

## Draft Housing and Business Choice Plan Change 14

### Waipuna Halswell Hornby Riccarton Community Board

#### **A. A range of topics where Board supports Council's position**

There are a range of topics where the Board supports Council's position and requests as large distance as possible between the residential sector and large commercial/industrial complexes. This protects both residents and the operating practice of the large industrial/commercial complex.

Our Board opposes Kainga Ora's approach where every distance must be shortened. This has been done from an Auckland perspective and appears totally at odds for a quality urban environment. I have not been able to ascertain why they are so enthusiastic about challenging all provisions in Plan Change 14. I understand they have taken the same approach in the Wellington District Plan.

##### **1. Chapter 16 Industrial**

Hornby which has a large industrial area that interfaces with the residential area. Our Board supports the position initially taken by the Council and would like to go further as recommended by Christian Jordan. {Refer Our cross submission.}

It is necessary to protect the residential sector as much possible from industrial activity and also to protect the industrial sector from reverse sensitivity. Ravensdown has experienced concerns from local residents.

##### **2. Airport Noise Contours**

Our Community Board in our initial submission supports the Airport Noise Control contours. We are not clear why the contours need to be referred back to Environment Canterbury. At the beginning of Plan Change 14 I was advised that Environment Canterbury staff and CCC staff were working on this together. If legally Environment Canterbury (ECan) needs to make the call why was this not thought through at the outset.

If the IHP decides ECan must be the determining authority, then we support that all residential areas potentially affected by noise contours retain their current density until the decision by ECan is made.

As mentioned in our previous submission there is no legal requirement for compensation.

Areas south of Straven Road and the railway line represented by the Riccarton Bush/Kilmarnock Residents' Association and those south of the Railway line covered by the Deans Avenue Precinct Society should **not** be zoned 8 or 10 storeys to compensate for some Riccarton areas retaining lower density due to Airport Noise Contours. (Our Board opposes the submission by Deans Avenue Precinct Society referring to the area between Kilmarnock Street and Matai Street East. Residents in this area are very concerned regarding Resource Consent RMA 2016/1434).

Again our Board refers to Christchurch City Council's Sarah Oliver's report where there is sufficient land until 2050. There is no land scarcity in Christchurch.

### **3. NZ Rail Interface**

The Board opposes submitters who wish to bring residential activities closer. Support for Kiwi Rail in keeping an appropriate distance. <sup>Riccarton</sup> Hornby is particularly affected by the rail network.

### **4. Electricity Transmission corridors**

The Board supports Council's position and also Orion's. Important to create a distance between residential activity and large electrical infrastructure. There are areas of Hornby which have large electricity corridors.

## **B. Other Issues**

### **1 Trees –**

As stated in our initial submission our tree canopy is now behind most large NZ cities. We have shown a decrease in tree canopy of 2% between 2015/2015 and 2018/2019 and Christchurch is now at 13.56% tree canopy cover. Auckland is 18%, Wellington 30%. One of the reasons is intensification. When a development occurs the developer can place the driveway where he/she wishes and trees on their land and Council roadside reserve are removed. The developer is required to replant on roadside reserve, but often the trees planted are exceedingly immature. The Panel needs to be aware of this issue in looking at increasing density. The drawings produced by WSP present a realistic picture of what 3 to 6 storeys will look like from a street perspective. One of the areas at risk are Tōtara. Hinau, Puriri Streets planted as part of the Deans previous estate.

Also our Board has argued for the Kauri Cluster- the south side of Rata, Rimu, Kahu- which is a distinct precinct developed in 2007/2008 by Christchurch City Council. It would be concerning if the area is zoned medium density and the native trees are removed.

Documentation regarding this was included in the Board's first submission.

We also have tabled a resource consent where in a development opposite Christchurch Girls' High School intended for medium density zoning, high density was allowed and the removal of four significant trees. This was done without a notified resource consent.

### **Conclusion.**

From submissions the Panel will be aware of general concern from individuals and residents' associations regarding the imposition of medium and high density.

All five Riccarton Resident Associations are opposed as is the Greater Hornby Residents Association. You have heard from all these Associations.

We acknowledge that high density remains as a requirement from Central Government and further understand the Panel may be continuing with Medium Density.

Our Board asks the Panel to protect as much as legally possible of the current residential environment. We recognise you have a very difficult task.

Thank you for your time and the rigour you have displayed in your questioning.

Warm Regards

Helen Broughton

Board Chairperson of

Waipuna Halswell Hornby Riccarton Community Board

RMA Commissioner

Cell 027 6404935



Helen Broughton &lt;helen@broughton.co.nz&gt;

## Re Section 16 Industrial

1 message

Broughton, Helen &lt;Helen.Broughton@ccc.govt.nz&gt;

Sun, Jul 16, 2023 at 8:38 PM

To: Helen Broughton &lt;helen@broughton.co.nz&gt;, "Broughton, Helen" &lt;Helen.Broughton@ccc.govt.nz&gt;

Chapter 16

737.19 Christian Jordan - support Important to minimise harm on a residential community.  
 737.13. Christian Jordan. Support . Need to protect residential sector as much as possible.  
 737.14. Christian Jordan. Support. As Above  
 737.20 Christian Jordan. Support amendment- as above.  
 737.15. Christian Jordan. Support amendment. As above.  
 737.17. Christian Jordan. Support amendment as above.

854.21. Orion NZ Ltd. Industrial Park Zone. Support Amendment and non complying status. Important to protect infrastructure.

737.21. Christian Jordan. Support amendment. Need to offer some protection to residential sector.

737.16. Christian Jordan- Support amendment. Recession planes developed further to protasct the residential sector.  
 737.18. Christian Jordan - as above.

Chapter 17. Rural Quarry Zone. Alison Dockery support . Need more protecrction for residential sector. Our standards are very low compared to other NZ cities and Australi

Open Space Chapter 18.

Chapter 19 Planning Maps

84.1 Alice McKenzie - Support . No rationale for this area to be zoned High Density.  
 121.2 Cameron Matthews. Fully oppose his requeste to remove stated qualifying matters and low density zones. Completely oppose all his requests in this chapter and throughout District Plan.

751.144. CCC- important that heritage sites are Medium density rather than High Density.

834.332. CCC Oppose in entirety. Christchurch does not require level of density suggested in this submission as no land scarcity . This is not fully understood in Auckland.

19 Planning Maps. MRZ Zoning

55.18 Tobias Meyer \_ Oppose . Opposed to further intensification around Central city and core bus routes.

67.18. Rachel Davies - Support Amendment. Increased intensification can be found in other areas than Town Centres.

69.1 John Campbell - Oppose. Retain councils modified position.

108.2 Charles Etherington. Support. Medium density not required in this way.

121.36 Cameron Matthes- oppose further intensification of Wigram.

132.1 Tiffany Boyle - Support. Hornby Residents are opposed to high density housing. Inappropriate for Hornby and Christchurch at this stage.

188.8. Riccarton Bush/Kilmarnock Resident's Association support. this is close to Riccarton House and Bush. The Kauri Cluster should be considered.

192.1 Nan Xu- Support. This area already intensified and close to St Peter's Church.

343.2. Ravensdowne - Support - As long as no reverse sensitivity issues.

321.2 George Hooft- Support. Intensification should start in central city.

351.4 Jono de Wit. Oppose . Area should not be high density due to Riccarton House and Bush.

There are many other changes that have been recommended as a response to submissions received. Please see all reporting here:  
<https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/hearings/>

Thanks  
Kind Regards

Mark Stevenson

**From:** RBK Residents Assoc <rbkresidents@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 21, 2023 11:44 AM  
**To:** Stevenson, Mark <Mark.Stevenson@ccc.govt.nz>  
**Subject:** City Council evidence on PC14 - changing the meaning of HRZ residential for Riccarton

Hello Mark,

Sarah Oliver recommends, in her S42a report...

*1.6.d Retention of the Operative District Plan zoning for all areas located within the Updated 50dBA Ldn Noise Contour Outer Envelope, except for an area of land north of Riccarton Road within the area broadly between Straven Road, Otakaro Avon River, Matai Street, Deans Avenue and Riccarton Road, which **I recommend to be rezoned High Density Residential Zone (HRZ).***

At first glance that seems to mean the area will remain the same because, as far as I was aware, the area is already designated to become HRZ Residential (6 storeys) .

However Ike Kleynbos **has recommended a change to the definition of HRZ** for the entire area (as far east as Deans Ave, north to the river and surrounding Mona Vale) making it 8 storeys, to compensate (it seems) for the fact that the Airport Noise Influence Area (ANIA) is proposed to be more restrictive on development further west.

This increased height recommendation appears to apply south of Riccarton Rd as well.

Is this correct because it seems arbitrary (the result of a discussion between Oliver and Kleynbos), and sneaky - and calling it compensatory suggests the council is seeking to punish one residential area for the fact that another falls within the airport noise zone and won't be intensified.

Why is this trade-off even needed, and will residents, all of whom will be substantially affected, be notified and given an opportunity to submit on what is effectively a new plan change.

Thanks

Tony  
--

Riccarton Bush - Kilmarnock Residents' Association

*You can join our association by emailing name/s, street address and phone details to [rbkresidents@gmail.com](mailto:rbkresidents@gmail.com). Then pay \$5 each via internet banking to Account 02 0820 0531755 00 with surname as a reference. Alternatively, deliver the subscription to the Treasurer at 25 Rata St.*

This electronic email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. The views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of the Christchurch City Council. If you are not the correct recipient of this email please advise the sender and delete the email.