

Regulatory Performance Committee
ATTACHMENTS - ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

Date: Friday 5 February 2021
Time: 9am
Venue: Committee Room 1, Level 2, Civic Offices,
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
1 Correspondence	
A. Letter from Papanui-Innes Community Board - RMA Process Review	3
B. Papanui-Innes Community Board St Albans Residents' Petition	7



Papanui Service Centre
5 Restell Street
Christchurch 8013

PO Box 73024
Christchurch 8154

ccc.govt.nz

18 December 2020

Tim Scandrett
Chair
The Regulatory Performance Committee
Christchurch City Council

Dear Tim

RMA Process Review

The Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board wish to bring the **attached** correspondence originating from local residents to your attention, and its relevance to the review your Committee is conducting on RMA processes.

Yours sincerely



Elizabeth Hovell
Community Board Advisor – Papanui/Innes
Community Support, Governance & Partnerships Unit
Citizens & Community Group
Christchurch City Council

Mobile: 027544 5081
DDI: 9418637

Attachment 1

Attachment 1



13 Dec 2020

Email: 



Attn: Emma Norrish, chair, Innes Ward CommunityBoard.

Sub: High density developments at 47 Mersey St, and 138 Westminster St, St Albans

Dear Ms Norrish

We are writing to the board, through you, on matters relating to these two addresses because we live between them, and now own a house on each street.

For almost 40 years we have lived next door to 138 Westminster St which was recently acquired by Wolfbrook Developments Ltd. Largely because of the prospect of this development looming over our section, increasing noise levels and parking problems and reducing our natural light, we recently bought a property in Mersey St, in readiness for our approaching retirement. Now we are aghast to find that Wolfbrook has applied for consent to build an even larger complex of six two-storied units in Mersey St as well.

The residential block which includes these two streets (indeed the general area) is 90% comprised of original character weatherboard homes built from 1910 to 1930, which are for the most in excellently maintained condition. There is a very small amount of infill housing in the vicinity. There have been two 2-storied dwellings erected since the earthquakes. These are private dwellings and are sympathetic to the suburb's age and character. We were grateful for the owners' consideration in this matter. Another 2-storied damaged house was replaced by a single storey dwelling. Many others like ourselves have upgraded significantly since the earthquakes. Many of us are dedicated gardeners and tree lovers. We know each other, as in a true neighbourhood. There is no development in the immediate area, anything like that proposed by Wolfbrook.

We personally have not yet sighted proposals for 138 Westminster St, but none-the-less are extremely anxious about the effect such large buildings will have on us. However, we **have** seen the proposals, and apparent approval, for 47 Mersey St and are very concerned.

Please refer to City Council documentation (date)
Report/Decision on a RCA. App No RMA/2020/1777
Wolfbrook Property Development Group
Zone :Res Suburban Density

Despite the fact that MANY of the required standards were not met by the Wolfbrook application, and were addressed (both positively and negatively by Messers Schroder (Schroeder and Clease) we were appalled to read that Mr Ken Gimblett has approved the application, citing its probable effects on our community as “less than minor, and acceptable”.

He believes residents “oppose rather than anticipate further redevelopment.” He’s correct on that one!

In his penultimate paragraph on page 10 he address Schroeder’s observation that “there is a very distinct existing character to the area” by saying “too much weight is given to existing character.” Well, we live here and we love the character of our neighbourhood! What a cheek he has!

It is all very well indeed that he considers a “sufficient level of on-site amenity will be afforded to the future occupants of the units”; but what about us? First and foremost this neighbourhood is our home.

Already we experience poor parking availability.

Mr Gimblett obviously knows nothing of Michael, the 49 year old solo father of a severely handicapped boy who requires 24-hour care from two separate caregivers. Michael and his small family live on the Westminster/Mersey corner and have struggled for many years with parking for disability vehicles. Recently he has received help from Council to provide off-street parking to help address the problem. Now his 16 year-old daughter is sitting her driving license, in order to help with her brother’s care. Ironically they are worried about the effect her new car would have on the parking situation. Michael, who is dyslexic, has asked me to write this paragraph for him. Michael is a trooper.

The council-permitted beauty salon at 137 Westminster St, established in a previously delightful small character home after the earthquakes, uses almost every park in this part of Westminster St and both sides of two blocks of Mersey Str, on a daily basis. Bus commuters use these parks too. This problem can only be exacerbated by the proposed cycle lanes. Mersey St is a much narrower street even. Twenty or more new resident cars in the area, from the two developments does not bode well for motorists, cyclists, commuters or pedestrians.

We have three pre-schools and a primary school very closeby. St Albans Primary parents already have major concerns over traffic safety in the area. And the roll is increasing.

Another almost unthinkable problem, is the issue of site works and the impact on our character homes, should these major developments go ahead in this form. Our area was impacted greatly by liquefaction in 2010/2011 and many houses are still susceptible to the movement of trucks and buses. We dread to think of

the pile-driving required for these enormous concrete constructions.

Personally, the loss of light in our home and garden would be devastating. One of our small but meaningful pleasures is to observe the prisms made by the sun on our beautiful leadlight windows. We would lose this

To summarise, we are asking the board to act on behalf of our neighbours and ourselves in this matter of huge concern to us. We are NOT against progress or reasonable development. As very long-term ratepayers and residents we simply want and expect to be considered in this matter.

Yours sincerely

June Peka

Graeme McDonald.

PS : 14 Dec 2020.

We have just been shown Paragraph 7.1.2 of the planning consent documentation for 138 Westminster St, and wish to strongly object and disagree with the assertion that we at [REDACTED] “will not lose sunlight or daylight admission to either our indoor or outdoor living areas.” In fact we will NEVER again see the morning sun during the winter months.

PPS We have also become aware of another Wolfbrook Development proposal (see link below) and it’s overturning by a community board. We are now feeling even more hopeful you and your board may achieve a similar success for us.

<https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/116171178/developer-spends-30k-on-consents-only-for-council-panel-to-reject-plans#comments>

Petition to the Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board

Petition Organiser:

Francine Bills

Christchurch 8014

PREAMBLE

Residential Developments: 47 Mersey & 138 Westminster Streets

We believe that these developments will have a major detrimental impact on the visual amenity and character of the area, undermining our lifestyle and devaluing our properties.

More dramatically, these developments are alien to the streetscape, and do not reflect the spirit of the RMA or District Plan.

Instead of serving the community by providing attractive and affordable homes, Wolfbrook exploits the community and pushes the rules & recommendations of the RMA & District Plan to the limit.

They choose an architectural design that is of massive bulk, ugly, cheap, and characterless. Thus, they have more power to influence our environment than we, or our elected representatives, or consents staff do.

We ask Council to take back the power that such developers have over our environment, and to demand that future developments use architecture that enhances and is sympathetic to its locality.

Attachment B

Attachment B

Attachment B Item 1

Attachment B

Attachment B

Attachment B