

SUMMARY STATEMENT

1. Tēnā koutou katoa, my name is **William Hemming Field**. I am employed as a Senior Urban Designer at the Christchurch City Council (**Council**). I have over 20-years' experience as an Urban Designer and Landscape Architect in private consultancy, as well as in local government.
2. I have prepared evidence on behalf of the Council in respect of matters arising from the submissions and further submissions on Plan Change 14, and previously given evidence at this hearing in relation to Chapter 13.5 Specific Purpose (Hospital) Zones and Chapter 7 Transport.
3. This summary provides a summary of key points in my evidence relating to the **Chapter 6.1A Qualifying matters - City Spine Transport Corridor**.
4. The proposed rules addressed in my evidence relate to proposed setbacks of 4m along the transport corridor within residential zones, and setbacks of 1.5m within commercial zones. The rules are set out in **Appendix 1** to this summary.
5. As outlined in my evidence, I consider the urban design benefits of a proposed 1.5m building setback along the corridor within commercial zones to include:
 - More accessible and useable commercial street environments.
 - Potentially greater space for public transport routes and services, car and cycle traffic lanes space, and pedestrian footpaths.
 - Potentially better safety for people with all levels of mobility.
 - Increased space for building frontage activation.
 - Larger street tree canopy area.
 - Potentially better accommodation of street furniture, lighting, signage, service boxes, sumps, and manholes within the corridor.
 - Potentially improving universal access, and crime prevention through environmental design (**CPTED**) outcomes, particularly in the long term.
6. In relation to high density residential zones (**HRZs**) along the corridor, I consider the urban design benefits of a proposed 4m building setback to include:

- Enhancing the corridor for all people by providing shade, visual interest, and softening of the built environment, and landscape and environmental amenity with street edge trees and other planting.
 - Improving residential amenity for occupiers and the neighbourhood.
 - Enhancing public transport, vehicle, and cycle users' appreciation of the corridor.
 - Increasing neighbourhood and civic pride and thereby helping to reduce anti-social activity along the corridor (a CPTED matter).
7. While some submitters suggest that the residential design principles are sufficient to address amenity issues along the corridor, in my opinion, having been involved in reviewing many residential (medium density) consent applications, rules addressing key outcomes are more effective than matters of discretion as they trigger a non-compliance and tend to be given more weight.
 8. Allowing for setbacks does not guarantee that trees will be planted as part of the residential developments along the corridor frontage. However, in my view it materially increases this likelihood, in conjunction with the residential design principles and canopy cover requirements, because setbacks will ensure that building location is well considered from the outset and the provision of space for trees is not an afterthought. As stated in my primary evidence (at paragraph 91), I would support a rule requiring tree planting along the frontages.
 9. I acknowledge that irregular commercial frontages would be likely to occur initially as the setback provisions 'bed in', and that this would not be an ideal urban design outcome. However, as addressed in my primary evidence (at paragraphs 101 and 102), over time the setbacks would likely align, providing for commercial street edge cohesion and benefits for the public realm of the City Spine Transport Corridor.
 10. I consider that the proposed commercial 1.5m setback would still provide for a degree of commercial street cohesion, would avoid creating narrow or deeply recessed concealed areas and CPTED issues, and would retain (and encourage) the potential for active frontages.
 11. Further, the 'Key pedestrian frontages' (rule 15.4.2.3 *Building setback from road boundaries/ street scene*) in the operative District Plan anticipates

commercial frontage modulation to a greater extent (up to 4m for a maximum length of 10m per site in identified areas) than the proposed 1.5m commercial building setback.

12. The setbacks would of course provide a constraint to architectural and landscape design flexibility, albeit only to a small extent, in my view. All development sites have constraints, and the proposed setbacks would not create insurmountable design constraints for skilled designers.
13. Lastly, the setbacks will not lead to a significant reduction in development capacity of the corridor, in my view. In paragraph 6 of my primary evidence, I concluded that the potential extent of loss in development capacity of individual sites would depend on the following factors:
 - Lot shapes, locations (extent of frontages such as corner sites), and lot sizes, and recession planes.
 - Maximum gross leasable floor areas (**GLFA**) (please note a correction: not “GFLA” as referred to in parts of my evidence).
 - Proposed heights in different zones including proposed street wall heights.
 - Whether residential use is proposed at ground levels in mixed-use zones.
 - Arrangements of considerations such as car parking, communal open space, services, tree canopy cover and landscaping, and outdoor living spaces.
14. This was diagrammatically illustrated in Figure 2 (at page 14) in my primary evidence. I concluded that, for HRZs, site coverage (50% net - 14.5.2.4/14.6.2.1.2) and 20% landscaped area and tree canopy cover rules (14.5.2.2/ 14.6.2.7) can be redistributed within the setback areas to reduce any impact on development capacity of sites.
15. Subsequent to preparing this analysis, a new rule - *14.6.2.18 Building length* ([PC14 for s42A - Sub-Chapter 14.6 Rules RCC Zone \(HRZ\)](#)) requiring for new buildings a maximum length of a building elevation shall not exceed 30 metres has been proposed. This provision has been included in further updated development capacity analysis in **Appendix 2** of this summary

statement. Despite this new rule and analysis, my overall conclusions on development capacity impacts remain the same.

16. To conclude, I consider that the long-term benefits of the proposed setbacks would create more well-functioning commercial and residential streets along the proposed corridor. This is in line with Policy 1(c) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (2020) (**NPS-UD**) and would provide for amenity values (RMA section 7(c) and NPS-UD Objective 4) along the residential parts of the corridor.

Date: 12 April 2024

William Field

APPENDIX 1 – Proposed Setback Rules and Matters of Discretion

Chapter 14 Residential

Minimum road boundary setback - Qualifying Matter City Spine Transport Corridor (14.5.2.18 and 14.6.2.17)

a. *For all properties fronting the City Spine Transport Corridor:*

- I. *where the road is 24m or less in width, a minimum building setback from the road boundary of 4m is required; and*
- II. *any fencing provided along the road boundary shall not exceed 1m in height maximum, except that the maximum height shall be 2 metres if the whole fence or screening structure is at least 75% transparent; and*
- III. *any outdoor living space must not be located within 1.5m of the road boundary.*

14.15.1j. *Matters of control and discretion*

14.15.1j. *Residential design principles - Qualifying Matter City Spine Transport Corridor*

- I. *Whether the reduced setback, location of an outdoor living space and fencing would provide sufficient space in the front yard to contribute positively to street amenity and provide for the planting of medium to large specimen trees.*
- ~~II. *Whether the reduced setback, location of an outdoor living space and fencing would provide sufficient opportunity to achieve well integrated and multiple land use and infrastructure outcomes, including as a minimum and to achieve best practice guidelines, two traffic lanes, pedestrian, cycle and public transport services; landscape amenity and tree planting; and stormwater retention and treatment facilities, residential street relationships and servicing, and CPTED principles*~~
- III. ~~*Whether buildings, the location of an outdoor living space and fencing enabled through a lesser setback from the road would impede widening of the road reserve through designation and/or land acquisition.*~~

Chapter 15 Commercial

Minimum road boundary setback - Qualifying Matter City Spine Transport Corridor (15.4.2.10, 15.6.2.11, 15.8.2.13, 15.10.2.10, 15.12.2.13)

a. *For all properties fronting the City Spine Transport Corridor:*

- I. *Where the road is 24m or less in width, a minimum building setback from road boundary of 1.5m is required; and*
- II. *Any fencing provided along the road boundary shall not exceed 1m in height maximum*
- III. *Any outdoor living space must not be located within 1.5m of the road boundary.*

15.14.5.3 *Matters of control and discretion*

15.14.5.3 *City Spine Transport Corridor*

- I. *Whether the reduced setback would provide sufficient space in the front yard to contribute positively to street amenity and provide for the planting of medium to large specimen trees.*
- II. *Whether the reduced setback would promote active engagement with, and contributes to the vibrancy and attractiveness of, any adjacent streets, lanes or public open spaces.*
- III. *Whether the reduced setback would provide sufficient opportunity to achieve well integrated and multiple land use and infrastructure outcomes, including as a minimum and to achieve best practice guidelines, two traffic lanes, pedestrian, cycle and public transport services; landscape amenity and tree planting; street furniture, stormwater retention and treatment facilities,*
- IV. *Is designed to incorporate Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, including encouraging surveillance, effective lighting, management of public areas, boundary demarcation location of outdoor living space and fencing;*
- V. *Whether buildings enabled through a lesser setback from the road would impede widening of the road reserve through designation and/or land acquisition.*

APPENDIX 2

City Spine Transport Corridor High Density Residential Zones (HRZ) Indicative Development Modelling