

SUMMARY STATEMENT – MIXED USE ZONE

- 1.1 Tēnā koutou katoa, my name is **Nicola Helen Williams**. I am employed as a Senior Urban Designer at the Christchurch City Council (the **Council**). I have over 20-years' experience as an urban designer in private practice, as well as local and central government.
- 1.2 I have prepared evidence on behalf of the Council in respect of matters arising from the submissions and further submissions on Plan Change 14 (**PC14**). This summary provides further information and highlights key points relating to the **Mixed Use Zones (outside the Central City)**. These areas currently include the Industrial General zoned properties within a 1.2 kilometre¹ walkable catchment of the City Centre Zone – namely the areas of Sydenham, Lancaster Park, and Phillipstown, east of Fitzgerald Avenue.
- 1.3 I note that whilst my evidence principally discusses Sydenham, that the other areas, including Mandeville Street which already includes a Mixed Use zone, all collectively align with the analysis, objectives and standards relevant for the Comprehensive Housing Precinct.

2. JOINT WITNESS STATEMENTS

- 2.1 Conferencing has been undertaken with two submitters who recommended changes to the Minimum Standards for Comprehensive Residential Development 15.10.2.9, relating to the Comprehensive Housing Precinct (**CHP**) over the Mixed Use Zone (outside the Central City):
- (a) **Simon Johnson (architect), for Christchurch NZ** – submissions #760, #2048, #2094. The agreed position was reached on 27th September and included the following amendments:
- (i) Standard 15.10.2.9 (m)(ii): Increase the maximum communal outdoor living space ratio from a maximum of 1:3 to **1:4**. This provides more flexibility in the length of the open space.
 - (ii) Standard 15.10.2.9 (g): Exchange 'At least 50% of the ground floor of the built development shall be living area' to '**living space**'. The definition of living space includes

¹ 1.2kilometres is the metric determined in the evidence of Mr Kleynbos which equates to an approximately 15 minute walk.

bedrooms, which collectively means developments can meet 50% target for ground floor of buildings.

(iii) Rule 15.10.2.9 (p): ' Any ground floor outdoor living space shall not be located adjacent to the street, **except sites only on the south side of a road**'. This exemption provides for maximising solar gain for these sites only, which are set behind a 3metre deep landscape strip (privacy).

(b) **Jonathan Clease (urban designer / planner) for Kāinga Ora** – submissions #834 #2082 #2099 – A Joint Witness Statement for 5th October and supplementary clarification on 16th October 2023 was prepared. Whilst several points were agreed, we respectfully did not achieve agreement on the issue of the workability of the rules.

3. OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN – BROWNFIELD DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY

3.1 The Brownfield Redevelopment Policy 16.2.2.2.c.² lists several urban design related matters that proposals are to achieve:

- (a) a good quality urban design and an appropriate level of residential amenity will be achieved on the site". (Clause iii);
- (b) sites be comprehensively developed (clause viii);
- (c) that CPTED principles are incorporated into the development (Clause x).

3.2 In my recent experience reviewing a brownfield consent proposal, it has been the interface conditions with the working adjacent industrial zone boundaries that has provided the most challenge, both from an acoustic perspective (not my area of expertise) but also the design response in terms of how to create a functional and appropriate buffer to new residential dwellings.

3.3 In brownfield areas, I understand that there is less focus on transitioning of the wider area, given both industrial and residential land uses are expected to coexist adjacent to each other over the long term.

² Industrial General zoned sites close to suburban centres of Hornby (23.9Ha.), Cranford (4.35ha), Papanui (20. Ha), and a smaller extent in Woolston (4.8 Ha) for the purposed of medium density residential development.

4. WHAT IS THE COMPREHENSIVE HOUSING PRECINCT?

- 4.1 In contrast, the CHP within the Mixed Use Zone seeks to enable a transition over time to a high density, walkable residential neighbourhood.
- 4.2 The urban outcome sought is a high density, yet medium scale (BRANZ Category 3³), high quality walkable residential neighbourhood. As directed by Objective 15.2.3, these neighbourhoods also seek to provide for improved diversity of housing types, tenure, affordability and support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.
- 4.3 Specifically, the form and site arrangement outcomes proposed are a transition to a perimeter block style of development (through a restricted discretionary pathway), which maximises onsite efficiency, amenity and densities. Buildings can develop across the full width of a site and face inwards not the communal space, and out to the street, to manage reverse sensitivities both for residents and adjacent businesses. .
- 4.4 A central communal open space within the middle of the site on the ground level, of at least 10% of the site area, provides for building separation, sun access, and a deep soil zone with mature trees. Given the typical 50-60m deep sites throughout all these areas, a smaller series of secondary buildings could be developed at the back of the site as terraces to cross-subsidise some of the apartments in the short term.⁴
- 4.5 The development of the CHP has also been specifically guided by and developed with the intended outcomes of NPS-UD Policy 1, including:
- (a) Providing for a **variety of homes that meets the needs for different households (a.i)**, through a minimum of 10% of accessible residential units⁵ in all apartment buildings;
 - (b) Improved internal unit storage at 4m³ which **enable Māori to express their cultural traditions norms and (a.ii)** e.g., space for a spare mattress and blankets to roll out when friends and family come to stay;
 - (c) Improved bike (including e-bike) storage for **good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural**

³ MDH building categories :: BRANZ Medium-density housing

⁴ Sense Partners, Proposed Industrial Land rezoning – Cost Benefit Analysis, 20 July 2022, P3.

⁵ Hamilton City Council – Plan Change 47 – whilst deferred a year, proposes 10% accessible units.

spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport (c). This also seeks to encourage a lifestyle switch from a house and garage typology with typically generous storage,

- (d) Limiting onsite carparking to a maximum ratio of 0.1/unit to **support to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions (e)**;
- (e) In combination with above, a minimum of 10% of the site area as communal open space with a deep soil zone and 1 tree per 100sqm capable of maturing to a height of at 8 metres, contributes to **likely current and future effects of climate change (f)**.

5. CHP V BROWNFIELD OVERLAY

5.1 Some of the reasons why I consider the CHP to be a more appropriate tool than the Brownfield Overlay in the Mixed Use Zones include:

- (a) The Brownfield overlay does not include a minimum scale of development, so one or two storeys could be developed which would undermine the development potential of these strategic sites; reduce economic support for the adjacent centres and offer a weaker contribution to the directions of the NPS-UD.
- (b) The CHP creates a more efficient high density pathway, at a medium scale, that better supports active and walkable streets, improves onsite amenity (privacy, access to sunlight and open space).
- (c) The CHP also better contributes to CPTED and safe streets through maximising the number of apartments that face both the street and into the heart of the development. The standards also seek better accessibility and liveability of units to provide for homes for life (or ageing in place) compared to the limitations of a two -storey terrace.
- (d) On reflection of appreciating that the brownfield overlay might be the alternative to the CHP, if we sought to consolidate its extent in Sydenham for example, I would now recommend that the CHP be maintained to its full extent given the CPTED / safety merits of buildings that are located along the edge of the street, versus down the side boundary (as seen on narrow and longer sites).

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 These inner areas of Ōtautahi Christchurch, which wrap around the southern half of the Central City, were historically very vital, working class suburbs. Industry then arrived and slowly pushed the housing out in the 1950's, 60's and 70's.
- 6.2 However, the NPS-UD and the surplus of industrial land has given us a renewed opportunity to look ahead to the future. Christchurch needs to capitalise on our sunlight and lifestyle to attract and retain talent. A transition to perimeter forms of development with a human or medium scale, could be the circuit-breaker that provides Christchurch with a distinctive lifestyle advantage.

Thank you and happy to answer any questions.

Nicola Williams

21 November 2023