

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS  
IN CHRISTCHURCH**

**TE MAHERE Ā-ROHE I TŪTOHUA MŌ TE TĀONE O ŌTAUTAHI**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of the hearing of submissions on Plan Change 14 (Housing and Business Choice) to the Christchurch District Plan

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JANE RENNIE ON  
BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

**RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER AREAS**

Dated: 28 November 2023

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>CERTIFICATION PATHWAY</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>LYTTELTON SCHOOL SITE</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>BECA STUDY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SPECIAL AMENITY AREAS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>EVALUATION OF ATTRIBUTES</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>SCOTT STREET</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1 – BECA STUDY (ATTACHED AS A SEPARATE PDF)</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2 – ATTRIBUTES</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3 – ARCGIS ONLINE TOOL</b>	<b>3</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. My full name is Jane Maree Rennie. I am employed as an Urban Designer at Boffa Miskell.
2. I prepared a statement of evidence, dated 11 August 2023, on behalf of the Christchurch City Council (the **Council**) in respect of Plan Change 14 to the Christchurch District Plan (the **District Plan; PC14**). My evidence addressed the topic of the Residential Character Areas (**RCAs**) as a Qualifying Matter.
3. I have prepared this supplementary statement of evidence in respect of issues raised at the PC14 hearing in relation to Residential Character Areas. This includes providing the following further information:
  - (a) The BECA character assessment from 2015.
  - (b) Background to Special Amenity Areas and how they relate to the RCAs including background to the policy framework.
  - (c) The attributes used for the assessment of the RCAs and use of ArcGIS Online in recording the data.
4. I confirm that:
  - (a) The former Lyttelton West School site falls outside the RCA boundary.
  - (b) There are no specific provisions in the District Plan which consider the effects of a proposed building /development on a nearby RCA.
5. Based on an assessment of questions raised, I conclude that:
  - (a) The certification pathway could be a good tool for assessment of proposals in a RCA if any potential overlap in 'areas of expertise' can be addressed.
  - (b) The evidence presented by Submitter 241 (Ms Schade) does not change my conclusion that Scott Street does not meet the level of consistent built and landscape qualities to be considered as a RCA.

## **INTRODUCTION**

6. My full name is Jane Maree Rennie and I am an Associate Partner and Urban Designer with Boffa Miskell Limited, based in the firm's Christchurch office.
7. My primary statement of evidence related to the Residential Character Areas (**RCAs**) Qualifying Matter. Specifically, it relates to the identification of existing RCAs as a Qualifying Matter, the proposed alteration of existing RCA boundaries, identification of new RCAs, and the District Plan provisions applying to these areas which are intended to maintain and enhance the special character values. In addition, this evidence considers the impact of changes to the different activity statuses outlined in PC14 and the associated built form standards that would apply.
8. During the PC14 hearing, the Panel requested additional information and clarification of several matters. As such, I have prepared this supplementary evidence.
9. I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the Council.

### **Qualifications and experience**

10. My qualifications and experience are set out at paragraphs 13 to 15 of my primary statement of evidence.

### **Code of conduct**

11. While this is a Council hearing, I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (contained in the 2023 Practice Note) and agree to comply with it. Except where I state I rely on the evidence of another person, I confirm that the issues addressed in this supplementary statement of evidence are within my area of expertise, and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my expressed opinions.

### **Scope of supplementary evidence**

12. This supplementary evidence responds to queries raised by the Panel as recorded in task #50 of the Memorandum of Counsel for Christchurch City Council Regarding Panel Requests for Further Information dated 10 November 2023, and addresses the following matters:
  - (a) Urban design advice on the potential merits of a certification pathway;

- (b) Clarification as to whether the former Lyttelton West School site on Voelas Road in Lyttelton is part of the Lyttelton Character Area assessment;
- (c) Provision of a copy of the 2015 Beca Character Area study;
- (d) Outline of the background to the introduction of Special Amenity Areas (SAMs), how many SAMs were included in the previous 1995 Christchurch Plan and how they transitioned into the Christchurch Replacement District Plan;
- (e) Whether the RCA policy was developed specifically in relation to the Beca work in the identification of RCAs, or whether that policy existed in relation to SAMs and had evolved?
- (f) Provision of additional information from the ArcGIS tool developed for the Character Area assessment to show, as an example, how the list of attributes created were evaluated on the ground; and
- (g) Advises on which provisions in the Operative District Plan enable consideration of effects of a proposed building / development on a nearby RCA.
- (h) Respond to Submitter 241 (Ms Schade) who seeks that Scott Street be identified as a RCA.

13. I address each of these points in my supplementary evidence below.

#### **CERTIFICATION PATHWAY**

- 14. The Panel have requested urban design advice on the potential merits of a certification pathway.
- 15. The District Plan contains a number of rules that enable certain activities to be considered as Controlled Activities rather than Restricted Discretionary Activities (**RDA**) when certified by a qualified expert who is on a Council-approved list. The approved experts are able to provide independent certification of relevant urban design requirements as part of the resource consent applications.
- 16. This approach could be used for proposals in Character Area i.e. for an extension or new build. The certifier would draw upon the relevant

Assessment Matters and the Design Guide for the Character Area in undertaking a qualitative assessment.

17. This process would enable the expert to identify and resolve any design issues that could compromise the values of the Character Area prior to certifying the proposal. If resolution of the design issues is not possible, the expert would not be able to certify the proposal and the standard RDA consent pathway would remain in place.
18. A key consideration with this approach is the ability for the Certifier to operate within their area of expertise in assessing all the provisions relevant to the proposal. If additional expertise is required it can make the process complex and raise ethical issues. In relation to the RCA Assessment Matters at 14.15.27 (Character Area Overlay), the only potential issue is the reference to historic heritage values and if additional expertise would be required to undertake an assessment. Although Akaroa is not the subject of PC14, it is noted that direct reference is made to the heritage assessment matters in Chapter 9 of the Plan.
19. Specifically the Assessment Matter framework includes consideration of:
  - (a) *Area context – clause i.D – the relationship with adjoining sites and buildings, including any recorded historic heritage values.*
  - (b) *Built character – clause i.F – the recognition of recorded historic heritage values of adjacent buildings.*
  - (c) *Akaroa and Lyttelton – Clause i.F – recognises any recorded historic heritage values adjacent and opposite to the development.*
  - (d) *Akaroa – Clause ii – where the site is located within the Akaroa Heritage Area, the matters set out in Rule 9.3.6.3.*
20. If this potential overlap with heritage matters could be resolved, then the certification pathway could be a good tool for assessment. The certification process has the added benefit of lightening the resourcing load of Council, with much of the assessment undertaken prior to the lodgement of an application.

## LYTTELTON SCHOOL SITE

21. The Panel has sought clarification around the former Lyttelton West School site on Voelas Road in Lyttelton and whether this was part of the Lyttelton Character Area assessment.
22. The site falls outside the RCA boundary but does fall within the Lyttelton Residential Heritage Area.

## BECA STUDY

23. BECA prepared a '*Christchurch Suburban Character Areas Assessment*' in January 2015 as part of the District Plan review (the areas were originally established in the mid 1990's with the development of the Christchurch City Plan – see further details below).
24. The BECA study is included at **Appendix 1** of this supplementary evidence and comprised 16 Character Areas.

## SPECIAL AMENITY AREAS

25. The Panel have sought further background on SAMs and how they transitioned into the Replacement District Plan.
26. The Christchurch City Plan which was notified in 1995 and made operative in 2005 (updated over time through until 2016) included a number of SAM's.
27. A list of the SAM's (41 in total) was set out at Appendix 4 of Part 2 of the City Plan (updated 29 January 2015) and are outlined in the following images taken from the Plan.

## Appendix 4 - List of Special amenity areas (Sams)

Updated 29 January 2015

Appendix 4 - List of Special amenity areas (Sams)		
Sam number	General location	Rules applicable (or other method)
1	Heathcote	Community based management plan
2	Beckenham Loop	Street scene
3	Tainui/Moana Streets	Street scene
4	Aynsley Terrace	Street scene
5	Cholmondeley Avenue	Street scene
6	Shand/Piko/Tika	Street scene; residential site density
7	Totara/Hinawi/Puriri	Street scene
8	Fendalton (general)	Residential site density; outdoor living space
8a	Bradnor Street	Residential site density; outdoor living space
8b	Heathfield Street	Residential site density; outdoor living space; external appearance
9	River Road	Street scene
10	Slater-Poulton Avenue	Street scene
10a	Dudley Street	Street scene; external appearance
11	Heaton and Circuit Streets	Street scene; external appearance (community based management plan)
12	Massey Crescent	Street scene; residential site density



13	Francis Avenue	Street scene ; external appearance
14	Gosset-Roosevelt	Street scene; residential site density; and external appearance
15	Severn Street	Street scene
16	St James Avenue	Street scene
17	Hackthorne/MacMillan/Dyers	Street scene - assessment matter
17a	Hackthorne Road	External appearance
18	The Esplanade	Street scene; external appearance
19	Church Square	Street scene (community based management plan)
20	Rastrick Area	Height
21	Elm Grove/Hanmer Street	Street scene; residential site density; height (community based management plan)
28	Beverly Street	External appearance (community based management plan)
29	Ranfury Street	Street scene; external appearance
34	Auburn Avenue	Street scene; external appearance
35	The Spur	External appearance
36	St Andrews Square/Peel Street	Street scene
37	Emmett Street	Street scene
38	Clissold street	Street scene
39	Mays/Chapter/Weston	Street scene
40	Hawkesbury Avenue	Street scene
41	Naseby Street	Street scene

28. The BECA report sets out that a review of relevant background information was undertaken in confirming the review of the 16 character areas assessed under the Replacement District Plan. This background information included review of the 'Christchurch Urban Character Study' undertaken in 2010 (and associated 'Proposed Christchurch Residential Heritage Conservation Areas Report, 2010')<sup>1</sup>.
29. A number of these SAM's were carried through into the current Operative District Plan (2017) via the IHP process. The following table outlines a summary of the progression of the SAM's to RCAs.

<sup>1</sup> BECA, Christchurch Suburban Character Aras Assessment, Page 2, para 2.1

City Plan 2005 (notified 1995 and updated 2016) - SAMs	Operative District Plan 2017 (IHP) – Character Area	PC14 As Notified - RCA
SAM 18	CA1 Esplanade	-
SAM 35	CA2 Clifton	-
SAM 17/17a	CA3 Cashmere	Cashmere
SAM 2	CA4 Beckenham Loop	Beckenham
SAM 3	CA5 Tainui/Moana	Tainui
SAM 6	CA6 Piko/Shand	Piko
SAM 11	CA7 Heaton/Circuit	Heaton
SAM 28	CA8 Beverley	Beverley
SAM 29	CA9 Ranfurly	Ranfurly
SAM 12	CA10 Massey	Massey
SAM 14	CA11 Malvern	Malvern
SAM 15	CA12 Severn	Severn
SAM 13	CA13 Francis	Francis
SAM 10/10a	CA14 Dudley	Dudley
SAM 21	CA15 Englefield	Englefield
-	CA17 Lyttelton	Lyttelton
-	-	Roker
-	-	Ryan
-	-	Bewdley
-	-	Cashmere View (recommended via submissions)
SAM 1 Heathcote Valley		
SAM 4 Aynsley Terrace		
SAM 5 Cholmondeley/Ford		
SAM 7 Totara/Hinau/Puriri		
SAM 8 Fendalton		
SAM8a Bradnor		
SAM8b Heathfield		
SAM 9 River Road		
SAM 16 St James Avenue		
SAM 19 Church Square		
SAM 20 Rastrick/Tonbridge		
SAM 22 Gloucester/Montreal		
SAM 23/23a Salisbury Street		
SAM 24 Avon Loop		
SAM 25 Gracefield Avenue		
SAM 26 Peacock/Beveridge/Conference		
SAM 27 Otley/Ely		
SAM 30 Chester Street East		
SAM 31 Park Terrace/Rolleston Avenue		
SAM 32 Cranmer Square		
SAM 33 Latimer Square		
SAM 34 Auburn Ave		
SAM 36 St Andrews Square		
SAM 37 Emmett Street		
SAM 38 Clissold Street		
SAM 39 Mays/Chapter/Weston/Knowles		
SAM 40 Hawkesbury Avenue		
SAM 41 Naseby Street		

30. The City Plan (up to 2016) included the following policies for SAMs:
- (a) **Policy 11.1.1** “To conserve and enhance the character of living areas identified as special amenity areas.”
  - (b) **Policy 11.5.1 Special Amenity Areas** “To ensure building, open space and site design within identified special amenity areas in the living environment maintain and enhance their coherent urban character”.
31. The above approach has evolved as part of the identified RCAs with key themes covered by the current Operative District Plan policy framework.

## EVALUATION OF ATTRIBUTES

32. The Panel have requested additional information from the ArcGIS tool developed for the RCAs assessment to show, as an example, how the list of attributes created were evaluated on the ground.
33. The Character Areas attributes (or elements) were largely derived from the BECA study (referred to as the 2015 data)<sup>2</sup>, with this data forming the ‘baseline’ for assessing the Areas, and specifically if there had been any change.
34. **Appendix 2** to this evidence includes a table of the overall attribute ‘topics’ considered in assessing each area. Beverley, Ranfurly and Massey RCAs have been used as examples.
35. These attributes were then used to prepare a ‘summary’ of the key attributes to be maintained and enhanced for each area. These formed the reference notes for the assessment of each site, including in the field. The following are the attributes for the Massey Crescent Character Area:
- *Building - Height – generally single storey.*
  - *Building - Scale – generally moderate-scale, individual bungalows.*
  - *Building - Roof form – simple forms with the additions of small projections, hip and gable roofs.*

---

<sup>2</sup> BECA, Christchurch Suburban Character Areas Assessment, page 2, para 2.4 Character Elements

- *Architectural Detailing – porches and entries, weatherboard, bay and bow windows, leadlights, shingle gable ends.*
  - *Site Coverage – approximately 35%.*
  - *Setback From Street – generally 6-13m with an average of approximately 10m.*
  - *Low Fencing or no Fencing – 1 to 1.5m fences.*
  - *Visual Connectivity between Dwellings and Street – through low or no fencing, placement of windows and dwelling entrances.*
  - *Vegetated Gardens - includes front lawns, side and rear yard vegetation including specimen trees.*
  - *Exclusion of garages within the streetscene.*
36. To determine the ranking of each property the relevant area attributes were assessed (noting that the attributes varied across the different areas given they possess varying qualities or values). **Appendix 2** also sets out a sample of the Massey Crescent properties and how they were assessed drawing on the 2015 Beca data and the 2022 desktop analysis (Google Earth/ building consent review and field work). Note that the spreadsheet has been structured in excel to present the data in a more understandable way (this was not the format used in the original analysis).
37. ArcGIS Online was used to build an on-site tool. An iPad was used in the field to collect the data, validating the 2015 BECA study. Where the data was not available it was necessary to record new data. **Appendix 3** to this evidence includes an example of the ArcGIS tool and the attributes assessed, i.e. front yard and landscape features, fencing and if the dwelling is sympathetic in terms of the era.

### **District Plan Provisions addressing effects of buildings on RCAs**

38. The Panel requested guidance on any provisions in the Operative District Plan which enable consideration of the effects of a proposed building / development on a nearby RCA.
39. There are no specific provisions in the Operative Plan that seek to manage the effects of built development, which is located outside of the existing RCAs, including such tools as daylight recession planes.

40. Objective 14.2.4 focuses on high quality residential environments and is supported by a number of related policies. Policy 14.2.4.1 seeks to *'Facilitate the contribution of individual developments to high quality residential environments in all residential areas through design'* with subclause 'i' noting *'reflecting the context, character and scale of building anticipated in the neighbourhood.'* This policy, although seeking to manage the quality of the residential environment, is not specific to Character Areas and is unlikely to be relevant to developments proposed adjoining or in the vicinity of a RCAs. This approach to interface issues has not been put forward for the RCA Qualifying Matter approach.

### **SCOTT STREET**

41. Submitter 241 (Ms Schade) requested that Scott Street be identified as a RCA and the Panel has sought clarification as to whether any of the evidence presented by Ms Schade might lead to a change in the recommendation.
42. Scott Street was assessed following Ms Schade's submission on the notification of PC14. My original evidence sets out at Appendix A the evaluation of the Scott Street area. Overall, it was not considered to meet the level of consistent built and landscape qualities to be considered a Character Area (being 40% Primary and 26% Contributory, with a total of 66%).<sup>3</sup>
43. Ms Schade outlined during the hearing that 12 buildings on Scott Street date from the 1860's/70's, and this was not acknowledged in the Boffa Miskell technical assessment, which set out that the era of development was the early 20<sup>th</sup> century particularly 1900-1920. Although the technical assessment refers to *'worker cottages from the early settlement days'*<sup>4</sup>, it is acknowledged that the worker cottages do date from the late 1800's. The building age data provided by the Council applies an age band to each property which is not exact in terms of when the dwelling was constructed.

---

<sup>3</sup> Boffa Miskell, Investigation of Character Area Qualifying Matter, Otautahi Christchurch Suburban Character Areas, Evaluation of Additional Character Areas Arising from Submissions on PC14, 11 August, 2013, Section 3.4.1, page 13 / section 4.2, page 32

<sup>4</sup> Boffa Miskell, Investigation of Character Area Qualifying Matter, Otautahi Christchurch Suburban Character Areas, Evaluation of Additional Character Areas Arising from Submissions on PC14, 11 August, 2013, Section 3.4.1, page 13

44. Ms Schade has undertaken an assessment of each of the dwellings, with her conclusions broadly aligning with the Boffa Miskell study. The key differences between the two are as follows:
- (a) 1 Scott Street – This was assessed as Neutral and Ms Schade identifies it as Contributory. This is a more recent dwelling, two storeys in form and comprising a large wooden fence around the perimeter of the site. Although this dwelling has adopted a form that draws from the character homes, overall I consider it to make a Neutral contribution.
  - (b) 9 Scott Street - This was assessed as Neutral and Ms Schade identifies it as Primary. The dwelling has been highly modified with a flat roof extension and introduction of aluminium windows, although noting that a low fence remains along the front of the property. These changes distract from the original character of the home and I recommend that the Neutral categorisation is retained.
  - (c) 16 Scott Street - This was assessed as Contributory and Ms Schade identifies it as Primary. Although the dwelling is an original example, the front door has been filled in, impacting the symmetry of the front façade. In addition, the recent addition of a high fence blocks views of the dwelling and interrupts its relationship with the street. I recommend that the original categorisation be maintained.
  - (d) 25 Scott Street - This was assessed as Contributory and Ms Schade identifies it as Neutral. The dwelling has been modified with the inclusion of aluminium windows, but with no other changes to the form of the building and low fencing along the street. It exhibits the site patterns evident for the era. I recommend that the original categorisation be maintained.
  - (e) 29 Scott Street – This was assessed as Intrusive and Ms Schade has not assessed it, noting a 4-unit townhouse development is proposed.
  - (f) 34 Scott Street - This was assessed as Primary and Ms Schade identifies it as Contributory. This dwelling maintains the original form of development and a low fence with an open relationship with the street. I recommend that the original categorisation be maintained.
  - (g) 36 Scott Street - This was assessed as Neutral and Ms Schade identifies it as Contributory. This house was developed well beyond

the worker cottage / villa era and now includes aluminium windows. I consider the original assessment categorisation should be maintained.

- (h) 42 Scott Street (rear dwelling) – The rear dwelling was assessed as Contributory and Ms Schade identifies it as Primary. Given this is a rear lot and is only partially visible from the street, I consider that the original categorisation is retained.

45. Based on a review of the above dwellings and of Ms Schade's evidence, I do not consider that any changes are recommended to the original technical assessment. As such, Scott Street is not recommended as a Character Area.

## **CONCLUSION**

46. This supplementary evidence addresses issues raised and information requested by the Panel at the PC14 hearing specifically in relation to Character Areas as a Qualifying Matter.

47. I confirm that:

- (a) The former Lyttelton West School site falls outside the RCA boundary.
- (b) There are no specific provisions in the District Plan which consider the effects of a proposed building /development on a nearby RCA.

48. In relation to questions raised, I conclude that:

- (a) The certification pathway could be a good tool for assessment of proposals in a RCA if any potential overlap in 'areas of expertise' can be addressed.
- (b) The evidence presented by Submitter 241 (Ms Schade) does not change my conclusion that Scott Street does not meet the level of consistent built or landscape qualities to be considered as a Character Area.

Date: 28 November 2023

**Jane Rennie**

**APPENDIX 1 – BECA STUDY (ATTACHED AS A SEPARATE PDF)**



## APPENDIX 2 – CHARACTER AREA ATTRIBUTES

Table 1 – Overall Attributes

ATTRIBUTES	Built Form								Landscape and Streetscape							
	Era	Architectural detail from era	Single storey	Double storey	Scale – small to moderate	Scale - large	Form - simple	Form - complex	Site coverage %	Setback – narrow (<5m)	Setback - wide	Fencing type / height (low - medium (1-1.5m))	Vegetation / Landscape Features	Garages	Streetscape	Visual connection with street
CA8: Beverley	Early to mid 20 <sup>th</sup> Century	Pitched gable or hip, timber weatherboard, tile/iron roofing, bay and box windows, dormer, shutters, etc		Double storey		Large, detached	Simple form		Largely intact sections	North side small setbacks	South side deeper setbacks	Low to medium, some stone walls	Large rear gardens with mature veg	Generally excluded from streetscene	Narrow street	Entries, windows face the street
CA9: Ranfurly	1920s to mid 20 <sup>th</sup> Century	Low pitched gable or hip, weatherboard, iron roofing, bay windows, shingles, entry features, porches/verandas	Single storey		Modest house footprints, bungalows, generous separation between houses		Simple form with small projections		Largely intact sections	North side small setbacks		Low fences	Richly planted established gardens contribute significantly	Generally excluded from streetscene	High quality. Mature street trees, grass berms etc	Windows face the street. Some front doors.
CA10: Massey	1920s-1930s	Porches, entries gable ends, shingles, bay/bow windows, leadlights, weatherboard	Single storey		Moderate, individual bungalows		Simple form with small projections		35%	North side small setbacks	6-13m (av 10m)	No fencing to low 1-1.5m	Manicured gardens, some large trees/shrubs	Exclusion from streetscene	Exceptional quality. Wide berms, mature street trees.	Windows face the street. Some front doors.

**Table 2 – Attributes Assessed for Massy Crescent**

Address	Study	RMA Check	Demolished	Landscape Front Yard	Landscape Garden	Landscape Fencing	Landscape Open Flow	Built Form Era	Built Form Sympathetic	Additional Notes	Recommended	Summary	Rear Lot Visible 2022	Field Check
13 Massey Crescent	Beca 2015	<Null>	<Null>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	<Null>	-	Primary	-	-
	Desktop 2022	<Null>	-	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	Primary	-	<Null>
	Field 2022	-	-	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	Primary	<Null>	-
8 Massey Crescent	Beca 2015	<Null>	<Null>	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	<Null>	-	<Null>	-	-
	Desktop 2022	<Null>	-	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	P	Primary	-	<Null>
	Field 2022	-	-	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	Primary	<Null>	-
37 Massey Crescent	Beca 2015	<Null>	<Null>	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	This property has an inconsistent colour treatment to the rest of the buildings in the SAM - which are mainly white, with blue or green highlights. This property is red with green highlights.	-	Contributory	-	-
	Desktop 2022	LUC 2021 Demolition and construction on new dwelling	-	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	<Null>	New consent. Check progress. Demo and construction not begun	NC	Contributory	-	YES
	Field 2022	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Red and green classic heritage colour palette	P	Primary	<Null>	-

APPENDIX 3 – ARCGIS ONLINE TOOL

- +
- Layers
- Tables
- Basemap
- Charts
- Legend**
- Bookmarks
- Save and open
- Map properties
- Share map
- Create app
- Print
- Information
- Collapse

**Legend**

**bm Stage 3 Boundary**

**District Plan Residential Character**

Residential Character Boundary

**SAM 12 Massey**

- Primary
- Neutral
- Contributory

**ResourceConsent513890**

Resource Consent

**BuildingConsents513890**

Building Consent

**BuildingDemolition513890**

Building Demolition

**DistrictPlanTreeProtection**

Protected Tree

**Massey**

Edit Get directions Zoom to

bm_full_address_number	34
Shape_Area	511.658203125
Shape_Length	94.35747843750801
Landscape_FrontYard_2022_stage2	Y
Landscape_Garden_2022_stage2	Y
BuiltForm_Fencing_2022_stage2	Y
Landscape_OpenFlow_2022_stage2	Y
BuiltForm_Era_2022_stage2	Y
BuiltForm_Sympathetic_2022_stage2	Y
Recommended_2022_stage2	P
AdditionalNotes_2022_stage2	Original two storey dwelling
RearLotVisible_2022_stage2	
Summary_2022_stage2	Primary
Assessment_2022_stage2	keep

- Add
- Layers
- Tables
- Basemap
- Charts
- Legend**
- Bookmarks
- Save and open
- Map properties
- Share map
- Create app
- Print
- Information
- Collapse

**Legend**

**SAM 12 Massey**

- Primary
- Neutral
- Contributory

**ResourceConsent513890**

- Resource Consent

**BuildingConsents513890**

- Building Consent

**BuildingDemolition513890**

- Building Demolition

**DistrictPlanTreeProtection**

- Protected Tree

**DistrictPlanHeritageItem**

- Heritage Item

**DistrictPlanHeritageSetting**

- Heritage Setting

**Massey**

Edit Get directions Zoom to

AdditionalNotes_2022_stage2	Original two storey dwelling
RearLotVisible_2022_stage2	
Summary_2022_stage2	Primary
Assessment_2022_stage2	keep


