

**Waimāero**  
**Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board**  
**Submissions Committee**  
**EXTRAORDINARY MINUTES**

---

**Date:** Monday 9 May 2022  
**Time:** 4.34pm  
**Venue:** Held Via Audio/Visual Link

---

**Present**

Chairperson	Bridget Williams
Deputy Chairperson	David Cartwright
Members	Jason Middlemiss Shirish Paranjape Mike Wall

---

Maryanne Lomax  
Manager Community Governance, Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood  
941 6730  
maryanne.lomax@ccc.govt.nz  
[www.ccc.govt.nz](http://www.ccc.govt.nz)

---

**Part A Matters Requiring a Council Decision**

**Part B Reports for Information**

**Part C Decisions Under Delegation**

---

**Post meeting Note:** This meeting was held via audio/visual link on the Zoom platform due to New Zealand being at the orange setting of the Covid-19 Protection Framework (the Traffic Alert system) on the date the meeting was scheduled. These minutes provide a written summary of the meeting proceedings.

The Chairperson opened the meeting and notified members that the meeting was being publicly livestreamed on YouTube and that the recording would be kept online for future viewing.

## **1. Apologies Ngā Whakapāha**

The Chairperson called for any apologies. An apology was received from Linda Chen. Bridget Williams moved that the apology be accepted. The motion was seconded by Shirish Paranjape and when put to the meeting was carried unanimously.

### **Committee Resolved FBSC/2022/00007**

That the apology received from Linda Chen be accepted.

Bridget Williams/Shirish Paranjape

**Carried**

## **2. Declarations of Interest Ngā Whakapuaki Aronga**

There were no declarations of interest recorded.

### **3. Submissions on Current Consultations**

The Chairperson introduced this item and asked for members to identify which consultations they wished to submit on. The Committee agreed that it would submit on the Draft Housing and Business Choice, and Draft Heritage Plan Changes, but would not submit on the Draft Coastal Hazards or Draft Radio Communication Pathways Plan Changes.

The Community Board Advisor presented draft submissions based on initial feedback received from Committee members in advance of the meeting. The Committee proceeded to discuss its submission on the Draft Housing and Business Choice Plan Change:

- Committee members reported various interactions they have had with the public regarding this topic. The Feedback received from the community has been close to universal in its opposition to allowing high rise developments in suburban areas. People generally understand the need to allow high rise development in the central city and are supportive of this.
- The Committee clarified that its comments regarding the Central City refer to the area within the four avenues.
- The Committee acknowledged that it has received concerns from residents throughout the Fendalton, Waimairi and Harewood Wards about the proposed height limits. However in most cases those height limits will be set by national legislation that the Council cannot influence; in the Merivale/St Albans area the Council is proposing to relax the height limits which is why the submission has a particular focus there.
- The Committee discussed the importance of providing car parking for business developments, particularly given the high number of complaints the Board is already receiving about the lack of parking in the Merivale commercial area, and added a comment regarding this.
- The Committee discussed the proposed Financial Contributions scheme which will initially be used to enhance the city's tree canopy. The Committee noted that the consultation material suggests this scheme could be applied to other issues. The Committee added a comment to its submission requesting clarification on what other circumstances the scheme could be applied to.
- The Committee agreed that it would prefer to see high quality greenspace being provided within developments rather than falling back on the Financial Contributions scheme to remedy a lack of greenspace, and added a comment to the submission regarding this point.
- The Committee clarified the final paragraph of the submission to acknowledge the need for housing intensification, but emphasise that it needs to happen in the right place. The Committee also added a comment that Christchurch needs to maintain its reputation of being the Garden City.

The Committee proceeded to discuss its discussion on the Draft Heritage Plan Change:

- The Committee discussed the potential impact on private property owners' rights and whether the proposal would unfairly restrict owners' rights to modify their properties. The Committee discussed whether the restrictions need to be sequenced so they become applicable when the property is next sold. The Committee decided not to include this point in its submission.
- The Committee discussed the importance of proactively communicating with residents who will be impacted by the changes to ensure they are fully informed of their new requirements.

The Committee concluded its discussion and agreed it was ready to adopt its final submissions. The Community Board Advisor recommended that the Committee vote to adopt the two submissions, confirm it would not be submitting on the two remaining consultations, and authorise the Chairperson to make any final amendments to the submissions if required after the meeting to correct any minor omissions or typographical errors. The motion was moved by Mike Wall and seconded by David Cartwright, and when put to the meeting was carried unanimously.

**Committee Resolved FBSC/2022/00008**

That the Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board Submissions Committee:

1. Decides not to submit on the:
  - a. Draft Coastal Hazards Plan Change.
  - b. Draft Radio Communication Pathways Plan Change.
2. Adopts the following submission on behalf of the Board regarding the Draft Housing and Business Choice Plan Change:

<p>Are we proposing the right areas for development above 12 metres?</p>	<p>The Board generally supports the proposed areas, particularly the Central City (within the four avenues) which is the most appropriate area to encourage high rise developments.</p> <p>However, the Board is extremely concerned about the proposal to allow development up to 20 metres high in the Merivale/St Albans area. The streets and infrastructure in the area were never designed to comfortably accommodate the level of population increase that has already occurred. The Board is particularly concerned that traffic and parking demand in this area already exceed the design limitations of the streets. These issues will only be exacerbated if the height restrictions are relaxed.</p> <p>The Board is also concerned that the Council regularly finds itself playing catch-up and needing to upgrade transport infrastructure after the population growth has occurred. The Board submits that if the Council does choose to proceed with this proposal, it needs to immediately and proactively invest in improved transport infrastructure so that the necessary capacity is in place in advance of new developments.</p>
<p>Do you have any comments about the proposed Qualifying Matters that will restrict intensified development or thresholds for needing a resource consent?</p>	<p>The Board seeks further clarification around the criteria for infrastructure constraints to be regarded as Qualifying Matters. The Board submits that the capacity of the transport network needs to be assessed and may be a qualifying matter for development in the Merivale/St Albans areas.</p>
<p>Does the proposed plan change allow for enough</p>	<p>Yes, the Board is supportive of business intensification but stresses the same points as above. The Merivale/St Albans area should not be</p>

business intensification?	intensified further when the transport infrastructure would not have capacity to serve this increase in population. The Board submits that a minimum level of customer car parking is still required in areas experiencing business intensification.
Any other comments?	The Board supports the financial contributions and agree that those wishing to develop land need to consider the impacts on their neighbours. We are supportive towards the tree planting example used, but we would prefer to see high quality greenspace being provided on the development sites in the first place. The Board seeks clarification of what other examples might be considered and qualify for a Financial Contributions scheme?  The Board acknowledge and support the need for housing intensification, and acknowledge that infill developments are necessary. Greenfield developments cannot accommodate population growth indefinitely. However, intensification needs to be well planned to ensure it occurs in the right place and is coordinated with proactive investment in infrastructure capacity. Christchurch is known as the Garden City, and every effort needs to be made to maintain this reputation.

3. Adopts the following submission on behalf of the Board regarding the Draft Heritage Plan Change:

Do you have any comments on the proposed Residential Heritage Areas?	The Board is particularly interested in the Heaton Street/Merivale area. The Board feels strongly about the need to protect, safeguard and respect our heritage – especially as the earthquake events took away many heritage buildings and houses. We ask that the houses in the Merivale area be treated on a case by case basis as the additional listed houses will likely differ in heritage value.
Do you have any comments about other elements of the proposed Heritage Plan Change?	The Board asks the Council to ensure that the residents who will be impacted by these changes (i.e. now own or live in heritage homes that are newly identified) are proactively informed and engaged with.

4. Authorises the Chair to amend the submissions if required to correct any minor omissions or typographical errors.

Mike Wall/David Cartwright

**Carried**

**Meeting concluded at 5.28pm.**

**CONFIRMED THIS 16<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MAY 2022**

**BRIDGET WILLIAMS**  
**CHAIRPERSON**