) exclusion should be applied. A large proportion of these town centre sites can accommodate off street parking, so where the land and/or development could feasibly support off street parking, then standard off street parking requirements should be enforced. I further raise concern with where additional vehicles are expected to park - if not on the site being developed? There seems to be no resolve to this problem. Lyttelton Town already has a chronic shortage of street parking (as identified in the Lyttelton Master Plan process several years ago). Given vacant sites within the Town Centre will be redeveloped into multi-use buildings ie: retail / commercial and residential (ie: higher usage than the prior buildings that stood there), this higher usage will substantially increase vehicle traffic and demand for parking. How does Council propose to find a solution for the shortage of parking that is guaranteed to follow the redevelopment of Lyttelton’s Town Centre - without forcing additional costs onto residents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25379</td>
<td>Robert Love</td>
<td>I support the proposed changes, but do believe that they should go further and implement a maximum off street parking restriction, to reduce the use of land to store vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25377</td>
<td>Liz Grant</td>
<td>It would be great to see the on-site parking requirements removed for Lyttelton. More business development would help restore the vitality of the town. This is a strong community but recovery from the earthquake damage is slow, and if that is one of the things that is deterring developers, this move would really help. As everybody knows, particularly evident on Saturday Market days, parking is difficult in Lyttelton but insisting that there be on-site provision is just not practical. Perhaps the Council or a developer would like to consider building a parking building on one of the currently empty sections on Norwich Quay? The top storey would have a terrific view of the harbour so could attract a cafe or restaurant. Thanks for the opportunity for input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25360</td>
<td>Lizzie Meek Lyttelton Museum</td>
<td>I strongly support the proposal to remove the minimum onsite parking requirements applying to development in the Lyttelton town centre. The close-built nature of the town centre, small section size, sloping topography and above all generations of historical precedent make onsite parking impractical and undesirable. The relatively small size of the town centre make access to buildings from on-street parking relatively quick and certainly not off-putting. From the perspective of the proposed new Lyttelton Museum, providing onsite parking for this building would take up so much space as to make the building plans un-viable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 25284  | Jillian Frater | Submission to Lyttelton parking plan changes.  
I support the proposed change, as I consider it is unreasonable and impractical for businesses in the Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone in Lyttelton to provide carparks in association with their operations. It is unclear to me however why those properties located within this zone, but on the southern side of Norwich Quay are not included in the proposed change. To my knowledge, some of this land is privately owned and is not owned by Lyttelton Port. It seems unfair to not include this land, unless it is the Council’s intention to prevent future use of this land for commercial purposes.
I also think that the wider issue of how to provide for the transport needs of visitors and residents in Lyttelton definitely needs to be considered in association with this change, and that the change should not happen in isolation. At present, parking limitations are rarely enforced in Lyttelton (which locals love) but as a consequence business owners and others often park in the main street and other nearby areas for well beyond the time periods given (sometimes all day). If further commercial development occurs in Lyttelton, and carparking is not provided on site, it is likely that more carparking will take place on Norwich Quay. The use of Norwich Quay, between the tunnel and Oxford Street, for parking is a major concern to me. At present priority is given to the passage of cars and heavy trucks and the parking of cars. As a consequence, the use of Norwich Quay by people on bikes is very dangerous. There needs to be provision made for safe cycling on Norwich Quay. With the opening of Sumner Road, the number of people cycling on Norwich Quay has increased substantially, and provision should be made for separated cycleways, or at the very least cycle lanes, on this stretch of the road. The safety of people travelling by bicycle is significantly more important than the use of this valuable land for carparking.
I made submissions on the safety of people walking and cycling on Norwich Quay as part of the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan, and am very pleased that a controlled pedestrian crossing has now been established on Norwich Quay. My other suggestions for improvements to Norwich Quay were however not taken on board. The continued development of Te Ana marina will also require much better links for walking and cycling between the town centre and the marina. Overall, in keeping with its commitment to combating climate change, the Council should be encouraging the use of transport other than private motor vehicles. Improving the safety of Norwich Quay for cyclists would be one step to achieve this. |
| 25177  | Cody Cooper | I support this proposal, but am concerned around the lack of parking available (particularly around market day).  
25167  | Sam Masters | Removing minimum onsite parking requirements for the Lyttelton CBD is a great idea. The Lyttelton CBD is stagnating in terms of development - this will remove one road block.
Uber, e-bikes, car sharing and public transport means that the traditional models of car ownership are no longer valid. It follows that mandated car parks are no longer a necessity. |
| 25142  | AJ Ward Mitre Hotel Holdings Limited | I am the Director of Mitre Hotel Holdings Ltd which owns the Mitre Hotel 40 Norwich Quay. The existing on site minimum parking requirement is a serious impediment to the redevelopment or repair of this site. It's helped make proposals un-economic.
I support the proposed rule change to remove the minimum on site parking requirements. |
<p>| 25052  | Craig Minehain | I support the proposal. It is simply not possible for people planning to build / rebuild on the available sites in the local centre, to find the space to provide the required number of car parks, and if they to provide them under the building, or on a site somewhere else, the cost makes the development not feasible. It should also be noted that car painting is something of an issue in Lyttelton, and the recent re-opening of the coastal road to Sumner has seen a significant increase in the numbers of people coming here, particularly in the weekends. Council might well consider the value of building a purpose-built car parking building. |
| 24919  | John Ascroft | Fully support removal of minimum parking requirements |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24879</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>McLister</td>
<td>The Lyttelton Seafarers Centre is in favour of this change to the plan. We will soon be needing to apply for consent for the building we currently have at 18 Norwich Quay (current consent is temporary earthquake), or for some other site within the proposed zone for change. Seafarers who come to our Centre walk up from the ships, and we only need one or two on road parks for volunteer staff generally at night when there is plenty of on road parking available. The current rules simply do not apply to our situation and will severely hamper our need to consent the current building or if we move to another site. Our need is just one example of the many unique situations Lyttelton has, and is a good example of why the rules need to take into consideration the Lyttelton context. We praise the foresight that has led to this suggested change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24809</td>
<td>Brent and Ann Stanaway</td>
<td></td>
<td>We support the removal of minimum onsite parking in the designated affected area. The existing rule has stifled commercial redevelopment of Lyttelton and continues to do so. Lyttelton has traditionally not had onsite parking for its smaller commercial buildings on London Street. Requiring onsite parking substantially reduces the available building footprint but also creates pedestrian hazards with vehicles having to cross a well used footpath. While rigidly enforcing the existing parking rules the CCC has done little to alleviate any perceived parking issues in Lyttelton. It has a number of perfectly good spaces for providing car parking including the availability of multiple spaces on the old Plunket site on Sumner Road, (being land which it owns) It is incongruous that such a rigid and inflexible parking rule is being enforced when the CCC is actively engaged in promoting alternatives to private car use, including ev car sharing, public transport and cycles. London Street has its congestion issues, though that is a Lyttelton tradition and is tolerated reasonably well by locals. However the congestion could be minimised by requiring delivery vehicles to attend prior to 9.30 am and excluding larger campervans from the angle car parks on the southern side. The parking rule applicable to our redevelopment of the Old Library site at 2 Sumner Road has meant that we are unable to consider a retail commercial use on the first floor and have instead opted for office space with the lower parking requirement. Lyttelton before the earthquakes had an increasingly vibrant retail, music and eatery scene generally involving smaller and economic spaces for renters. The number of visitors to the town then, was greater than it currently is and there was rarely an issue about parking for visitors then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicki Clay</td>
<td></td>
<td>As a long term resident on London st, I am very concerned about the parking problems on the street between Oxford st and Canterbury st. Recently the parking situation has been dire. I appreciate the historic character of London st, but as the town is becoming a popular destination we have to be realistic about the vehicles that will need to find parking. Historically there have been some parking spaces at Colletts Corner and the current plans do not appear to have considered car parks. Currently I am fighting for the right to park outside my property without being penalised. My home is historic and the only access to my house is through a narrow alleyway and up some steps. This has not been a problem in the past as I have previously rented parking space and I was also issued a resident’s parking permit by the Banks Peninsula District Council. More recently I have managed to park on London st over night. This is increasingly becoming more difficult. I think it is only fair that new commercial properties provide parking spaces! So please take into account the rights of full time residents on the street!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Forrester</td>
<td>Lyttelton Health Centre</td>
<td>The on-street parking in Lyttelton during normal business hours currently works reasonably well, but only just. On Saturdays and during events, the parking is totally inadequate. To change the District Plan to remove the remove the minimum parking requirements on all properties indicated in the pink zone on the published map would make the parking inadequate at all time, lead to more congestion and inconvenience to locals and visitors alike. Whilst it may be reasonable for very small land plots to be not required to provide parking, this would need to be totally dependent on the intended use of the site, the expected number of occupants/visits/customers and the duration that they would need to have a car park. It should remain that larger properties should provide the existing requirement for site off street parking. If there is any change to parking requirements as proposed, I consider that the CCC has an obligation to the community to provide an off street parking area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Betts</td>
<td></td>
<td>I’m fully in support of a change in the rules in the District plan to allow development in Lyttelton, without the usual requirements to supply off street parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camia Young</td>
<td>Collett’s Corner Ltd</td>
<td>I own the sites at 3-11 London Street. I strongly support this change. If we followed the District Plan’s rules for the Collett’s Corner development we would be required to put 60-70 car parks on the Collett’s Corner site, which is simply impossible. I believe the parking requirements for Lyttelton’s town centre would best be considered holistically rather than on a site by site basis. I would support working on a town wide strategy that supports regeneration if the opportunity were to arise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah van der Burch</td>
<td></td>
<td>I support changing the Plan to ensure that new buildings developed in Lyttelton do NOT need to provide parking spaces. I think that would drastically change the nature of the Village in a very bad way. I would like to see London Street made a pedestrian only street as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Randall</td>
<td></td>
<td>I support the proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 24551 | Jean  | Jack  | Support removal of onsite parking requirements. 
| 24539 | Tony  | Usher | I support the change to remove the minimum onsite parking requirements applying to development in the Lyttelton town centre. 
| 24533 | Anne  | Mackay| I support the change to remove the minimum onsite parking requirements. It's important that the Lyttelton buildings are able to be built right on the street, and there is often little room behind for parking. We need to encourage walking and public transport! 
| 24525 | Brian | Lodge | I would like to see the current onsite parking requirements for Lyttelton business removed. 
In fact I would recommend that London St, from Oxford St to Canterbury St become a pedestrian only area and a carpark be created on Norwich Quay, on land currently occupied by Fulton Hogan. 
The present parking layout on London St creates traffic issues when cars are backing into traffic or a service delivery truck is double parked in the area. 
| 24520 | Andrew| Stark | Stark Bros Ltd and Stark Bros Holdings Ltd support the proposed changes to minimum on site parking requirements to support the various re-development projects in the Lyttelton Town Centre area as identified in the proposed Rule Change. 
| 24515 | Steve | Hanrahan| I support the proposed changes and would like to see the removal of the minimum onsite parking requirements in Lyttelton. 
The town and its commercial centre struggled as a consequence of the Canterbury earthquakes and redevelopment has been slow. Anything hindering further development and regeneration would be detrimental. 
Lyttelton has a very unique geographical make-up and I believe onsite parking dispensations should be considered because of its distinctive historical layout. 
The many now demolished businesses that existed prior to the earthquakes managed without any major parking issues as do the current surviving shops and amenities. 
I feel this proposal is very pragmatic and will assist considerably in revitalising Lytteltonâ€™s business centre. The rejuvenation of the numerous unsightly vacant lots will also be very well-received. 
| 24474 | Chris | Neame| I support further development in Lyttelton so generally support the proposal to remove minimum parking requirements. However, this needs to be considered with the requirement for parking for the town. The town may need additional centralised parking to cater for development. Both of these aspect should be considered at the same time. 
<p>| 24413 | Dana  | Dopleach| I fully support the removal of off-site parking requirements for new developments in Lyttelton's town centre. There isn't space for onsite parking in our steep land, and many people walk or e-bike, making new car parking spots for re-developments less important than it may be in spread-out, flatland suburbs. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24406</td>
<td>John Thrupp</td>
<td>Lyttelton Pharmacy &amp; Post Centre</td>
<td>If the current parking time limits are enforced, I support removing the minimum onsite parking requirements applying to development in the Lyttelton town centre. It is impossible for almost any site in Lyttelton to be expected to develop car parks. The lack of parking is a real problem, I lose customers due to it. Parking times need to be enforced in the designated area in this district plan change. This would go a long way to resolving issues. It is well known among residents that there are no consequences for violation of the 60 minute parking or the 5 min parking zones. Maybe it is time to hand over this to someone else who will do it. Project Lyttelton or the harbour business association to employ a local person to enforce it regularly on top of their other duties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24399</td>
<td>Louis Dyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>I fully support relaxing the laws surrounding carpark requirements for developments in Lyttelton. I see why this law is important elsewhere but it is stagnating the recovery of Lyttelton post Earthquake. I have seen developments at 1, 6 and 40 London St as well as the Supervalue ground floor enter and then halt at the design stage because of the carpark requirements. We will never get back to the pre-quake Lyttelton I remember, immortalised on Google Street View, without this law change or serious public investment in a car parking building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Draft Submission on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill

Reference: 19/649567
Presenter(s): Clive Appleton Team Leader Natural Environment
Brent Pizzey Associate General Council

1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Council to approve the draft submission on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill.

2. Staff Recommendations
   That the Council:
   1. Approve the draft submission on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill (Attachment A) to enable it to be submitted by 16 July 2019.

3. Key Points
   3.1 The purpose of the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill is to establish a framework which New Zealand can use to develop clear, stable climate change policies in accord with the Paris Agreement. The Paris Agreement is a global effort to combat the effects of climate change by limiting the global average temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels.


   3.3 This Bill will have major implications for Council's future operations and legislative reporting concerning meeting emission reduction targets and establishing adaptation plans. If passed, the Bill:
      • Establishes a new independent Climate Change Commission (the Commission) to provide independent expert advice and monitoring, to help keep successive governments on track to the long-term mitigation and adaptation goals;
      • Sets a new greenhouse gas emissions reduction target to:
         o Reduce gross emissions of biogenic methane within the range of 24% to 47% below 2017 levels by 2050, with an interim requirement to reduce emissions to 10% below 2017 levels by 2030;
         o Reduce net emissions of all other greenhouse gases to zero by 2050.
      • Establishes a series of emissions budgets to act as stepping stones towards the 2050 target; and
      • Establishes a range of climate change adaptation measures to make sure New Zealand understands the risks we face, and has a plan to address them.
Key submission points

3.4 In the draft submission (Attachment A), the Council supports the establishment of the Commission as an independent Crown entity.

3.5 The draft submission emphasises that the Council considers it important that the Commission, in its operations, always considers distribution of benefits, costs, burden and risks between Government, local government, business and individuals. This must also include impacts across different socio-economic groups and generations.

3.6 The draft submission states Council endorses the CO2 emission reduction target set for 2050. For methane emissions Council submits that there should be one biogenic methane emission target similar to the 35% or more by 2050 relative to 2010, as recommended by the IPCC. In addition we would like to see the Commission advising the Minister on research required to inform future emission budgets and target reviews.

3.7 The draft submission requests changes to provide that when setting emission budgets and preparing national climate change risk assessments the Commission consults and takes into account local government plans and statutory timeframes.

3.8 When it comes to emission budget reporting it should be mandatory for central government, local government and departments to demonstrate the steps being taken to meet emission targets. This should provide a level of accountability that is currently not written into the Bill.

3.9 The draft submission supports the establishment of a National Adaptation Plan as long as the Minister takes into account the ability (including financial ability), of local authorities to implement adaptation strategies, policies and proposals within statutory time frames.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Draft submission on the Zero Carbon Bill</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Xx July 2019

Committee Secretariat
Environment Committee
Parliament Buildings
Wellington
zerocarbon@parliament.govt.nz

Christchurch City Council submission on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill

Introduction

1. Christchurch City Council (the Council) thanks the Environment Select Committee for the opportunity to provide comment on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill.

2. The Council submitted on specific proposals for a Zero Carbon Bill in July 2018 and it is pleasing to see that the majority of proposals that Council supported have been included into the draft Bill.

3. The Council wants to see urgent action on climate change, both nationally and locally, so on 23 May 2019 it declared a Climate and Ecological Emergency for Christchurch City. Since that date, all four major cities in New Zealand have followed Christchurch in declaring a climate emergency and the number of towns doing the same is growing. Therefore we strongly support the Government in progressing this Bill. In the meantime, the Council is now proceeding with drafting emissions targets for greenhouse gases for Christchurch City. The Council already plans to be net carbon neutral by 2030 for Council activities.

Submission

4. Part 1A - Climate Change Commission
   The Council supports the establishment and role of the Climate Change Commission as set out in the Bill as an independent Crown Entity, and supports the Commission’s advisory and monitoring role to assess Climate Change risk and monitor New Zealand’s progress towards its goals. We support the method of appointing members of the Commission, as set out in the Bill.

5. 5B - Purposes of Commission
   The Council suggests amending 5B (b) so that the Commission’s monitoring and review of Government’s progress is not against “its” goals (which could differ from plans currently in force) but “Government’s progress against the emission budgets, emission reduction plans and national adaptation plans in force.”
5J - Commission’s functions
This section is silent on the Commission’s involvement on advising the Minister on the
preparation of the National Adaptation Plan. Its only proposed involvement in the Plan is
through preparing reports on the Plan’s implementation (clause (h)). We believe that the
Commission should have an integral role in advising the Minister on preparation of the National
Adaptation Plan. Therefore we recommend the following additional clause to section 5J:
(j) to provide advice to the Minister on the preparation of the National Adaptation Plan.

6. Greenhouse gas research will be necessary to inform future budget setting and reviews of
emission targets. This being the case, the Commission should be able to recommend future
research and funding required, therefore we ask that the following clause be included to section
5J:
(k) to provide recommendations to the Minister on research required to inform emission
budgets and target reviews.

7. 5L - Matters Commission must consider
The Council foresees the responsibility for dealing with the impacts of climate change falling on
local government. Therefore this section should have an additional clause:
(g) the distribution of benefits, costs, burden and risks between Government, local
government, business and individuals.

Another matter that the Council believes the Commission must consider is the impacts of
climate change and how the measures required to respond to it could have a disproportionately
detrimental effect on vulnerable groups, such as lower socio-economic groups, given their
limited resources for change. This has been recognised in the list of matters to be considered in
preparing a national climate change risk assessment and national adaptation plan (ss SZN (2)(b))
and SZQ (4)(b) – reference to vulnerable groups or sectors).

We submit that consideration of vulnerable groups is also an important aspect in the exercise of
the Commission’s functions and duties generally, and for the development of emissions budgets
and emission reduction plans, in order to promote a just transition to a low emissions economy.
This can be summarised by referring to a requirement to consider the effect on different socio-
economic groups.

We request the following amendments:
Section 5L (d): ‘social, cultural, environmental, and ecological circumstances, including
differences between sectors and regions and socio-economic groups; and”

Section 5Z (2)(b)(vii): “the distribution of those impacts across the regions and communities
of New Zealand, across different socio-economic groups, and from generation to
generation:”

8. Emission Reduction
5O - Target for 2050

While Council endorses section 5O (1)(a) stating that net emissions of greenhouse gases in a
calendar year, other than biogenic methane, are net zero by the calendar year beginning on 1
January 2050 and for each subsequent calendar year, our preferred option is to have the zero
emission target date increasingly brought forward as research evidence and technological
advancements support it.
While the Council recognises the Government’s proposed 2030 and 2050 targets for gross emissions of biogenic methane, we believe having a target range of at least 24% to 47% less than 2017 emissions by 2050 does not instil the same urgency required as a single target, to drive reductions in methane from the agricultural sector. The Council submits that there should be one biogenic methane emission target and that should initially be set at 47%, with the view of increasing this target as and when new scientific research findings provide overwhelming evidence to change it.

While there is still a level of scientific uncertainty around what biogenic methane emission targets should be set at, the Council would like to raise the following matters for consideration:

i. From an equity point of view, not setting tough targets for methane emissions by 2050 means that other sections of society have to pick up the costs for the agricultural sector.

ii. If a greater reduction target was to be set for methane then it would require greater effort to reduce emissions from the beginning of the emissions reduction period. This would be prudent given New Zealand’s ability to deal with all greenhouse gases in a timely manner is still unknown. An example is if average global temperatures rapidly increase faster than expected. In this scenario, it is likely that there would be a call to mitigate emissions faster than what is currently being asked for. It would therefore be more desirable and effective for New Zealand to be at the forefront in reducing emissions, rather than struggling to catch up, which will likely result in greater economic stress.

iii. A greater reduction target will drive more research and innovation. For example, a greater reduction target will mean a larger market drive for biotech companies to commercialise new and more effective ways of reducing methane emissions from livestock. Greater research effort is critical as we cannot solely rely on the hope that one or two key research breakthroughs will bring about the rapid reduction in emissions being sought after. It will require a holistic suite of technological approaches.

Along with this approach, we encourage Government to promote, invest and encourage primary industries to diversify their land use and production activities, so they can meet emission targets while remaining economically viable.

Council also considers that the 2050 targets should be protected from the whims of political change, by providing that the 2050 targets can only be reduced by a supermajority of Parliament, e.g. 75%.

9. 5P - Target review

Given the uncertainty as to how New Zealand will be able to reduce and offset emissions, we consider it vital that the Commission is given flexibility to recommend, at any time, a change to the 2050 target. Therefore we consider the following additional clause be included in section 5P (1):

(C) at any time where it considers it is necessary to investigate whether there has been a significant change that would permit it to make a recommendation under section 5Q.

In section 5P(2) there is currently no explicit requirement for the Commission to report on what and how matters considered might have influenced emission budget and target recommendations. To ensure transparency, the Council recommends the following amendment to section 5P(2):

The Commission must advise the Minister in writing of the matters considered and how they have influenced outcomes of any review, including any recommendations made......

10. 5R - Government response to target review recommendations
The Ministers reporting timeframe of 12 months back to the Commission in section 5R(1), seems to be a considerable length of time provided. We recognise that time may be required to build consensus for change, but priority should be placed on being able to quickly adapt and respond to any changes in climate change knowledge and goals to reflect the fact that any broad changes made to climate change policy should be dealt with urgently.

We suggest the following amendments to section 5R, denoted in italics:

1. If the Minister receives a 2050 target review recommendation under section 5Q, the Minister must advise the Commission in writing of the Government’s response to the recommendations as soon as practicable and within 12 months of receiving the recommendation.

2. The Minister must present a copy of the Government’s response to the target review recommendation to the House of Representatives as soon as practicable, but within 12 weeks, after it has been provided to the Commission.

Role of Commission in setting emissions budgets

11. SZ - Matters relevant to advising on, and setting, emissions budgets

Emission budget setting will have implications for local government activities and responsibilities, therefore Council recommends the following matter should be included as an additional clause in SZ (2)(b):

(xii) local government plans and legislative timeframes

Monitoring

12. SZI - Commission to report at end of emissions budget period

Given the Commission will be preparing the relevant emissions period budget report, it would seem logical that it also explains exceedances, to assist the Minister in reporting on this under section 5ZI (5), as stated in the Bill. We suggest the following new section in SZI (1):

(d) an assessment of the principal reasons that an emissions budget has not been met, if applicable.

Effect of 2050 target and emissions budgets

13. SZJ - Effect of failure to meet 2050 target and emissions budgets

The Council is disappointed that the emissions targets of the Amendment Bill do not provide sufficient accountability. Therefore Council would like to see the following matters included into SZJ to provide accountability:

(4) The Minister must provide an annual report to the House of Representatives on how the government’s policies will contribute, and are contributing, to meeting the targets and plans under this Act.

Council requests that the Bill expressly provides protection against lawsuits, not only to the Crown but also to local government, e.g. local authorities cannot be sued for their perceived part in a failure to meet the 2050 target or an emissions budget at a general level, and that this extends to protection from lawsuits for failure to achieve requirements of a national adaptation plan generally (as opposed to claims by specific individuals for breach of duty under other statutes leading to foreseeable loss for those individuals).

14. SZK - 2050 target and emissions budget are permissive considerations

SZK (1) - currently allows a person or body the option, “...if they think fit, take the 2050 target or an emissions budget into account in the exercise or performance of a public function...”. The
Council recommends that this should be strengthened such that emissions targets and emission reduction budgets must be taken into account otherwise they will not be taken seriously. We propose the following amendment to SZX (1): *A person or body may, if they think fit, must take the 2050*....

15. SZL - Guidance for departments
The Council considers that departments must set an example to reduce emissions. Therefore the Council proposes that section SZL(1) be amended to provide: “The responsible Minister *may issue guidance for must provide recommendations to* departments on how to take the 2050 target or an emissions budget into account...”.

16. Adaptation
The Council supports the general approach to a National Climate Change Risk Assessment and National Adaptation Plan as set out in the Bill.

17. SZN - Preparation of national climate change risk assessment
The Council considers that when the Commission develops national climate change risk assessments it would benefit from taking into account local risk assessments undertaken by or for local government agencies, including statutory timeframes around long term planning; accordingly, the Council recommends that the following clause should be added to SZN (2):

*(h) local authority statutory timeframes, risk assessments and plans.*

18. SZP – Minister must prepare first national climate change risk assessment
We are concerned that the Minister is tasked with preparing the first national climate change risk assessment and not the Commission, given that they are responsible for subsequent assessments. Having the Minister prepare the first plan does not provide an apolitical independent process, which could result in setting precedents that influence future assessments undertaken by the Commission. The Council submits that the first national climate change risk assessment should be made by the Commission, and that section SZP should be deleted from the Bill. CONSEQUENTIAL changes are to delete section SZN(3) and add a new subsection to SZN that requires the Commission to prepare the first climate change risk assessment no later than 1 year after the commencement of this Part of the Act.

19. SZZ - National adaptation plan
The Council considers that when the Minister is developing a national adaptation plan there should be recognition of local government’s role. Therefore we recommend an additional clause to SZZ (4):

*(h) the ability (including financial ability), of local authorities to implement adaptation strategies, policies and proposals within statutory time frames.*

20. SZV – Minister may request certain organisations to provide information on climate change adaptation
There are no dates in the Bill for when organisations may need to begin reporting. Before this can be done, the Minister must consider the capability of the reporting organisations. The Council suggests that the Bill should provide a start date for reporting that enables organisations plenty of time to plan and allocate resources e.g. a date that aligns with Council Long Term Plan reviews.

21. Part 2 Consequential amendments (clause 10)
The Council does not agree with the Climate Change Commission’s activities under Parts 1A to 1C being covered by confidentiality. We recommend full transparency of the Commission’s work
in the interests of an open democracy and that the Commission should be an “organisation” subject to the usual provisions of the Official Information Act 1982.

Conclusion
22. The Council looks forward to working with Government in achieving the targets set in the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill. We thank you for the opportunity to provide this submission.

For any clarification on points within this submission please contact Clive Appleton, Team Leader Natural Environment at Clive.Appleton@ccc.govt.nz.

Yours faithfully

Lianne Dalziel
Mayor of Christchurch
1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 For Council to approve its draft submission (as attached) on the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Bill.

2. Staff Recommendations
   That the Council:
   1. Approve the draft submission on the Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities Bill.

3. Context/Background
   Issue or Opportunity
   3.1 The Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Bill establishes a new Crown entity (Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities). This entity was foreshadowed late last year in a Government announcement (at that stage it was called the Housing and Urban Development Authority).


   3.3 The new entity will have two key roles – being a public housing landlord, and being an urban development authority (UDA). The Act (and entity) is intended to be in action on 1 October 2019.

   3.4 The Bill consolidates central government housing and urban development delivery capability by:

   3.4.1 disestablishing the Housing New Zealand Corporation (Housing New Zealand) and its development subsidiary, HLC (2017) Limited;

   3.4.2 putting Housing New Zealand and HLC’s functions and assets into Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities;

   3.4.3 repealing the Housing Corporation Act 1974; and

   3.4.4 putting some of the functions and assets related to KiwiBuild that currently sit in the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development into Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities.

   3.5 The Bill’s objectives are to contribute to sustainable, inclusive, and thriving communities that:

   3.5.1 provide people with good quality, affordable housing choices that meet diverse needs;

   3.5.2 support good access to jobs, amenities, and services; and

   3.5.3 otherwise sustain or enhance the overall economic, social, environmental, and cultural well-being of current and future generations.

   3.6 The specific functions listed in the Bill relating to urban development are:
3.6.1 to initiate or undertake any urban development, whether on its own account or on behalf of other persons, including:

(i) development of housing, including public housing, affordable housing, homes for first home buyers, and market housing;

(ii) development and renewal of urban environments, whether or not this includes housing development;

(iii) development of related commercial, industrial, community, or other amenities, infrastructure, facilities, services, or works.

3.6.2 to provide a leadership or co-ordination role in relation to urban development;

(i) supporting innovation, capability, and scale within the wider urban development and construction sectors;

(ii) leading and promoting good urban design and efficient, integrated, mixed-use urban development.

3.6.3 to understand, support, and enable the aspirations of communities in relation to urban development;

3.6.4 to understand, support, and enable the aspirations of Māori in relation to urban development;

3.6.5 to support others to undertake urban development, including through co-investment.

3.7 The Bill also introduces a Government Policy Statement on housing and urban development to promote a housing and urban development system that contributes to the current or future well-being of New Zealanders. Among other things the GPS will set out the Government’s overall direction and priorities for housing and urban development.

3.8 The Government has indicated that a second tranche of legislation setting out the Crown Entities special powers to over-ride local government plans and accelerate urban development initiatives will be introduced before the end of the year. The current Bill does not provide for the establishment of local UDAs, and at this point it is unclear whether the second tranche of legislation will do so.

Key Submission Points

3.9 A draft submission was discussed at an elected members briefing on 2 July 2019. Feedback from the briefing has been incorporated into the final draft submission for approval.

3.10 The key points of the draft Council submission are that in order to achieve its objectives, the Crown entity being proposed by the Bill needs to take strong account of the following matters when undertaking urban development:

- Effective, localised engagement and decision-making with councils and their communities.
- A human rights based approach that prioritises affordable housing provision.
- Existing local planning policies, strategies and documents relating to urban development.

Strategic Alignment

3.11 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

3.11.1 Activity: Strategic Planning and Policy
Level of Service: 17.0.1.1 Advice to Council on high priority policy and planning issues that affect the City. Advice is aligned with and delivers on the governance expectations as evidenced through the Council Strategic Framework.
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Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.
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Christchurch City Council submission on the Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities Bill

Key Submission Points

1. Christchurch City Council (the Council) thanks the Environment Select Committee for the opportunity to provide comment on the Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities Bill.

2. To achieve its noteworthy objectives, the Crown entity being proposed by the Bill needs to take strong account of the following matters when undertaking urban development:

   (i) Effective, localised engagement and decision-making with councils and their communities.
   (ii) A human rights based approach that prioritises affordable housing provision.
   (iii) Existing local planning policies, strategies and documents relating to urban development.

Purpose and Objectives of the Bill

3. The Council supports the Bill’s intent of achieving more diverse, accessible mixed housing communities as reflected in its objectives. A greater range of tenure and typology models, connected to other forms of urban development, are clearly needed to overcome the outdated development models in the housing system that are contributing to household stress.

4. For more comprehensive housing outcomes to be achieved, these will need to occur through locally driven partnerships and decision-making processes with the proposed Crown entity. These are some of the clear learnings to date from Auckland residential developments in Tamaki and the Waimahia Inlet. To be given effect, the Bill’s objectives will need to recognise existing communities and their connections within them, i.e. the security of both people living there and of the community itself.

5. Analogous to the related issue of climate change which the Bill wisely recognises, urban regeneration will be most effective when addressed and responded to at the local level rather than a one size fits all approach. The Bill’s operating principles in Clause 14 should be strengthened to recognise this desired and required ‘localism’ approach to collaboration and partnerships.

6. The Bill correctly recognises the centrality of Maori interests in housing, with much research occurring in this area. Among other reasons this is appropriate given that the Council, like many
others, is grappling with how to make papakāinga housing developments easier to carry out. Addressing these issues would also have benefits in developing other papakāinga-style housing developments generally (e.g. co-housing) to contribute to a broader range of housing options. The Crown entity should be a leader in innovative forms of housing provision models to meet a greater range of, and changing, housing need.

7. The Council agrees with the four wellbeings approach in the Bill’s objectives, which to its mind suggests a long overdue change in conceiving of housing as a merit good rather than a market one. How housing is framed and discussed is important for identifying a broader set of responses to the housing challenges noted in the Bill’s explanatory note. To strengthen this view, it is recommended that the human right to housing, based on the premise of the seven dimensions of ‘housing adequacy’, is more explicitly noted in the Bill, e.g. within the Government Policy Statement clauses.

8. However, the Council considers that the objective of the proposed Crown entity should be to enhance overall well-being, not just sustain it as currently a permitted outcome in the objective. The projects it undertakes should deliver a public good to the community as a whole.

9. The Council also notes the references to ancillary employment, amenities and services, which appears to recognise that urban redevelopment and regeneration needs to occur in a holistic, joined-up way.

Scope and Functions

10. The Council broadly supports a new agency such as the Crown entity being proposed in the Bill that will have powers to unlock current barriers to urban development and growth, in particular the challenges to deliver affordable housing across all tenures. Given the housing challenges facing New Zealand that impact on wellbeing, whilst not losing sight of restoring public housing provision the principle focus of the Crown entity should be on affordable housing, i.e. both rental and owner-occupied.

11. Notwithstanding this support, the Council echoes the comments of SOLGM that it is difficult to comment on this Bill without sight of how it will be given effect to by the 2nd piece of legislation still to be introduced that sets out the new powers of the Crown entity.

12. Most councils have undertaken, with their communities, considerable assessment, planning and investment for housing and urban development as directed by a number of statutes and National Policy Statements. These are intended to enhance the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of their communities, including integration between local authority districts at regional and sub-regional levels. They include Future Development Strategies, Regional Policy Statements, Regional Land Transport Plans, and Long Term Plans.

13. These council driven plans and policy documents, and the commitments made to achieve those outcomes, should not be lightly set aside. In the carrying out of its functions, Kaiā Māra-Homes and Communities should be required to either be consistent with, or at least have particular regard to the plans, policy documents and commitments made by local authorities relating to housing and urban development in accordance with statutory requirements. This will provide an appropriate linkage between this legislation, and its wide ranging powers, and other legislation such as the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity which directs high growth councils to prepare a Future Development Strategy for their areas, based on robust evidence and in collaboration with partners, other agencies and the community.
14. The Crown entity’s powers will also need to follow through to the funding of the necessary infrastructure (and other tools) to support well established growth strategies (e.g. the Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern) that focus on community wellbeing through well designed urban developments. The Council hopes that the necessary resourcing will also follow through into the strategic direction to be outlined in the first General Policy Statement-Housing and Urban Development.

15. In terms of local democracy, in the Greater Christchurch context there has been growing disquiet over the inefficiency and confusion of having multiple regeneration agencies with urban planning and development functions. Christchurch has of course had many years of having heightened central government involvement in our planning and development, and decision making processes with mixed results.

16. Experience indicates that there are both advantages and disadvantages in using specific powers and expedited planning and development processes, with care now needed not to disenfranchise our communities after recent efforts to re-engage with them. Community engagement and participation processes will need to be well thought through with strong emphasis on what will work well at a local level. There are past (e.g. the Aranui public housing renewal) and present (e.g. natural hazards community engagement) models in Christchurch that can also be drawn upon.

17. In terms of Greater Christchurch, there is potential for considerable overlap of the functions and powers of Regenerate Christchurch and Otākaro Limited with those of the new Crown entity proposed. It will be important to clearly resolve those overlaps. It would be preferable to avoid having another planning and development delivery agency operating in the sub-region.

18. The structure and powers of the proposed Crown entity, and the use of those powers, needs to be carefully considered in terms of how the legislative and the ensuing governance and partnership structures will work in the future in Greater Christchurch and elsewhere to avoid duplication and fragmented decision-making. The Crown entity will also need to balance community wellbeing and aspirations with the need to respond decisively on key challenges, such as affordable housing, to enhance community participation and cohesion. The emphasis needs to be on collaboration, building relationships, and strong partnerships and interagency communication rather than any heavy handed intervention.

19. At a more general level, the extent of the Crown entity’s urban development role and the urban development being proposed (housing, urban environments, related commercial, industrial and community infrastructure, services and amenities) is very broad. It goes significantly beyond the remit of the housing-specific agencies being replaced and what is required to support community-focused housing development. The Crown entity having both wide-reaching planning and consenting powers in order to achieve pace and scale also presents a conflict of interest.

20. There is therefore a risk that achieving mixed, connected, affordable housing developments could be compromised if too much focus is given to other potential housing and urban development. This could be mitigated by emphasising in Clause 13(f) that the primary purpose of the urban development activities to be carried out by the Crown entity should be the provision of affordable housing. Further, the affordable housing developed should remain so, both for its ongoing supply and so that mixed housing and communities are maintained.
21. However, the Council also recognises that the Crown is in a position to incentivise and facilitate urban development, so as to remove barriers that are hindering appropriate development, in ways that are difficult or not possible for local authorities to achieve. This could include such things as incentivising site amalgamation and the upfront funding of infrastructure.

Operating Principles

22. Given that the powers of the Crown entity are yet to be specified, sections of the Bill such as its operating principles assume high significance, and presumably indicate some form of accountability.

23. Several areas of the principles section need highlighting given the issues highlighted in this submission. These relate to security of tenure, an emphasis on retaining affordability as its core focus, and recognising and partnering with local authorities.

24. In addition, the Council believes that recognition needs to be given to adaptation as well as mitigation when taking into account the effects of climate change.

Government Policy Statement

25. The Council supports the Bill’s requirement for a Government Policy Statement (GPS) on housing and urban development. To be more effective the GPS should take into account the following matters.

26. Firstly, it should recognise housing as a human right. The GPS will then have the opportunity to make it clearer what such a right to housing means so as to operationalise it, and by extension develop accountability for it.

27. The phrase ‘good quality’ is at the moment a somewhat vague term use in the objectives section of the Bill. To ensure developments are of a high standard, rather than for example the minimum required under the Building Code, quality could be defined more clearly, and should be further elaborated upon as a key focus in the GPS.

28. In order for the affordable housing being developed to remain affordable, the GPS provides a good opportunity to elaborate on the general means for doing so.

29. Given the strong link between housing and transport, it is preferable if the GPS requirements for each were timed to coincide with each other, so as to contribute to council long term planning.

30. Greater clarity is needed when referring to ‘other agencies’ that the Government expects to support the GPS.

31. Lastly, in terms of aligning the GPS to other legislative and planning instruments when it is being developed, the Council supports the recommended changes to Clause 23 being put forward by Society Of Local Government Managers in its submission.

Other Matters

32. Board composition – in the Council’s opinion, this needs improving in two ways:
(i) Given their key and growing role in housing it should include reference to a community housing provider, preferably registered under government regulations, as an option for board membership.

(ii) Given its importance as a key partner, a local government representative ought to be both a key member, and one who needs to have knowledge and experience in the field rather than ‘perspectives’ as currently stated.

33. Kāinga Ora will be established as a Crown entity. This will mean that Kāinga Ora is exempt from paying development contributions under the Local Government Act 2002. The cost of providing infrastructure to or for Kainga Ora initiated developments may impose a significant financial cost on the community, particularly considering that the potential scope and scale of develop could include the development of new satellite towns. The Council does not believe that its ratepayers should be required to pay for the costs of providing such infrastructure to service these developments.

34. Definitions and ambiguity – there are several ambiguous terms that need clarifying and defining, including:

- the reference to ‘good quality’ in the objectives clause as noted,
- the term ‘urban’, e.g. as used in the term ‘urban development’, which should be clarified to include, amongst other things, 6 star ratings
- clarity on the use of the term ‘persons’ and who it is referring to, given that it appears to refer to organisations and agencies in some places and individuals in other places,
- clarity on what is meant in Clause 13(1)(b) by ‘appropriate accommodation’ for community organisations – is it supposed to mean housing that community organisations deliver?
- defining what ‘not significant’ is under Clause 29 in any amending of a GPS

Recommended Amendments

Membership of board of Kāinga Ora—Homes and Communities

35. Clause 10(2)(f) – amend to read ‘knowledge and experience of local government’.

36. Clause 10(2) – insert new subclause:
   (j) “perspectives of community housing providers”.

37. Clause 12(1)(c) – amend to read “(c) otherwise enhance the overall economic, social, environmental, and cultural well-being of current and future generations.”

Functions of Kāinga Ora—Homes and Communities

38. Clause 13(1)(a) – amend to read “to provide secure rental housing, principally for those who need it the most”.

39. Clause 13(1)(f) – amend to read “to initiate, incentivise, facilitate, or undertake any urban development, whether on its own account or on behalf of other persons, including…”

40. Clause 13(f)(i) – amend to read “development of housing, with a primary focus on public housing, affordable housing, and homes for first home buyers, as well as associated market housing”.
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41. Clause 13(f)(ii) – amend to read “development and renewal of urban environments, ancillary to housing development”.

42. Clause 13(g)(ii) – amend to read:
   (ii) “leading and promoting good urban design and efficient, integrated, sustainable mixed-use urban development”.

43. Clause 13(g) – insert new subclause:
   (iii) “enabling the more effective uptake and adoption of evolving forms of housing”.

**Operating principles**

44. Clause 14(1)(b)(iii) – amend to read “to sustain secure tenancies”.

45. Clause 14(1)(f) – insert new subclause to read:
   (i) “ensuring that the affordable housing being developed remains affordable”.

46. Clause 14(g) – insert new subclause (g) and consequentially renumber the subsequent subclauses:
   (g) “having particular regard to, and not being inconsistent with, local planning policies, strategies, plans, other strategic documents and commitments made by local authorities relating to housing and urban development in accordance with statutory requirements.”

47. Clause 14(1)(j) – amend to read “operating in a manner that recognises environmental, cultural, and heritage values and that appropriately avoids or mitigates the effects of climate change and/or adapts to its impacts”.

48. Clause 14(1) – insert new subclause:
   (n) “partnering with early and meaningful engagement and decision-making with local government and communities, in order to achieve well integrated, sustainable and efficient urban development.”

**Content of Government Policy Statement**

49. Clause 23 – amend to read:
   (b) “consult Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities and persons, and representative groups of persons, who have an interest in housing and urban development in New Zealand; and”
   (c) “have particular regard to:
      (i) any national energy efficiency strategy in force;
      (iii) any Government Policy Statement on land transport;
      (iv) the infrastructure priorities signalled in any infrastructure strategy report prepared by the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission Te Waihanga.”

50. Clause 24(1)(d) – amend to read:
   (d) “how the Government expects other agencies to support that direction and those priorities and how it will support them.”
51. Clause 24(1) – insert new subclause:
   (f) “how it will provide direction to give effect to the human right to housing”

Other matters

52. That the Select Committee add a provision establishing that any development undertaken by, or on behalf of, Kāinga Ora is liable for development contributions assessed under section 198 of the Local Government Act 2002.

53. Clarifying and defining various terms and ambiguities as noted in paragraph 31 above.

Conclusion

54. The Council looks forward to working with Government in achieving the aims set in the Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities Bill. We thank you for the opportunity to provide this submission.

For any clarification on points within this submission please contact Paul Cottam, Principal Advisor, at paul.cottam@ccc.govt.nz.

Yours faithfully

Lianne Dalziel
Mayor of Christchurch
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1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Mayor to report on external activities she undertakes in her city and community leadership role; and to report on outcomes and key decisions of the external bodies she attends on behalf of the Council.

1.2 This report is compiled by the Mayor’s office.

2. Mayors Recommendations

That the Council:

1. Receive the information in this report.
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Mayor's Report to Elected Members – June 2019

Foreword
The arrival of winter has not cooled the spirit of our city. A significant number of openings and launches confirmed that Christchurch remains focused on future growth and development.

Linwood Mosque Charitable Trust Iftar Dinner
I was privileged to be invited to join the Linwood Mosque community and guests to participate in an Iftar dinner. The community used the opportunity to express its appreciation to their own members and the wider community for their actions to respond to the 15 March attacks.

Risingholme Homestead re-opening
This month saw the re-opening of one of Christchurch’s much-loved buildings, the Risingholme Homestead gifted to the city in 1943 by Sir John McKenzie. The Risingholme Community Centre was established shortly after that, and for decades offered a wide range of adult and community education classes. Although the building was badly damaged and closed after the 2011 earthquake, the Community Centre continued to offer courses in an alternative location and remained a much-appreciated mainstay of the local community. Graeme Penney, longterm trustee, and Conor Carston, who has wanted to be involved in a ribbon cutting ceremony, helped me cut the ribbon—representing the past, present and future. I helped to plant a Wolllemi Pine tree in memory of previous Risingholme Director Maryke Fordyce. With the doors of Risingholme now open again to the local community and visitors, I am certain the building will once again play the role its benefactor intended.

Welcome to Nagano University students
Selwyn District Mayor, Sam Broughton, and I enjoyed the opportunity to welcome 70 students from Nagano University arriving to attend short-course training programmes at Ara and Lincoln University, in areas such as management studies and food and health sciences. This is the first group of students from Nagano to visit us under a multi-year memorandum of understanding signed with our providers and Christchurch NZ. It’s pleasing that Christchurch continues to be viewed as an attractive study destination and partner of choice for top overseas universities.

Metro Sports Facility sod-turning Ceremony
The Council supported Government Ministers and Ōtākaro to mark the start of construction of the Metro Sports Facility. It’s encouraging to see that this key project is now underway, one of a number of exciting developments that will continue to transform Christchurch.

Muslim Community Eid Dinner
I was honoured to be invited to attend another significant event in the Muslim calendar, a dinner to mark the Eid festival celebrating the end of Ramadan. Ramadan is traditionally a period of self-reflection for Muslims around the world. It was hard to believe that the dinner took place less than three months after the 15 March attacks, and that the local community has experienced so much in such a short period of time. Once again, the warmth of the welcome and spirit of the community was very evident.

Sikh Community Donation to ChCh Foundation
I visited Gurudwara Singh Saba Temple in Woolston to witness leaders of the NZ Supreme Sikh Society present their donation of $60,000 to The Christchurch Foundation’s ‘Our People, Our City Fund’, which was established to provide medium and long term support to the Mosque attack victims, their families and the wider Muslim community. Auckland Co-op Taxis donated an additional $11,000 to the Al Noor Mosque. The visit was also a reminder that we have many vibrant and active religious and ethnic communities in Christchurch who are committed to making a full contribution to our city and community.

Irish Business, Innovation and Enterprise Minister
The visit by Irish Minister Heather Humphreys, and the launch the previous week of the Irish Business Network NZ’s Christchurch branch attended by Ireland’s new Ambassador to New Zealand, confirmed that our two business communities have much in common and that there is a lot Christchurch and Ireland can achieve together. I was particularly struck by Ireland’s large and active innovation and entrepreneurship sector. As an English-speaking member of the EU with strong historical and family links to Christchurch, we have a solid friend which is interested in advancing cooperation. I was pleased to be joined by Cr Raf Manji, whose Irish roots were welcomed as part of that connection.

Shakti Trans-Tasman Conference, Auckland
Shakti is a national not-for-profit community organisation focused on women’s development, empowerment and domestic/family violence intervention, prevention and awareness. The Auckland conference had the theme “Let’s Deal With It: A Trans-Tasman Campaign Towards Facilitating Racial Equity”, and focused on how to reduce racism, discrimination, prejudice, micro-aggression and radicalization in our two countries. I used my ‘Christchurch voice’ as a keynote speaker to highlight the many very positive ways that our city and community responded to the Mosque attacks, and our potential to once again use that response to lead social change globally by “being the change we want to see in the world”. But I also acknowledged that there are issues we need to face up to, and we need to talk about those. We can learn a lot and dispel myths simply by getting to know each other. We can do that one neighbourhood at a time – we learnt that from the earthquakes, and we can do that again.

Launch of Canty Earthquake Insurance Tribunal
I joined three government ministers at the opening of this new tribunal, established under the Canterbury Earthquake Insurance Tribunal Act 2019. The Tribunal is intended to provide Canterbury homeowners with a fair, speedy, flexible and cost-effective way to resolve long-standing insurance claims dating back to the 2010 and 2011 earthquake sequence. Support will include a fully-funded mediation service provided by MBIE. The Government acknowledges that many homeowners with outstanding claims have felt very frustrated by continuing delays in resolution – I look forward to the Tribunal having a quick and positive impact on homeowners still seeking closure, to allow those affected to move on.

Knight Stream School Opening
Cri Anne Galloway, local Community Board Members and I were pleased to attend the official opening of this new school, which opened its doors to over 100 local students in February. Congratulations to the Establishment Board of Trustees for their work so far. I look forward to hearing how Knight Stream School develops in future.
Central Government Local Government Forum

This annual meeting is an opportunity for the Prime Minister, Ministers and Local Government New Zealand National Council members to discuss issues where coordination between levels of government is vital - climate change, water, regional development and housing. A “Guide for Central Government Engagement with Local Government”, available at www.dpmc.govt.nz was launched during the meeting.

Visit by Habib Kadhim al-Saqqa

Habib Kadhim al-Saqqa is a senior and highly respected Sunni scholar who is a direct descendant of the prophet Mohammed. Based in Yemen, his visit to Christchurch was prompted by the response to the 15 March attacks. Habib Kadhim promotes a philosophy of religion that is based on tolerance, love and kindness for others, in complete contrast to the violent extremism that dominates media discourse. He observed the same approach in the response of Muslims and non-Muslims to the attacks, and we were honoured that he visited the Council to express his encouragement and solidarity as part of a visit to our city arranged by the Canterbury Muslim Charitable Trust.

World Refugee Day Celebration

Christchurch reinstated a refugee settlement programme in late 2013 after an eight year hiatus and will accept 120 refugees per year, working with the Red Cross. The first 21 refugees from Afghanistan and Eritrea arrived on 1 March, and another 19 May. One family arrived from Eritrea on World Refugee Day (June 20), and they helped me cut the cake.

Tragically, many of those killed and injured in the Mosque shootings were former refugees, happily and successfully living in this ‘safe haven’. Opening our doors again to those fleeing persecution and violence to start a new peaceful life demonstrates that we will continue to be a city welcoming and opening to all. In my capacity at the event I also paid tribute to Ahmed Tari, founder and Chair of the Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre, who was honoured with an ONZM in last year’s New Year’s Honours List, for his unwavering support for our refugee communities over many years.

Hillmorton Hoon Hay Mosque Shootings Memorial Event

This memorial service to honour the lives of four Shaheed (martyrs) of the 15 March attacks who lived in the Hillmorton and Hoon Hay areas was a reminder of the impact that the attacks have had on individual neighbourhood communities in Christchurch, and that the steps that some are taking to pull closer in support and get to know each other. Farid Ahmed, who spoke so eloquently at the National Remembrance Service in Christchurch on 29 March, helped to coordinate the memorial service to honour his wife Husna Ahmed, and, Tariq Omar, Matullah Saifi, and Abdulkadir Elmi. Ensuring our city remains true to the expression of unity that emerged in the wake of the shootings is vital to our future. We will continue to support local initiatives which demonstrate that We Are One.

Te Korowai Opening Ceremony

The main office of Presbyterian Support Upper South Island (PSUSI) was extensively damaged in the 2011 earthquake. The organisation, which has operated in Christchurch for 130 years, has now re-built its local headquarters and it was a privilege to attend the opening of ‘Te Korowai’ – home of PSUSI. Like many other local organisations over recent years, PSUSI’s story is one of determination as it has continued to operate from damaged and temporary premises. The Harakeke bush I planted with PSUSI Board Chair Andrew Johnston is a fitting symbol of new growth in 2019.

Opening of Lumiere Cinemas

and several Councillors attended the opening of the Lumiere Cinemas in the Arts Centre on 27 June. The Lumiere plans to enhance and diversify the Christchurch film scene by showing a curated selection of cultural films from around the world. And once a month, they will invite local film-makers from the community to showcase their own movies. There was a cinema at the Arts Centre from 1976 to 2011, and I am very pleased that this will once again be part of the city’s cultural scene.

Events and meetings calendar

Jun 03 — Linwood Mosque Charitable Trust Iftar dinner  
Jun 05 — Risingholme Homestead re-opening ceremony  
— Civic welcome for students from Nagano University  
Jun 07 — Community Board Chairs’ Forum  
— Attend Speaking 4 The Planet speech competition  
— Metro Sports Facility sod-turning ceremony  
— Council – Environment Canterbury governance forum  
Jun 09 — Muslim community Eid dinner to mark the end of Ramadan  
Jun 12 — Presentation of Sikh community donation to Christchurch Foundation  
Jun 13 — Launch of Irish Business Network in NZ (IBINZ) Christchurch branch  
Jun 14 — Shakti Trans-Tasman Conference, Auckland  
Jun 15 — Speak at NZ Certified Builders Annual Conference  
Jun 17 — Attend launch of Canterbury Earthquake Insurance Tribunal  
— Meet Irish Minister for Business, Innovation and Enterprise Heather Humphreys  
— Opening of Knights Stream School  
Jun 18 — Marshall Primary School Ferndale art exhibition  
Jun 19 — Meeting with Local Government Minister Mahuta and officials, Wellington  
— Attend Central Government Local Government Forum, Wellington  
Jun 20 — Christchurch Foundation Board Meeting  
— Te Hononga Council – Papatipu Runanga Committee meeting  
Jun 21 — Visit to Council by Muslim scholar Habib Kadhim al-Saqqa  
Jun 22 — World Refugee Day celebration  
Jun 23 — Memorial service for Hillmorton/Hoon Hay Mosque attacks Shaheed  
Jun 24 — Opening ceremony at Te Korowai, Presbyterian Support Upper South Island premises  
— Presentation by 24-7 Youth Work Initiative  
Jun 26 — Welcome to Mayor of New Plymouth, Neil & Melissa Holdom, and delegation to introduce new Govett-Brewster Art Gallery & Len Lye Centre Directors from New Plymouth  
Jun 27 — Meet visiting Commissioner for EU Security Sir Julian King  
— Opening of Lumiere Cinemas, Arts Centre  
Jun 28 — Council/ECAN/CDEM/DPMC and Canterbury Mayors meetings on Emergency Management System Reform  
Jun 28 to 14 July – Leave

Reference: 19/741350
Presenter(s): Mary Richardson, Acting Chief Executive

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 This Chief Executive's Report provides a summary of the Council’s organisational performance for June 2019.

2. Recommendation to Council

That the Council:

1. Receive the report.
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Chief Executive’s Report to Elected Members

June 2019
Acting Chief Executive's Foreword

This is my first report to elected members as Acting Chief Executive and it has been an eventful month.

With the departure of the Karleen Edwards and General Manager Corporate Services, Anne Columbus, there have been some changes in the Executive Leadership Team. Brent Smith has stepped in as Acting General Manager Citizens and Community, Leonie Rae has moved into the Acting General Manager Corporate Services role and Carolyn Gallagher has taken on the Acting Consenting and Compliance General Manager role.

Annual Plan

On 25 June 2019 Council adopted the 2019/20 Annual Plan. It provides for an average rate increase of 4.73 per cent, which is less than was forecast in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

Thanks to everyone across the organisation who has been involved in the Annual Plan process — from developing the draft plan, managing the consultation process, preparing advice and briefings, writing reports, reviewing the capital programme, compiling and reviewing the budget, forecasting rates through to managing the meeting process. I would also like to acknowledge the time and energy our Mayor, Councillors and Community Boards put into the Annual Plan. They were committed to developing a plan that met the needs and aspirations of our citizens and communities and was affordable for the ratepayers. This involved months of hard work and long hours at various stages throughout the process.

Partnership approach to Governance

At the 13 June meeting, the Council endorsed a partnership approach to governance between the Council and Community Boards. This means Community Boards will have more authority to make decisions on behalf of their communities.

This approach will help the Council achieve a more participatory, localised and collaborative approach to decision-making, increasing opportunities for residents to be involved in decision making that affects their community. The partnership principles and protocols are set out in a Governance Partnership Agreement between the Council and each of the Community Boards.

Delegations to Community Boards will be increased from Thursday 1 August. The first phase of additional delegations to Community Boards will see them becoming the final decision makers on many issues for which they currently make a recommendation to the Council.

New purpose for local government

The recently enacted Local Government (Community Well-being) Act reinstates social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing to the purpose of local government. It also restores the ability of councils to collect development contributions to fund the full range of public infrastructure that growing communities need and want. This includes libraries, swimming pools and changing rooms at sportsgrounds. You may have seen the recent Newsline story with the Deputy Mayor’s comments welcoming their reinstatement. As the Deputy Mayor emphasised, these legislative changes mean local authorities have a broad role in promoting the economic, environmental, social and cultural well-being of their communities. Fortunately, our Council’s Strategic Framework is already well-aligned to the four well-beings as our Community Outcomes — which are grouped under the themes of Strong Communities, Liveable City, Healthy Environment and Prosperous Economy — reflect the well-beings in the Act. However, there will be a few minor adjustments to key Council report templates and processes to reflect the Act’s changes.
Election protocols

As you will be aware, we are heading into the election period. I have sent out Election Protocols to elected members.

The official pre-election period is the three months before the local election. In 2019, this begins on Friday 12 July.

The protocols provide guidance for you to balance your dual role as elected members and candidates seeking re-election.

- Election protocols were also sent to staff.

Our 2019 Election campaign is now live, so you should start seeing it online and in print.

World Refugee Day

Thursday 20 June was designated World Refugee Day and a number of events were held across the country to mark the occasion. Christchurch lost its status as a resettlement location for refugees after the Canterbury earthquakes due to the limited supply of housing and strained essential services. In August last year, it was reinstated as a resettlement option for those arriving in New Zealand under the national refugee quota. Our city and has undoubtedly been enriched though the presence of refugees in our communities.

Awards

I would like to congratulate everyone involved in the development of Tūranga and Taïora QEI. Both facilities won awards at the Property Council New Zealand’s Rider Levett Bucknall Property Industry Awards.

Tūranga won the Supreme Award, with judges citing the facility as “a visually stunning symbol of hope, unity and rebirth, shaping the way the community and visitors experience Christchurch’s City Centre”. Taïora QEI won The Holmes Consulting Group Tourism and Leisure Property Award. This is excellent kudos.

Events

Congratulations to our Recreation, Sport and Events Unit for working with Cycling NZ to secure the Criterium National Championships for Christchurch. You can read more about this on Newsline - Road cycling champs coming to Christchurch (https://ccc.govt.nz/news-and-events/newsline/show/3686)

Strategy and Transformation

Urban Design, Regeneration and Heritage

Central City Action Plan (cross agency implementation)

The Ōtautahi mural in Evolution Square has been completed, ahead of being illuminated using projection mapping in October.

ChristchurchNZ and Air New Zealand’s five-week campaign encouraging New Zealanders to visit Christchurch has launched https://youtu.be/weQrlWzmY8Y

Collateral has been produced and distributed for the Winter Circus; the performance series began early June, read more online at https://www.ccc.govt.nz/news-and-events/whats-on/programme=31

Life in Christchurch Survey findings have been released. See the results here: https://www.ccc.govt.nz/the-council/how-the-council-works/reporting-and-monitoring/life-in-christchurch/

Enliven Places Programme

- Linwood Tiny Shops near the intersection of Worcester and Stanmore Streets has been officially opened with a blessing
council. The recently completed workshop and shop space complete the tiny village. Tenants and services include a community café, cycle repair shop, community pantry, second-hand goods shop, JP, craft workshops and a women’s bike workshop. Watch the opening celebration https://youtu.be/X-e7nuUJt9g

- New ‘active’ games have been placed in the Tūranga Library Plaza ready for the winter period and school holidays. These are two brightly coloured corn hole toss games which feature holes of varying sizes and bean bags to throw, and a smaller quoits game.

Strategic Policy

Climate Change Programme

June was a busy month for the climate change programme, building on momentum from Council’s declaration of a climate emergency in May. The results of a public survey on climate change showed 75% of respondents felt climate change was an extremely important issue to them.

On 11 June an external advisory panel met with staff to discuss climate change issues, including how best to engage on the development of the climate change strategy. The first step of the strategy is to set targets for the district on greenhouse gas emissions.

Council Submissions

Two new submissions were made in June. One was a staff submission on the Building System Legislative Reform Programme (Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment) noting that meaningful change to ‘risk and liability’ has not been proposed in this reform.

The other was a Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board submission in opposition to the proposed development of a quarry in Templeton.

A supplementary submission was made to the Public Inquiry into the Earthquake Commission, highlighting the Council’s financial support of the Canterbury Insurance Advisory Service, and the need to establish advocacy services with urgency following major events.

Council submissions on the Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities Bill and the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill are currently being prepared for consideration at the Council meeting on 11 July.

The Council has put forward a remit to Local Government New Zealand’s Annual General Meeting seeking sector support for new legislation, enabling councils to require all guest accommodation providers to register and keep records of how often their properties are used for short-term rental accommodation. This would enable councils to engage more effectively with accommodation providers. Work on a range of regulatory and rating options requested by the Council, is being undertaken by the City Planning, Strategic Policy and Regulatory Compliance teams. Options are expected to be presented to the Council at the end of the 2019 calendar year.

An Adaptation Strategy is also at a scoping stage with initial discussions having taken place with Environment Canterbury and Ngāi Tahu.
Public Information and Participation

Social Media Monthly Report
(30 May – 27 June)

Facebook
The Christchurch City Council Facebook page has grown by 400 likes to a total of 49,803. Our posts have been viewed 1.8 million times during this period, with our posts engaged with almost 25,000 times either through commenting, clicking on a link to our website or liking a post.

Top posts for post engagement:

- Video - Soft toys from tribute wall gifted to Muslim children (Newsline): This post was seen 51,511 times. 1,709 people reacted to the post, the majority by clicking ‘like’ or ‘love’. There were 53 comments and 199 shares. Feedback was very positive.

- Help the Animal Shelter – Cocker spaniel looking for owner: This post was seen 75,438 times. 2,029 people reacted to the post, the majority by clicking ‘like’ or ‘love’. There were 50 comments and 967 shares.

- Parking charge changes at Lichfield St carpark: This post was seen 19,453 times. 745 people reacted to the post. There were 140 comments and 24 shares. 635 people clicked the link to read the Newsline story.

- Birth of new era with Pioneer aqua natal classes: This post was seen 14,516 times. 473 people reacted to the post, the majority by clicking ‘like’ or ‘love’. There were 194 comments and 21 shares. 333 people clicked to read the Newsline story.

Twitter
Currently we have 13,774 followers, which is an increase of 10 followers in the last month. We had 40,000 post views this month, 505 total engagements and 120 link clicks. We ‘tweeted’ 28 times.

Top tweets for engagement:

- Black Caps to play England, Australia and India at Hagley Oval
- Beam scooters launched in Christchurch
- Annual Plan preview

Instagram
Our Instagram account is continuing to grow, with an increase of 103 new followers taking our total to 6,845 followers.

We had 446 engagements to our two posts we put up last month. One was the opening of the Risingholme Homestead, and the other was the video of the soft toys for Muslim children.

Social Media Trends
Water infrastructure, rates increases and transport projects have been among the hot topics on social media in the last month as Council signed off on its Annual Plan.

The consultation at the intersection of Harewood-Gardiners-Breens has been one of our more popular topics on our community channels, while there is growing interest in KidsFest with the event getting underway in just over a week.

Media Queries
A total of 443 media queries were received in the period from 30 May to 27 June.
Citizens and Community

Capital Delivery

Projects Completed/Handed Over/Opened

- Risingholme Community Centre and Hall

Awards

The following projects received awards in June:

Turanga

- Property Council of NZ 2019 Awards - Supreme Winner and Excellence & Best in Category Civic & Arts Category. The judges cited Turanga as a visually stunning symbol of hope, unity and rebirth, shaping the way the community and visitors experience Christchurch’s city centre.

- Turanga also won the Warren and Mahoney Civic and Arts Property Award, one of the 11 categories open to nominees in the awards.

Taiora QEII Recreation & Sports Centre

- Property Council of NZ 2019 Awards - Excellence & Best in Category Sports & Leisure Category

- NZ Master Builders Awards 2019 - Silver Award: Civic Category

Rose Historic Chapel

- 2019 Canterbury Architecture Awards – Winner Heritage Category

Woolston Community Library

- 2019 Canterbury Architecture Awards - Winner Public Architecture Category

Hornby Library, Customer Services and South West Leisure Centre

A Hearings Panel has recommended that the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board approves a change to the reserve classification for part of Kyle Park, along with management plan amendments.

Lancaster Park Demolition & Deconstruction

The Crane work has been completed on the Paul Kelly stand.

Metro Sports Facility

On 7 June 2019, Minister of Sport Grant Robertson, Greater Christchurch Regeneration Minister Megan Woods and Christchurch Mayor Lianne Dalziel turned the sod for the construction
of a new indoor 50-metre competition pool and dive well for Christchurch.

**Libraries**

**Philippine Independence day Celebration**

On 15 June, Tūranga provided a platform for events to help the Filipino community within Christchurch celebrate and recognise the importance of Philippine Independence Day. Philippine Independence Day “Araw Ng Kalayaan” is a significant day for all Filipinos across the world. Celebrated annually on 12 June, it is one of the most significant dates in Philippine’s history because it marks the nation’s independence from Spanish rule on June 12, 1898.

Libraries’ staff hosted programmes and events, and showcased resources and services, to help the Filipino community to feel connected, included and informed. With lots of fun activities, it proved an exciting day for the whole family to enjoy and to experience the Philippine culture.

**Christchurch Art Gallery**

**The Ron Mueck Exhibition**

Have you seen Chicken/Man? The Ron Mueck sculpture now sits proudly in place in the Gallery’s arcade on level 1.

**William Wegman Exhibition**

The William Wegman exhibition continues to attract strong visitor numbers.

**Citizen and Customer Services**

May saw the start of the busiest time of the year, as our interaction volumes with our customers’ ramp up across all of our channels. With 36,159 phone calls, 5,482 emails and 15,276 Service Desk transactions.

**Community Support, Governance & Partnerships Unit Update**

**Graffiti Programme**

Our Graffiti Projects Coordinator Kerryn Findlater continues to work closely with several graffiti artists and utility companies to create some eye-catching mural projects.

We think creating artwork like these is a really effective way of deterring unsightly tagging and instead, inspiring pride and a sense of community.

This Chorus box on Aikmans Road was recently completed by graffiti artist Deypher.

Chorus cabinet on Rose Street completed by graffiti artist Honuko.

Chorus cabinet on River Road completed by graffiti artist Ikarus.
National Volunteer Week

The National Volunteer Week ran from 16 – 22 June. It celebrates the collective contribution of the 1.2 million volunteers who enrich Aotearoa New Zealand.

This year’s theme was “Whiria te tangata – weaving the people together”. To celebrate National Volunteer Week, the Graffiti Programme completed some tag-removal on a community mural on the underpass at Kyle Park.

South and South New Brighton in the east. We’ve also celebrated the value of trees on Arbor Day, with one of our parks volunteers receiving special recognition from Volunteering Canterbury for his planting project to provide habitat for skinks alongside the Ōpawaho/Heathcote River.

It’s not just biodiversity that benefits from these efforts; volunteer projects like these connect people and communities together, promotes active citizenship and a sense of wellbeing through achievement and time spent in nature.

\textit{Tou rourou, toku rourou, ka ora te iwi.}

\textit{With your contribution and my contribution we will thrive.}

Vbase

The Big Sing

The Town Hall opened its doors to one of New Zealand’s largest choral and school events. The Douglas Lilburn Auditorium was the host for 27 choirs, made up of almost 1000 choristers from around the region. These students were vying for a place in the National Finale, a competition for the top 24 choirs selected from regional festivals around the country such as this one, to be held in Dunedin in August.

Michael McIntyre

June 17 and 18 saw Horncastle Arena filled to capacity with 14,610 people in total enjoying some comedic relief from the very popular Michael McIntyre. Of the audience 21 percent came from outside of the Canterbury region.

Consenting and Compliance

Building Consenting Unit Update

Performance

466 Code Compliance Certificates were issued in May 2019, which is an increase from 341 in April. 97.8% of those certificates were issued within the 19 day target, which exceeds the 95% target.
The number of building consents issued also increased with 506 issued (422 residential and 83 commercial), up from 355 in May. 96.8% of those consents were issued within 19 days. The average number of processing days for those building consents was 13 days for commercial and 10 days for residential.

Earthquake Prone Buildings

By the end of May 2019, there were 717 Christchurch buildings on the national earthquake-prone building register. We added 27 buildings in May, and removed five due to structural strengthening being completed.

There were five 133AH notices sent to owners requesting a detailed seismic assessment report for clarification of the earthquake prone building status of their building. Link to the register: epbr.building.govt.nz

All known priority buildings on strategic routes have now received letters reducing their previous time frame of 15 years to strengthen or demolish, to seven and a half years.

Stakeholder Engagement

The Head of Building Consenting attended a number of workshops on the proposed building law reforms by MBIE. The Unit made a submission on the proposed reforms on behalf of Christchurch City Council.

Eco-Design

For the month of May, the eco-design service provided 28 individual consultations. The yearly total of 342 so far is well over the KPI of carrying out 300 consults per year. Our advisor also attended 10 industry meetings and was invited to talk at the Waimakiriri District Council.

Resource Consents Unit update

Performance

Applications received increased from 230 in April to 309 in May and 13 District Plan certificates were issued in May. Overall application numbers are tracking slightly below the 2017/18 years.

Workloads remain high overall driven by a surge in application numbers and an increased complexity profile of applications taking more time to process.

97% of non-notified applications were processed within timeframe in May. Notified applications were 100% within timeframe for May and YTD.

Customer Satisfaction

Included on the decision letter for every resource consent is a link to an electronic survey. This survey provides feedback on the service which is reviewed regularly and feeds into the continuous improvement programme.

The May survey indicated 100% of respondents were satisfied with the quality of service received throughout the consent process, year to date satisfaction is tracking at 90%, the highest score to date. In addition, in the Council’s Residents Survey, resource consents achieved 74% customer satisfaction which was above the target of 70%.

City Services

Three Waters and Waste

Project Management

Lyttelton Harbour Wastewater Pipeline Scheme – the last of the water supply connection works at both ends of the Lyttelton road tunnel are complete. This completes the first part of the project — an upgraded water supply main to Lyttelton.

Work to convert the Diamond Harbour wastewater plant to a pump station is advancing after having resolved on site geotechnical problems. Geotechnical work included rock stabilisation to protect people and assets during operation of the plant.

The Governors Bay pump station has been commissioned and is now pumping wastewater to Lyttelton via the two new harbour pipelines,
and thereby removing the routine discharge of treated wastewater at Governors Bay.

Work has started on the pump station at Simeon Quay. This will be the most visible part of the project in Lyttelton. Once the Simeon Quay and Heathcote pipeline are complete, all wastewater flows can be directed to the Bromley wastewater treatment plant.

Construction of the 4.5km Heathcote Valley pipeline from the Lyttelton tunnel to pump station 15 in Woolston is continuing with four construction crews operating along the alignment. This is coordinated with Mobil, CCC Transport and Orion. Significant planning is underway on the horizontal directional drill shot for the pipe installation under the Heathcote River, with installation planned for October. These works are expected to be completed in December 2019.

Solid Waste

Battery Collection Scheme

Last month Solid Waste launched a one-year trial for the Battery Collection Scheme, with funding received from the Council’s Innovation and Sustainable Development Fund, Canterbury Waste Joint Committee and ECAn. In the past 12 months there have been 19 fires / mouldings, either in kerbside collection trucks or at our processing facilities, which are likely caused being batteries.

The aim of the trial is to mitigate risk to public and contractors by keeping batteries out of kerbside collection, and to enable an industry-led product stewardship scheme, where industry take responsibility for the whole life cycle of the batteries.

Battery drop-off stations are located at Bunnings Tower Junction, Countdown Ferrymead, Countdown Hornby, Mitre 10 Mega Papanui, EcoDrop Metro Place, EcoDrop Styx Mill and EcoDrop Parkhouse Road.

Wheelie Bin Stocktake

As of 18 June 2019, 447,621 wheelie bins have been fitted with RFID tags representing a completion rate of 94.2%. 7,280 additional bins have been removed from circulation as of this date. This three-year project is nearing completion and a campaign has now been launched to assist residents in checking if their bins have been tagged and advising that untagged bins will so no longer be emptied.
Stormwater and Land Drainage

During the significant rain event of 31 May to 2 June, most of the city had 80-90mm of rain and up to 160mm for Banks Peninsula. A tidal surge of 0.5m was also recorded. Widespread surface flooding occurred with a number of road closures and restrictions. However, no homes were flooded. The land drainage recovery programme is showing demonstrable reductions in flood risk in the most vulnerable areas, with the Dudley Creek bypass operating to protect Flockton, the newly completed Bells Creek pump station operating to protect Woolston, and the Heathcote storage basins operating to protect the upper to mid catchment, while the well advanced bank stabilisation works and dredging helped reduce flooding in the mid to lower reaches.

A resident of Eastern Terrace commented, ‘In the past we have had water thigh high on the road… During Saturday’s rain event we still had water on the road but it was much less than before at similar rain events and easily drive-able, so “yeah!” for the changes to the bank.’

Projects to deliver additional Upper Heathcote storm water storage are advancing with significant progress being made in the last year on:

- Cashmere Worsley Outlet structure
- Curletts Basin
- Wigram Basin
- Eastmans Wetlands bund

Hoon Hay basin and the Cashmere Valley Dam are still to come.

These projects have been delivered alongside some significant growth projects:

- Sparks Road Wetland
- Sutherlands Basin

Wastewater Treatment Plant

As picked up by local media, the midges disappeared a couple of months earlier than usual at the end of the season. Usually the midge season can extend until late April/early May, however this season the occurrence of midges in the neighbouring residential areas ceased late January/early February. As this was only the first year of a 10-year programme to reduce the midge numbers, this early success was encouraging. It does indicate that the programme is on the right
track and further reductions in midge numbers are anticipated for future years. Planning for next season is already underway.

Reticulation and Maintenance

We have seen the numbers of water reactive jobs drop by a reasonable amount. Citycare have worked hard to reduce the total number of outstanding jobs down to 430 as of Wednesday 19 June.

Transport

A 60km/h speed limit will be introduced on Summit Road and adjoining side streets.

The lower 60km/h speed will cover Summit Road (from Godley Head to Gebbies Pass Road), Evans Pass Road, Sumner Road, Mount Pleasant Road, Broadleaf Lane and Worsleys Road.

Mr Male has agreed with the Council that he will make some meeting spaces within the Sign of the Takahe available for not-for-profit community groups to use during the week.

“Bringing the community together is very important for my family and I,” Mr Male says. “We want to see people coming together and appreciating the building. We are really excited about sharing our journey with everyone.”

The Sign of the Takahe on Hackthorne Road is a well-known landmark in Christchurch but it has been mostly off-limits to the public since it was badly damaged in the Canterbury earthquakes.

The Council completed a $2.8 million restoration of the nearly 100-year-old building in 2017 but it has sat largely unused since then while the Council has explored options for its future use.