

SUMMARY STATEMENT

1. My full name is **Marcus Hayden Langman**. I am an independent planning consultant and have set out my background and experience in my evidence-in-chief.
2. I have prepared the evidence evaluating the submission made by the **Christchurch City Council** on Plan Changes 13 and 14. The submission relates to a number of requests across the breadth of the plan change, variously seeking amendments to Plan Change 13 and 14, ranging from minor corrections to more substantive changes.
3. In relation to the content of my evidence addressing the 'central city' topic that is the subject of this part of the hearing, I have addressed the following matters:
 - (a) Replacement of references to Appendices 6.12.17.1 to 6.12.17.3, with reference instead to the planning maps for radiocommunications pathways (paragraphs 87 to 88 of my evidence);
 - (b) Amendment of the residential heritage areas contributions maps for 31 Worcester Street and 1 Armagh Street (para 81(c), para 84);
 - (c) Removal of sites from the residential heritage interface areas to achieve consistency in how sites are identified (para 81(e), para 86);
 - (d) Amendment of 13.6.6.3 Private Schools, so that the alternative zones for Christ's College east of Rolleston Avenue, and Cathedral Grammar in respect of 17 Armagh Street, refer to MRZ, as they are in Residential Heritage Areas (RHAs) (para 87(dd), para 92);
 - (e) Amendment to the definitions of "building base" and "building tower" (para 111(d), para 125-128).
4. I note that rebuttal evidence has been filed by Ms Dixon regarding the inclusion of the Christ's College and Cathedral Grammar sites in the relevant RHA. My evidence also recommends that an additional change be made to the pre-amble for Rule 13.6.4.2 which includes reference to the specific limits for schools in residential heritage areas. Ms Dixon considers that the relevant submission point of the Council could be rejected, instead relying on the default Special Purpose Schools zone built form standards as the guidance for built form. I consider Ms Dixon's suggest amendment

provides a more generous amount of built development while still providing for consideration of RHA matters through consent. I agree with Ms Dixon and, as a result, amend my position and recommend rejecting submission point 751.54.

5. Otherwise, I retain the recommendations set out in my evidence in chief on the remaining matters for the Central City.

Marcus Hayden Langman

Date: 18 October 2023