

## 1. SUMMARY STATEMENT: SPECIFIC PURPOSE ZONES

- 1.1 My full name is **Clare Joan Piper**. I am a Senior Policy Planner in the City Planning Team of the Christchurch City Council (the **Council**).
- 1.2 I have prepared a section 42A report and rebuttal evidence on behalf of the Council in relation to the Specific Purpose Chapter, with particular regard to the School, Tertiary and Hospital Zones.
- 1.3 This summary statement relates in particular to the following clauses in the RMA:
- (a) 77N (2) - in relation to ensuring provisions for non-residential zones give effect to changes required by policy 3,
  - (b) 77O - in relation to qualifying matters application to non-residential areas; and,
  - (c) 80E (1) (b) (iii) – in relation to amending related provisions that support or are consequential on the MDRS.
- 1.4 I will reappear before the Panel regarding the Transport Chapter later within this hearing week.
- 1.5 As well as providing a general overview in this summary statement, I also summarise the recommended changes to the original notified proposals, as per my s.42A reports, and outline any further recommended changes as result of rebuttal evidence, conferencing or pre-hearing mediations with submitters.
- 1.6 For the Specific Purpose – School, Tertiary and Hospital – Zones, it can generally be summarised that the proposed changes to the provisions seek to provide a commensurate response to intensification of the residential zones they are located within. As such, changes to provisions are primarily providing increases in permitted building heights, balancing the mitigation of this, along with consequential changes, such as giving effect to Qualifying Matters (**QMs**) which seek to retain existing residential zones impacting on sites' 'alternative zone'.
- 1.7 As per my s.42A report<sup>1</sup>, I have noted that should the recommendations of other topic areas be accepted, such as in relation to the area/extent of the

<sup>1</sup> [10B-Clare-Piper-section-42A-report-final.PDF \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#) – paragraph 4.1.3

QM's and the HRZ zones along with provisions within HRZ, further consequential amendments may be required within the Specific Purpose – School, Tertiary and Hospital – Zones to ensure a commemorate response.

- 1.8 A summary of the proposed notified changes for the Specific Purpose – School, Tertiary and Hospital – Zones, can be found in both the s.32<sup>2</sup>, and s.42A<sup>3</sup> reports.
- 1.9 It is noted that recommended s.42A changes to the Specific Purpose (Tertiary) Zone were not part of the original notification package, however the proposed changes to that zone I consider are consequential as a result of the application of QM's, and the removal of the Catholic Cathedral building as a heritage building.

## **2. SPECIFIC PURPOSE (SCHOOL) ZONE (SPSZ)**

- 2.1 As per the changes proposed within the s.42A report for SPSZ, these seek to:
- (a) Reinstate:
- (i) Residential zone naming throughout provisions – RS and RSdT.
  - (ii) Setbacks for accessory buildings and spiritual activities.
  - (iii) Nil site coverage for sites within HRZ (Central City), CCMU, FUZ and IG zones.
  - (iv) Heights for sites within the central city to be as per the maximum building height planning map.
- (b) Amend:
- (i) MRZ sites to be as per ODP for medium density in relation to site coverage, setbacks, and heights.
  - (ii) Naming of HRZ references to precincts – to be either HRZ, or HRZ within and outside central city.

<sup>2</sup> [ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/The-Council/Plans-Strategies-Policies-Bylaws/Plans/district-plan/Proposed-changes/2023/PC14/Section-32/Plan-Change-14-HBC-NOTIFICATION-Section-32-Revised-provisions-for-SP-Schools-and-Hospitals2.pdf](https://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/The-Council/Plans-Strategies-Policies-Bylaws/Plans/district-plan/Proposed-changes/2023/PC14/Section-32/Plan-Change-14-HBC-NOTIFICATION-Section-32-Revised-provisions-for-SP-Schools-and-Hospitals2.pdf)

School: page 12-13 paragraph 3.3.4 a. -h;  
Hospital; page 17 -19 paragraph 3.8.4 a.- i.

<sup>3</sup> [10B-Clare-Piper-section-42A-report-final.PDF \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#) Pages 17-18.

- (iii) Landscaping - to apply only to HRZ sites, and simplification of rules.
- (iv) Removing the proposed RD enablement activity for heights, increasing permitted heights for MRZ and HRZ, and incorporating continuous building length within the provisions for HRZ that was previously within the RD activity table.
- (v) Alternative zones of sites to reflect application of QM's, and to retain existing alternative zone (i.e. RS and RSDT).

2.2 As per the rebuttal evidence provided<sup>4</sup> and the Urban Design and Architecture Joint Witness Statement<sup>5</sup>, it is now recommended that:

- (a) Rewording of the provision for continuous building length – Rule 13.6.2.4 be clarified to now read as applying to:

**a. The wall of any building which is parallel to, and within 15 metres of an internal boundary, building shall either:**

- (b) Alternative zones for schools located under the QM Airport Noise Influence Area (**ANIA**) be amended to reflect the missed changes to the extent of this QM.

2.3 I acknowledge the Council submission that has been addressed by Mr. Langman in his Statement of Evidence<sup>6</sup>, along with changes recommended with the Rebuttal Evidence from Ms. Hoddinott<sup>7</sup>, in relation to SPSZ and accept the recommendations for provisions to be amended, namely:

- (a) Amend Appendix 13.6.6.3 Private Schools, so that the alternate zones for Christ's College east of Rolleston Avenue, and Cathedral Grammar in respect of 17 Armagh Street, refers to MRZ, as they are in Residential Heritage Areas.

2.4 In addition, Mr. Langman sought to support the Council submission with regards to wording amendments to the proposed provision 13.6.4.2.a - for heritage items and settings to be excluded from SPSZ provisions - to include RHA's, and for this to be accepted<sup>8</sup>. I noted that in Ms. Dixon's

<sup>4</sup> [10.-Rebuttal-Evidence-Claire-Piper-SP-Zone.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#) - paragraphs 22-30

<sup>5</sup> [Joint-Expert-Witness-Statement-of-Urban-Design-and-Architecture-Experts-Urban-Design-and-Architecture-5-October-2023-Updated-9-October-2023.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

<sup>6</sup> [Christchurch-City-Council-751-Evidence-Marcus-Langman.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#) – paragraph 57-62, and 87 (dd),

<sup>7</sup> [30.-Rebuttal-Evidence-Wendy-Hoddinott.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#) – paragraph 12.

<sup>8</sup> [Christchurch-City-Council-751-Evidence-Marcus-Langman.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#) – paragraph 87 – (aa) – page 31

Rebuttal Evidence<sup>9</sup> it is recommended that the Council submission should be rejected. I agree with Ms. Dixon and recommend this is rejected.

2.5 I further acknowledge that throughout the notified SPSZ provisions references to the Residential Hills zones was removed. As per Mr. Kleynbos's Rebuttal Evidence<sup>10</sup>, this zone is recommended to now be retained. As such, amendments to provisions are now required to reinstate Residential Hills zone within the SPSZ provisions in the appropriate locations.

2.6 With regard to the rezoning requests from Christ's College and the Catholic Diocese of Christchurch, I consider these submissions to be out of scope in relation to 77G and 77N (3)(a) of the RMA in that they seek a non-residential rezoning and do not give effect to policy 3.

### **3. SPECIFIC PURPOSE (TERTIARY) ZONE (SPTZ)**

3.1 As per the changes proposed within the s.42A report for SPTZ, these seek to:

(a) Amend:

(i) Building setback from road boundary requirement for Ara Institute of Canterbury on Barbadoes St – to be as per other road boundary setbacks for their site.

(ii) Alternative zones for University of Canterbury – to reflect QM application.

3.2 As per my Rebuttal Evidence<sup>11</sup>, I accept the changes proposed by the University of Canterbury, and that the wording of the alternative zones now be as per below:

<sup>9</sup> [06.-Rebuttal-Evidence-Glenda-Dixon.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#) – paragraphs 50 - 55

<sup>10</sup> [05.-Ike-Kleynbos-Rebuttal-Evidence-16-October-2023.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#) – paragraph 59.

<sup>11</sup> [10.-Rebuttal-Evidence-Claire-Piper-SP-Zone.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#) – Paragraphs 19-21

	Tertiary Facilities Name	Location	Map Ref	Alternative Zone
1	UC east of Ilam Road site	East of Ilam Road, Ilam	31A	<del>RSDT-MRZ</del> except those parts of the site which fall outside the 50, 55 and 65 dBA Ldn Noise Contours shall be MRZ
2	UC west of Ilam Road site	West of Ilam Road, Ilam	30/31A	<del>RS MRZ</del> except those parts of the site which fall outside the 50, 55 and 65 dBA Ldn Noise Contours shall be MRZ
3	UC Dovedale site	Dovedale Avenue, Ilam	30A	<del>RS MRZ</del> MRZ

#### 4. SPECIFIC PURPOSE (HOSPITAL) ZONE (SPHZ)

4.1 As per the changes proposed in the within the s.42A report, these seek to:

(a) Reinstate:

(i) RD activity for continuous building length and amend to apply to inner urban sites.

(b) Amend:

(i) Removing the proposed RD enablement activity for heights, increasing permitted heights for those sites within HRZ, and incorporating continuous building length within the provisions for HRZ sites that was previously within the RD activity table.

(ii) Insert recession plane provisions for large inner urban sites.

(iii) Fencing provisions to be as per operative.

#### 5. SUMMARY ON SPECIFIC PURPOSE ZONES

5.1 Overall, I consider the proposed changes to the Specific Purpose – School, Tertiary and Hospital – Zones provide for enablement of development at a level that is commensurate with the surrounding environment they are located within and continue to support such facilities to meet the needs of the community.

Date: 21 November 2023

Clare Joan Piper