

## Right of Reply – Response to Submissions – Residential Chapter (s42A of Ike Kleynbos)

The following provides an updated account of response to submissions relevant to the s42A of Ike Kleynbos. Changes to recommended responses to submissions have been formatted in the same manner as Right of Reply provisions, being:

Text in **bold dark orange underlined** indicates responses to submissions that are recommended to be altered from the recommendations to the s42A and text recommended to be deleted in **~~bold dark orange strikethrough~~**.

In an effort to efficiently address the scale submission requests, consistent themes or directly comparable requests have been grouped together and treated as one. Similarly, further submissions on submission requests have not been incorporated, however recommendations reached on primary submissions may be applied accordingly. Council have provided documentation of both original and further submissions and is available via the following link: <https://makeasubmission.ccc.govt.nz/PublicSubmissionSearch.aspx>.

CONTENTS:

14.1 – INTRODUCTION .....	3
14.2 – OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES .....	4
14.4 – RESIDENTIAL SUBURBAN ZONE AND RESIDENTIAL SUBURBAN DENSITY TRANSITION ZONE .....	20
14.5 – MEDIUM DENISITY RESIDENTAL ZONE .....	28
14.5.2.6 – MRZ HEIGHT IN RELATION TO BOUNDARY [SUNLIGHT ACCESS QM] .....	44
14.6 – HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTAL ZONE .....	81
14.6.2.2 – HRZ HEIGHT IN RELATION TO BOUNDARY (SUNLIGHT ACCESS QM) .....	100
14.7 – RESIDENTIAL HILLS ZONE .....	137
14.8 – RESIDENTIAL BANKS PENINSULA.....	141
14.10 – RESIDENTIAL LARGE LOT ZONE.....	150
14.10 – RESIDENTIAL SMALL SETTLEMENT .....	158
14.11 – RESIDENTIAL VISITOR / GUEST ACCOMMODATION ZONE .....	162
14.13 – ENHANCED DEVELOPMENT MECHANISIM .....	164
14.14 – COMMUNITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT MECHANISIM .....	171
14.15 – MATTERS OF CONTROL AND DISCRETION .....	172
14.16 – RESIDENTIAL APPENDICIES.....	180
QUALIFYING MATTER – LOW PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESSIBILITY AREA (LPTAA) .....	205
QUALIFYING MATTER – RICCARTON BUSH INTERFACE AREA .....	213

## 14.1 – INTRODUCTION

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Accept / Reject
377	Jo Horrocks for Toka Tu Ake EQC	Toka Tū Ake EQC		Residential > Introduction	377.11	Support	Retain 14.1 as notified.	Acknowledge
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities		Residential > Introduction	834.136	Seek Amendment	14.1(e) Introduction to residential policies. Retain statement. Amend reference at the end of the statement to “...subclause g f”	<b>Reject Accept</b>
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities		Residential > Introduction	834.79	Oppose	1. Delete the Low Public Transport Accessibility Qualifying Matter and all associated provisions. 2. Rezone all areas subject to this QM to MRZ	<b>Reject Accept in-part, insofar as the rezoning of areas in the QM to MRZ.</b>
853	Jo Appleyard for Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Lyttelton Port Company Limited		Residential > Introduction	853.5	Support	Retain as notified.	Acknowledge

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Accept / Reject
878	Rebecca Eng for Transpower New Zealand Limited	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Residential > Introduction	878.11	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.1 Introduction as follows: “ ...In this chapter the reduction in intensification, including the avoidance of intensification in some cases, due to qualifying matters has been implemented in two ways: by having the Medium Density Residential or High Density Residential zones , but enabling lesser, or no further, intensification than the Medium Density Residential Standards require in the areas or sites in those zones where a qualifying matter applies;” .. ”	Reject

## 14.2 – OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

### GENERAL:

Theme & Points raised	Submission points	Response
<b>Additional urban design matters</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both submissions seek additional measures within objectives and policies to have greater recognition of social effects, specifically in regard to housing being physically accessible to all people and designed in a way that fosters social cohesion and a sense of community belonging.</li> </ul>	145.21 <a href="#">(Te Mana Ora/Community and Public Health)</a> , 627.3 <a href="#">(Plain and Simple Ltd)</a>	<b>Additional urban design matters : Accept in part</b>  Provisions included in residential proposals seek to ensure that better social engagement and safety is considered alongside greater density (e.g. windows to street exemptions, habitable rooms, communal outdoor living, fencing). <b>I recommend this is further considered</b>

		alongside any recommended changes to objectives and policies.
<b>Qualifying matter framework</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter wishes for all QM areas to have MRZ applied, for the LPTAA to be removed, and for the consequential changes to be made to objectives and policies.</li> </ul>	834.80 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<b>Qualifying matter framework: Accept in part</b>  The recommendation is for MRZ to be applied to LPTAA area, with two Precincts managing density.

#### 14.2.1 – Housing supply & associated policies & associated policies:

Theme & Points raised	Submission points	Response
<b>Accept as notified</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>22 of 29 submission points on this objective and associated policies were in support of changes as notified.</li> </ul>	237.13, 237.14 ( <a href="#">Manthei Marjorie</a> ), 259.7 ( <a href="#">Ara Poutama Aotearoa</a> ), 689.19, 689.21, 689.22, 689.20, 689.23 ( <a href="#">Canterbury Regional Council</a> ), 814.126, 814.128, 814.130, 814.129 ( <a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a> ), 823.98, 823.99, 823.101, 823.100 ( <a href="#">The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</a> ), 834.137, 834.139, 834.140 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 625.8 ( <a href="#">Pamela-Jayne Cooper</a> ), <del>805.35</del> ( <a href="#">Waka Kotahi – WITHDRAWN</a> ), 695.25 ( <a href="#">Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga</a> ), 811.15, 811.21 ( <a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a> )	<b>Acknowledge</b>
<b>Reflect spatial distribution of MRZ and HRZ</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All 3 submission points related to Policy 14.2.1.1. Submitters requested that the spatial distribution of both</li> </ul>	184.1 ( <a href="#">University of Canterbury</a> ), 834.138 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 877.21 ( <a href="#">Ōtautahi Community Housing Trust</a> )	<b>Accept</b>

Theme & Points raised	Submission points	Response
<p>MRZ and HRZ is reflected in the policy, whilst acknowledging that the influence of QMs.</p>		
<p><b>Māori housing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter (Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga) requests that 14.2.1.1.vii better recognises and enables the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui to be met in Banks Peninsula.</li> </ul>	<p>695.23, 695.24 (<a href="#">Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga</a>)</p>	<p><b>Māori housing: Accept in-part</b></p> <p>Policies 14.2.1.3, 14.2.5.7, 14.2.5.8, and Objective 14.2.5 address housing need and the cultural values of Ngāi Tahu. However, these are limited in their applicability to the rūnanga and more broadly to Ngāi Tahu whānui providing housing.</p> <p>I recommend that Policy 14.2.1.3 is updated to also include ‘relevant residential zones’ to increase the clarity in which the policy should be applied.</p>
<p><b>Out of scope</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter (Red Spur Ltd) makes specific requests for land proposed to be Residential Large Lot Zoned is included in policies that relate to the Residential Hills zone and removed from the zone.</li> </ul>	<p>881.10, 881.9 (<a href="#">Red Spur Ltd</a>)</p>	<p><b>Out of scope</b></p> <p>This is not a relevant residential zone. Changes have only been made to better reflect National Planning Standards and I consider all other changes to be out of scope.</p>
<p><b>Policy for retirement villages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter (RVA) requests a new policy to reflect the change to residential areas over time, in line with Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. The submitter also requests that table 14.2.1.1a is updated to specifically reference retirement villages.</li> <li>RVA also requests that 14.2.1.8 (Provision of housing for an aging population) is updated to reflect Plan Change 5 and MDRS and/or NPS-UD, by inserting d. <u>Recognise that housing for the older person provide for shared spaces, services and facilities and enable affordability and the efficient provision of assisted living and care services.</u></li> </ul>	<p>811.46, 811.22 (<a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a>)</p>	<p><b>New Policy for retirement villages: Reject</b></p> <p>Changing amenity is a given, and council has sought to articulate what the planned urban character is with the introduction of MRZ and HRZ zones. The policy is unnecessary. I do not consider it is necessary to have provisions specifically addressing retirement villages. This would not align with the convention of objectives and policies to date and should be seen as the wider solution to the increase supply some housing types.</p> <p><b>Policy 14.2.18 - Accept</b></p>

#### 14.2.2 – Short term residential recovery needs & associated policies:

Theme	Submission points	Response
<b>Accept, as notified</b>	695.26	<b>Acknowledge</b>
<b>Qualifying matter framework</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) rejects QMs for LPTAA, Tsunami Hazard, and Airport Noise Contour, and requests for references in the objective to be removed. Consequently, there would be no need for the EDM or CHRM.</li> </ul>	834.141, 834.142, 834.144 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<b>Reject <u>in-part</u></b>  The LPTAA is recommended to remain. Reference should be made to evidence by Ms Oliver for further consideration of Tsunami Hazard and Airport Noise Contour. <a href="#">The EDM is part of the RS/RSDT framework applicable to coastal hazard and Airport Noise Contour QMs.</a>

#### 14.2.3 – MDRS Objective 2 & associated policies

Theme	Submission points	Response
<b>Accept, as notified:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>23 of 32 submission points on the objective and associated policies are in support, with some suggesting minor wording or structural changes.</li> </ul>	259.8 ( <a href="#">Ara Poutama Aotearoa</a> ), 689.24, 689.30, 689.25, 689.31, 689.32, 689.28, 689.29, 689.27, 689.26 ( <a href="#">Canterbury Regional Council</a> ), 834.143 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 878.12, 878.14, 878.15 ( <a href="#">Transpower New Zealand Limited</a> ), 814.131 ( <a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a> ), 823.102, 823.103 ( <a href="#">The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</a> ), 237.15 ( <a href="#">Manthei Marjorie</a> ), 780.10 ( <a href="#">Josie Schroder</a> ), 842.23 ( <a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a> ), 852.7 ( <a href="#">Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)</a> ),	<b>Acknowledge</b>

Theme	Submission points	Response
	853.6 ( <a href="#">Lyttelton Port Company Limited</a> ), 854.11 ( <a href="#">Orion New Zealand Limited (Orion)</a> ), 811.24, 811.30, 811.25, 811.26, 811.28, 811.29, 811.27 ( <a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a> )	
<p><b>Alignment with NPS-UD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of these submitters wanted to either amend or replace Policy 14.2.3.6 and 14.2.6.7 in order to better align with the intended outcomes of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. This was to specifically state HRZ building heights within the policy and where the zone would be applied. Submitter #834 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) also proposed a re-classification to Metropolitan Centre and requested consequential changes to be reflected here.</li> <li>Submitter #212 ('The Fuel Companies') also requested that reverse sensitivity be addressed within the policy to ensure lawfully established activities would not be impeded by occupation within high density housing, which can be more exposed to noise effects.</li> </ul>	556.4, 556.3 ( <a href="#">Winton Land Limited</a> ), 834.145, 834.146 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 212.7 ( <a href="#">BP Oil New Zealand Ltd, Z Energy Limited and Mobil Oil New Zealand Ltd (referred to as The Fuel Companies)</a> ), 811.31 ( <a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a> )	<p><b>Alignment with NPS-UD: Accept in part</b></p> <p>The purpose of Policy 14.2.3.6 is to compliment the MDRS objectives and policies and to better acknowledge that MDRS also applies within residential Policy 3 areas. Mr Lightbody has rejected the request for metropolitan centres. <b>I therefore recommend that the wording requested with #556.3 is adopted in-part, removing the HRZ locations and simply stating height.</b></p> <p>Similarly, <b>I support submitters request to make changes to Policy 14.2.3.7 to improve clarity and specificity, such as #556.4.</b> The purpose of the policy is to detail what should be considered for greater densities when faced with a restricted discretionary threshold. The policy still gives effect to Policy 3 and further details Policy 1 outcomes. <b>I recommend that submissions seeking to drastically simplify or entirely remove this policy are rejected.</b></p> <p>I support the greater consideration of reverse sensitivity effects within MRZ and HRZ areas. <b>I recommend reverse sensitivity is best captured within 14.2.3.6 and is captured in 14.2.3.7.</b></p>
<b>Variety of housing types – MDRS Policy 1</b>	145.19, 145.20 ( <a href="#">Te Mana Ora/Community and Public Health</a> )	<b>Variety of housing types – MDRS Policy 1: Accept in part</b>



Theme	Submission points	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter (Te Mana Ora/Community and Public Health) requests that Council consider how the MDRS policy is achieved to ensure there is a diversity of housing types to create housing choice. The submitter is specifically interested in the health of occupants, namely through air quality.</li> </ul>		<p>I consider that proposed objectives and policies, including zoning response, suitably detail zone outcomes (noting that MDRS objectives and policies are mandated). However, lower density outcomes for the LPTAA should be further detailed in objectives and policies, in line with the recommendation to apply MRZ over these areas and Precincts to manage outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New policies needed for LPTAA Precincts</li> </ul>
<p><b>Modify MDRS Policy 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter (Transpower New Zealand Limited) requests that MDRS Policy 1 is modified to reflect inappropriate development within QM areas.</li> </ul>	<p>878.13 (<a href="#">Transpower New Zealand Limited</a>)</p>	<p><b>Modify MDRS Policy 1: Reject</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not possible to modify MDRS policies contained in Schedule 3A. QMs are addressed in MDRS Policy 2.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inconsistent with NPS-UD</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter (Carter Group Limited) requests the deletion of Policy 14.2.3.7 because they believe it is inconsistent with the NPS-UD and EHA.</li> </ul>	<p>814.132 (<a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a>)</p>	<p><b>Inconsistent with NPS-UD: Reject</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 14.2.3.7 is intended to capture developments that exceed the building form directed by the NPS-UD and MDRS. It reflects the RDA ceiling set under both regulations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>New Policy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter requests a new policy to ensure that density standards are used as a baseline for effects assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>811.47 (<a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a>)</p>	<p><b>Reject:</b></p> <p>The proposed policy incorporates an approach through consenting. Council has adopted the RDA framework, which is highly enabling. The policy is unnecessary.</p>

#### 14.2.4 – Strategic infrastructure & associated policies:

Theme	Submission points	Response
The submitter (Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)) supports Objective 14.2.4 and related policy 14.2.4.1.	852.8, 852.9 ( <a href="#">Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)</a> )	Acknowledge

#### 14.2.5 – High quality residential environments & associated policies

Theme	Submission points	Response
<p><b>Support, as notified:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>26 of the 52 submission points on the objective and associated policies are support proposals as notified.</li> </ul>	<p>145.8 (<a href="#">Te Mana Ora/Community and Public Health</a>), 689.33, 689.37, 689.38, 689.35, 689.34, 689.36, (<a href="#">Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council</a>)</p> <p>814.133, 814.139, 814.135 (<a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a>), 823.104, 823.110 (<a href="#">The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</a>), 237.19, 237.16, 237.17, 237.18 (<a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a>), 834.152 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 852.10 (<a href="#">Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)</a>), 184.2 (<a href="#">University of Canterbury</a>), 212.8 (<a href="#">BP Oil New Zealand Ltd, Z Energy Limited and Mobil Oil New Zealand Ltd (referred to as The Fuel Companies)</a>), 780.11, 780.14, 780.12, 780.15, 780.13 (<a href="#">Josie Schroder</a>)</p>	Acknowledge
<p><b>Urban design control:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitters expressed a diversity of views on Policy 14.2.5.3, centring on the difference between “good” and</li> </ul>	<p>834.147, 834.150, 834.149 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 862.4 (<a href="#">Lloyd Barclay</a>), 692.4 (<a href="#">David Murison</a>), 693.4 (<a href="#">Henri Murison</a>),</p>	<p><b>Urban design control: Reject in-part</b></p> <p>The policy is designed to capture scale developments and aligns with the residential design principles</p>

Theme	Submission points	Response
<p>“high” qualify outcomes and the protection of status quo amenity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those supporting greater control and protection (#145, #184, #862, #692, #693) seek that there is better reflection of accessible housing &amp; site design, or better protection of surrounding open space areas or status quo amenity being protected.</li> <li>Those submitters seeking “good” urban design outcomes (#834, #877) were otherwise supportive of the policy, but considered that “high” was unattainable and overly restrictive.</li> <li>RVA (#811) seeks that the objective better addresses the NPS-UD by removing ‘sustainable’ and ‘well designed to reflect’ and better align the objective with MDRS objective wording.</li> </ul>	<p>877.23, 877.22 (<a href="#">Otautahi Community Housing Trust</a>), 145.22, 145.24 (<a href="#">Te Mana Ora/Community and Public Health</a>), 184.3 (<a href="#">University of Canterbury</a>), 811.32 (<a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a>)</p>	<p>captured in matters of discretion (14.15.1). I consider that the policy is suitable in light of the permissive threshold set in recommended provisions and in respect of the residential outcomes detailed in the Plan’s strategic directions and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.</p>
<p><b>Reverse sensitivity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Fuel Companies (#212) seek that reverse sensitivity are better captured within the policy direction to protect lawfully established activities within or adjoining residential areas.</li> </ul>	<p>212.9 (<a href="#">BP Oil New Zealand Ltd, Z Energy Limited and Mobil Oil New Zealand Ltd (referred to as The Fuel Companies))</a>)</p>	<p><b>Reverse sensitivity: Accept</b></p> <p>I acknowledge and accept the submission.</p>
<p><b>Māori housing:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter (Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga) requests that Policy 14.2.5.8 is modified to provide an additional clause which enables Ngāi Tahu whānui to provide for their housing needs in residential areas.</li> </ul>	<p>695.27 (<a href="#">Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga</a>)</p>	<p><b>Māori housing: Accept in-part</b></p> <p>As previous, Policies 14.2.1.3, 14.2.5.7, 14.2.5.8, and Objective 14.2.5 address housing need and the cultural values of Ngāi Tahu. However, these are limited in their applicability to the rūnanga and more broadly to Ngāi Tahu whānui providing housing. However, further consideration of policies by Council is limited as the majority (all outside of the Lyttelton Township) is beyond the scope of PC14.</p>

Theme	Submission points	Response
		<p>I therefore recommend that Objective 14.2.5 is updated to also extend the scope of consideration beyond just ‘Ngāi Tahu heritage of Ōtautahi’ by adding ‘and housing needs’.</p> <p>Furthermore, to specifically address the local concern by Ngāti Wheke, I recommend that Policy 14.2.5.8 is also amended to include ‘relevant residential zone’ to acknowledge the wider needs of Māori housing.</p> <p>Lastly, as a consequence of the above, I recommend that a new policy is inserted beneath Objective 14.2.3 that recognises the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui across relevant residential zones. This approach is support through Policies 1 and 9 of the NPS-UD and reinforces the approach within PC14 to consider Papakāinga/Kāinga within matters of discretion in the residential zone.</p>
<p><b>Inconsistent with the NPS-UD &amp; redundant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitters considered that policies <b>14.2.5.5</b> (Assessment of wind effects), <b>14.2.5.1</b> (Neighbourhood character, amenity and safety), <b>14.2.5.4</b> (On-site waste and recycling storage), <b>14.2.5.3</b> (Quality large scale developments) were inconsistent with the NPS-UD and should be removed.</li> <li>• Submitter #834 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) seeks that <b>14.2.5.1</b> (Neighbourhood character, amenity and safety), <b>14.2.5.4</b> (On-site waste and recycling storage) are simplified, with <b>14.2.5.1</b> seen to be addressed by MDRS policies and <b>14.2.5.4</b> overly-detailed and unnecessary. Both are requested to be removed.</li> </ul>	<p>814.138, 814.134, 814.136, 814.137 (<a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a>), 823.109, 823.105, 823.108, 823.107 (<a href="#">The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</a>), 834.148, 834.151 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 811.36, 811.34, 811.33, 811.35 (<a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a>)</p>	<p><b>Inconsistent with the NPS-UD &amp; redundant: Reject in part</b></p> <p>I consider that each of these have merit when viewed alongside the NPS-UD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14.2.5.5 – does not seek to restrict Policy 3 outcomes and is supported by Objective 1 and Policy 1.</li> <li>• 14.2.5.4 – This policy is needed to support other low-density areas, such as areas within the ANC or LPTAA. I support changes to better clarify this distinction.</li> </ul>

Theme	Submission points	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RVA (#811) requests that retirement villages are excluded from 14.2.5.1 and 14.2.5.3 or amended to be more consistent with MDRS and/or the NPS-UD.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14.2.5.4 – This policy does not restrict Policy 3 development, is supported by Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD, and is supported by MDRS Policy 4 (residential day-to-day needs).</li> <li>14.2.5.2 – I consider the changes requested by RVA (#811) as immaterial and have a lesser potential impact than what RVA states, however to ensure consistency, I accept that 'reflects' should change to 'responds' to align with Objective 2. I also note that the policy is limited to medium density development and should also extent to include high density development. I reject the changes to 14.2.5.2(a)(vi) as this would be an inaccurate reflection of built form standards. Changes should also be made to reflect high density development here.</li> <li>14.2.5.3 - I reject the request by RVA to specifically exclude retirement villages from the policy as they assist in providing for a range in housing types and should be considered alongside other housing types accordingly.</li> <li>14.2.5.1 - I reject the request by RVA to specifically exclude retirement villages from the policy as they assist in providing for a range in housing types and should be considered alongside other housing types accordingly.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Specify wind assessment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter #556 (Winton Land Limited) seeks that greater than six storeys is specified as the target for <b>14.2.5.5</b> (Assessment of wind effects), replacing the 'tall buildings' reference.</li> </ul>	556.5 ( <a href="#">Winton Land Limited</a> )	<p><b>Specify wind assessment: Accept in-part</b></p> <p>While I agree that greater detail in the policy is beneficial, with recommendations to increase permitted height to 22m, technically, greater than six</p>

Theme	Submission points	Response
		storeys is possible. I recommend that the policy states “...adverse wind effects of residential buildings exceeding 22m in height to ensure...”.

#### 14.2.6 – Medium density residential zone & associated policy

Theme	Submission points	Response
<p><b>Support, as notified:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 of the 16 submission points on the objective and associated policies are support proposals as notified.</li> </ul>	<p>187.1 (<a href="#">Tom Logan</a>), 189.1 (<a href="#">Matt Edwards</a>), 689.39, 689.41, 689.40 (<a href="#">Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council</a>), 814.140, 814.141 (<a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a>), 823.112, 823.111 (<a href="#">The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</a>), 237.20 (<a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a>), 811.38 (<a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a>)</p>	<p><b>Accept</b></p>
<p><b>Modifications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transpower New Zealand Limited (#878) seeks to modify MDRS Policy 1 to better address qualifying matters.</li> <li>Te Tāhuhu o te Mātaranga (Ministry of Education) (#806) seek to modify the MRZ objective to better recognise the sufficiency of educational facilities to support residential development.</li> <li>Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (#834) seeks to remove the MRZ objective, stating that this is addressed by the MDRS objectives and policies. The submitter also seeks to remove the associated policy for Local Centre Intensification Precinct as a consequence of their related</li> </ul>	<p>878.16 (<a href="#">Transpower New Zealand Limited</a>), 806.17 (<a href="#">Te Tāhuhu o te Mātaranga (Ministry of Education)</a>), 834.153, 834.155, 834.154 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 842.24 (<a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a>)</p>	<p><b>Modifications:</b></p> <p><b>Reject – out of scope:</b> I recommend that the request by #878 is rejected as I consider modification of MDRS objectives and policies out of scope.</p> <p><b>Accept</b> I recommend that the request by #806.17 is accepted as this responds to the sufficiency requirements ‘additional infrastructure’ under the NPS-UD.</p> <p><b>Reject</b> I recommend that the requests by #834 are rejected because MDRS objectives and policies apply across all</p>

<p>request to remove the Precinct and replace this with HRZ.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fire and Emergency (#842) seek an additional policy to permit the development and ongoing operation of emergency service facilities.</li> <li>• RVA (#811) requests that the objective is updated to remove reference to MDRS density, as it is seen to cause confusion.</li> </ul>		<p>relevant residential zones, therefore greater specificity for MRZ is required. Such an approach is also directed by National Planning Standards zone framework. The further request to remove and replace the MRZ Precinct is rejected.</p> <p><b>Accept</b> I recommend that the request by #842.24 is accepted, however is addressed in 14.2.3.6 and 14.2.3.7, as per the request by The Fuel Companies.</p> <p><b>Reject</b> While I understand the position of RVA, I consider that it is important to state the density effect of MDRS alongside the building height matters, which are different.</p>
---	--	--

#### 14.2.7 – High density residential zone & associated policies

Theme	Submission points	Response
<p><b>Support, as notified:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 24 of the 40 submission points on the objective and associated policies are support proposals as notified.</li> </ul>	<p>187.2 (<a href="#">Tom Logan</a>), 189.2 (<a href="#">Matt Edwards</a>), 237.21, 237.23, 237.22 (<a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a>), 689.42, 689.45, 689.44, 689.48, 689.47, 689.46, 689.43 (<a href="#">Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council</a>), 814.142, 814.145, 814.144, 814.148, 814.143 (<a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a>), 823.113, 823.116, 823.115, 823.119, 823.114 (<a href="#">The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</a>), 834.157 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and</a></p>	<p><b>Acknowledge</b></p>

Theme	Submission points	Response
	<p><a href="#">Communities</a>), 556.6 (<a href="#">Winton Land Limited</a>),</p>	
<p><b>Specific modifications:</b></p> <p><b>HRZ development policy (12.2.7.6):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #237 (Marjorie Manthei) requests the removal of two storey requirement and enhancing street wall as it was too restrictive and did not provide for housing choice.</li> <li>• Submitter #834 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) requests that the whole policy was removed as the direction for two storeys was too restrictive and impractical.</li> <li>• Submitter #811 (RVA) requests that the policy is removed as it is inconsistent with the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Precincts and structure:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #556 (Winton Land Limited) requests that the building typology reference is removed from Policy <b>14.2.7.5</b> and simply states ‘residential buildings’ to ease application.</li> <li>• Submitter #834 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) requests that objective 12.2.7 and associated policies are relocated to be after the suite of MRZ policies i.e. after Policy 14.2.3.5. This approach is supported by RVA (#811).</li> <li>• The submitter also requests that policies related to HRZ precincts are removed as it added unnecessary complication.</li> <li>• RVA (#811) seek that Policy 14.2.7.1 is updated to reflect the NPS-UD.</li> </ul>	<p>237.31 (<a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a>), 556.7 (<a href="#">Winton Land Limited</a>), 834.156, 834.159, 834.158, 834.160 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 878.17 (<a href="#">Transpower New Zealand Limited</a>), 842.27 (<a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a>), 811.44, 811.43, 811.42, 811.40 (<a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a>)</p>	<p><b>HRZ development policy (12.2.7.6) –Accept in-part:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I consider that the policy direction is appropriate, however could be refined to be less restrictive and consider the appropriateness of single level dwellings. But I reject there is a need to remove the policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Precincts and structure – Accept in-part:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As discussed in section 6.4 of this report, I recommend that all HRZ precincts are removed and a single HRZ Precinct is created to capture the greater (12-storey) intensification enabled around CCZ.</li> <li>• I do not support the structural changes requested by #834, since policies are intended to apply to HRZ, only.</li> <li>• <b>Reject #811</b> – I consider that the Policy reflects the NPS-UD.</li> </ul> <p><b>Qualifying matters &amp; reverse sensitivity - Reject:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I recommend that these submissions are rejected as they would both be addressed elsewhere in objectives and policies: qualifying matters are addressed in MDRS Policy 2 (14.2.6.2); reverse sensitivity would be addressed across all residential zones, giving effect to the submission by The Fuel Companies (#212) and Fire and Emergency (#842).</li> </ul>



Theme	Submission points	Response
<p><b>Qualifying matters &amp; reverse sensitivity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #878 (Transpower New Zealand Limited) seeks that the application of qualifying matters is addressed in the HRZ objective (14.2.7.1).</li> <li>• Submitter #842 (Fire and Emergency) request that a new policy is inserted to consider potential reverse sensitivity effects within HRZ.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Inconsistent with NPS-UD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitters #814 and #823 seek that wording in 14.2.7.5 is simplified as it is seen as inconsistent with the NPS-UD.</li> <li>• RVA seek that that that objective an Policy 14.2.7.2 is modified to reflect the NPS-UD.</li> </ul>	<p>814.147, 814.146 (<a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a>), 823.118, 823.117 (<a href="#">The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</a>), 811.39, 811.41 (<a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a>)</p>	<p><b>Inconsistent with NPS-UD: Accept in-part</b></p> <p>As previous, recommendations have been made to remove the precinct in its entirety. Consequently, the policy would be removed.</p> <p><b>Reject: 811.39, 811.41</b></p> <p>The objective and Policy has been created to give effect to the NPS-UD and it’s direction to enable high density. It is considered appropriate in light of the NPS.</p>
<p><b>Spatial application &amp; walking catchment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitters #692 and #693 have stated that the zoning response is inconsistent with objective 14.2.7 and policy 14.2.7.2.</li> <li>• Submitter #237 requests that “surrounding area” is clarified in 14.2.7.3 and does not include the area north of Salisbury Street.</li> </ul>	<p>692.7, 692.8 (<a href="#">David Murison</a>), 693.7, 693.8 (<a href="#">Henri Murison</a>), 237.33 (<a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a>), <del>805.37</del> (<a href="#">Waka Kotahi (NZ Transport Agency) - WITHDRAWN</a>), 851.9 (<a href="#">Robert Leonard Broughton</a>), 605.6 (<a href="#">Benjamin Wilton</a>)</p>	<p><b>Spatial application &amp; walking catchment:</b></p> <p><b>Reject:</b></p> <p>Reference is made to mapping request responses. The area subject to the request by #692 and #693 has proposed to be intensified in accordance with Policy 3, as the (wider) area is subject to walking catchments from the city centre, Merivale LCZ, and Papanui TCZ, and has been further intensified in accordance with Policy 1 criteria.</p>

Theme	Submission points	Response
		<p><b>Reject in-part:</b> While I agree that greater clarity for 14.2.7.3 is needed, the Precinct would terminate along SPH, SPS, and CCMUZ areas north of Salisbury Street.</p>

#### 14.2.9 – Non-residential activities & associated policies

Submission points	Response
<p>237.26, 237.27, 237.32, 237.29, 237.28, 237.24, 237.25 <a href="#">(Marjorie Manthei)</a>, 834.165 <a href="#">(Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities)</a></p>	<p><b>Out of scope – reject</b> I recommend that all submission by #237 (Marjorie Manthei) and #834 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) on this section are rejected as non-residential activities are beyond the scope of this plan change.</p>

#### 14.2.11 – Visitor accommodation in Residential Zones & associated policies

Theme	Submission points	Response
<p><b>Policy 14.2.11.1 – Visitor Accommodation in Residential Units:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #237 (Marjorie Manthei) raises concern that such activities would be used for commercial purposes and requests that the policy made more explicit as to the wider neighbourhood (amenity) effects.</li> </ul>	<p>237.30 <a href="#">(Marjorie Manthei)</a></p>	<p>Part of this zone is within scope of the plan change, being located within a Policy 3 catchment. At greater density, there is greater potential for conflict to arise. This density is unlikely to be reflected in the policy or Plan Change 5B, however the scope of the plan change means that this policy is likely to be out of scope as it considered visitor accommodation within residential units, rather than the zone that is considered to be within scope of the plan change.</p> <p>Policies 14.2.11.2 and 14.2.11.3 I consider within scope of PC14. Greater consideration of whether enabled intensification is adequately captured within these policies is possible.</p>

		<b>For the above reasons, I recommend that submission 237.30 is rejected.</b>
--	--	---

## 14.4 – RESIDENTIAL SUBURBAN ZONE AND RESIDENTIAL SUBURBAN DENSITY TRANSITION ZONE

### 138 submission points

Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
<b>Considered elsewhere</b>	<p><i>These submission points are beyond the scope of this evidence and are considered elsewhere.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Riccarton Bush Interface – See Issue 7 in this report</li> <li>• Port Influences overlay – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• Landscaping, tree canopy and financial contributions – Ms Hansbury</li> <li>• Electricity Transmission – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• Railway setback – Ms Oliver</li> </ul>	<p>876.11, 876.8 (<a href="#">Alan and Robyn Ogle</a>), 834.171, 834.93, 834.58, 834.53, 834.63, 834.64 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 189.8 (<a href="#">Matt Edwards</a>), 225.4 (<a href="#">Michael Dore</a>), 44.2, 44.5 (<a href="#">The Riccarton Bush Trust</a>), 859.9 (<a href="#">Ministry of Housing and Urban Development</a>), 852.11, 852.12 (<a href="#">Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)</a>), 121.9 (<a href="#">Cameron Matthews</a>), 479.3 (<a href="#">Karelia Levin</a>), 147.5 (<a href="#">Rohan A Collett</a>), 183.3 (<a href="#">Brooke McKenzie</a>), 806.18 (<a href="#">Te Tāhuhu o te Mātaraunga (Ministry of Education)</a>), 1003.14 (<a href="#">Melissa Macfarlane</a>), 2.10 (<a href="#">Greg Olive</a>), 116.3 (<a href="#">Russell Fish</a>), 854.3, 854.13 (<a href="#">Orion New Zealand Limited (Orion)</a>), 878.29 (<a href="#">Transpower New Zealand Limited</a>), 829.2, 829.3 (<a href="#">Kiwi Rail</a>), 571.19 (<a href="#">James Harwood</a>), 814.152 (<a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a>), 615.15 (<a href="#">Analijia Thomas</a>), 835.9 (<a href="#">Historic Places Canterbury</a>), 689.80 (<a href="#">Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council</a>),</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Riccarton Bush Interface – See Issue 7 in this report</li> <li>• Port Influences overlay – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• Landscaping, tree canopy and financial contributions – Ms Hansbury</li> <li>• Electricity Transmission – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• Railway setback – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• <a href="#">Tsunami Management Area – Ms Oliver</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Airport Noise Contour – Ms Oliver</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Coastal Hazard Management Areas – Ms Oliver</a></li> </ul>

Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
		443.2 ( <a href="#">Summerset Group Holdings Limited</a> )	
<b>Support, as notified</b> 2 submission points	Submitters supported the proposal, as notified.	305.2 ( <a href="#">Vickie Hearnshaw</a> ), 411.1 ( <a href="#">Ruth Parker</a> )	<b>Acknowledge.</b>
<b>Support QM approach</b> 7 Submission points	Submitters expressed general support for the QM approach, requesting that two storey development remain the maximum and that measures to protect sunlight through limiting density and building height were welcomed.	224.1 ( <a href="#">Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)</a> ), 276.2 ( <a href="#">Steve Burns</a> ), 205.6 ( <a href="#">Addington Neighbourhood Association</a> ), 21.1 ( <a href="#">Grant McGirr</a> ), 294.1 ( <a href="#">Chessa Crow</a> ), 297.1, 297.2 ( <a href="#">Kate Z</a> )	<b>Acknowledge.</b>
<b>Accessory buildings</b> 1 submission point	This submitter requests that accessory buildings are not permitted along site boundaries and should be maintained.	205.11 ( <a href="#">Addington Neighbourhood Association</a> )	<b>Accessory buildings: Reject</b>  I reject that accessory buildings should not be able to be built along the property boundary. Building materials at the boundary are managed under the Building Act.
<b>Building coverage exemptions</b> 1 submission point	Andrew Evans (#89) expressed support for excluding eaves from building coverage calculations.	89.6 ( <a href="#">Andrew Evans</a> )	<b>Building coverage exemptions: Accept</b>  Support the operative means of exempting eaves in the RH and RSDT zones due to the lesser site coverage, when compared to MRZ or HRZ.
<b>Net floor area</b> 5 submission points	Submitters seek that the requirements for net floor area is reduced by 33% to allow for greater diversity in housing [under P4, the smallest net floor area is	797.1 ( <a href="#">Zsuzsanna Hajnal</a> ), 802.1 ( <a href="#">Anita Moir</a> ), 801.1 ( <a href="#">Jean Turner</a> ), 789.1 ( <a href="#">Eric Woods</a> ), 792.1 ( <a href="#">Carmel Woods</a> )	<b>Net floor area: Reject</b>  The requested standard would reduce the intended suburban outcomes of the zone/precinct.

Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
	35m <sup>2</sup> , which would reduce to 23.5m <sup>2</sup> under this request].		
<b>Building heights</b> 4 submission points	A variety of requests have been made by submitters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #504 requests that 3 storeys is only enabled in close proximity to the city centre.</li> <li>• #842 requests that emergency service facilities are provided greater leniency in permitted heights, including associated infrastructure.</li> <li>• Submitters #338 and #339 request that an absolute maximum of 22m for buildings is applied.</li> </ul>	504.2 ( <a href="#">Diane Gray</a> ), 842.29 ( <a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a> ), 339.2 ( <a href="#">Chris Neame</a> ), 338.5 ( <a href="#">Kate Revell</a> )	<b>Building heights: Reject - #504</b> MDRS must be enabled within relevant residential zones, subject to QMs, with higher development directed through Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. <b>Building heights: Accept - #842</b> I agree that lawfully established Emergency Facilities in the zone should have an exemption for associated infrastructure. <b>Building heights: Reject - #338 and #339</b> Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD directs that ‘at least’ six storeys must be enabled around the city centre. The alternative proposal recommends that 12-storey development is enabled in close proximity to CCZ.
<b>Setbacks</b> 11 submission points	Almost all submissions request that the front boundary setback is reduced to 1.5m. Submitter #383 requested that buildings of 2-3m have a greater setback apply.	802.5 ( <a href="#">Anita Moir</a> ), 801.5 ( <a href="#">Jean Turner</a> ), 800.4 ( <a href="#">Ramon Gelonch Roca</a> ), 789.6 ( <a href="#">Eric Woods</a> ), 792.5 ( <a href="#">Carmel Woods</a> ), 107.23 ( <a href="#">Heather Woods</a> ), 383.3 ( <a href="#">Colin Dunn</a> ), 796.4 ( <a href="#">Justin Woods</a> ), 803.5 ( <a href="#">Tamsin Woods</a> ), 797.5 ( <a href="#">Zsuzsanna Hajnal</a> ), 795.5 ( <a href="#">Andrew Stevenson</a> )	<b>Setbacks: Reject</b> I consider that a 1.5m setback is inappropriate in within a suburban setting. I reject that a bespoke setback should apply for greater heights as this is managed through height in relation to boundary controls.
<b>Outdoor living space</b> 12 submission points	All submissions seek greater flexibility for outdoor living areas, with specific consideration of communal outdoor living areas.	796.16 ( <a href="#">Justin Woods</a> ), 789.2, 789.5 ( <a href="#">Eric Woods</a> ), 795.2 ( <a href="#">Andrew Stevenson</a> ), 797.2 ( <a href="#">Zsuzsanna Hajnal</a> ), 801.2 ( <a href="#">Jean</a>	<b>Outdoor living space: <del>Accept</del> <u>Reject</u></b>

Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
		<p><u>Turner</u>), 802.2 (<u>Anita Moir</u>), 803.2 (<u>Tamsin Woods</u>), 800.3 (<u>Ramon Gelonch Roca</u>), 107.22, 107.19 (<u>Heather Woods</u>), 792.2 (<u>Carmel Woods</u>)</p>	<p><del>I accept these submission points and recommended that MRZ outdoor living standards are applied.</del></p> <p><u>The zone is a qualifying matter response to either: the Airport Noise Contour; Tsunami Management Area; or Medium/High Risk Coastal Management Areas. Reference should be made to the s42A report of Sarah Oliver.</u></p>
<p><b>Three units per site</b> 18 submission points</p>	<p>This topic received the most submissions, with submitters requesting that three units per site be enabled only under specific conditions, being that a maximum building height of 5m was applied and there was a maximum of 3 units per 450m<sup>2</sup> of land. Other variations were for such an area to only be limited to two dwellings and one minor residential unit; all subject to being a single storey.</p>	<p>107.20, 107.21 (<u>Heather Woods</u>), 796.2, 796.3 (<u>Justin Woods</u>), 803.3, 803.4 (<u>Tamsin Woods</u>), 797.4, 797.3 (<u>Zsuzsanna Hajnal</u>), 801.4, 801.3 (<u>Jean Turner</u>), 802.3, 802.4 (<u>Anita Moir</u>), 795.4 (<u>Andrew Stevenson</u>), 800.2 (<u>Ramon Gelonch Roca</u>), 789.4, 789.3 (<u>Eric Woods</u>), 792.4, 792.3 (<u>Carmel Woods</u>)</p>	<p><b>Three units per site: Reject <del>in part</del></b></p> <p><del>The requested standard would reduce the intended suburban outcomes of the zone/precinct. However, I do support removing the requirement for each dwelling to be located on a separate site and recommend that the requirement should instead that each residential unit shall instead have a minimum net site area of 400m<sup>2</sup>. This enabled multiple units to be constructed on a single parcel at a sufficient size.</del></p> <p><u>The zone is a qualifying matter response to either: the Airport Noise Contour; Tsunami Management Area; or Medium/High Risk Coastal Management Areas. Reference should be made to the s42A report of Sarah Oliver.</u></p>
<p><b>Social housing</b> 2 Submission points</p>	<p>Heather Woods (#107) requests that the definition of social housing provided is broadened to include other 'community minded private companies'.</p>	<p>107.36, 107.37 (<u>Heather Woods</u>)</p>	<p><b>Social housing – Reject in-part</b></p> <p>I consider the operative 'Social housing complex' definition in Chapter 2 to be adequate. However, note that the references should be updated to 'Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities' and the Public Housing and Community Management Act 1992.</p>

Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
<b>Tiny homes</b> 4 submission points	Heather Woods (#107) requests that tiny homes are better provided for within the sub-chapter by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decreasing net floor area for minor dwellings;</li> <li>Recognise transportable homes;</li> <li>Recognise that tiny homes contribute to housing choice and density.</li> </ul>	107.18, 107.35, 107.6, 107.9 <u>(Heather Woods)</u>	<b>Tiny homes: Reject <del>in-part</del></b>  <del>The requested standard would reduce the intended suburban outcomes of the zone/precinct. However, I do support removing the requirement for each dwelling to be located on a separate site.</del>  <u>The zone is a qualifying matter response to either: the Airport Noise Contour; Tsunami Management Area; or Medium/High Risk Coastal Management Areas. Reference should be made to the s42A report of Sarah Oliver.</u>
<b>Climate change &amp; stormwater</b> 3 submission points	These submitters seeks that additional controls are added to better respond to the current and future effects of climate change, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carbon footprint calculation</li> <li>Roof reflectivity</li> <li>Rainwater storage</li> <li>Greywater</li> <li>Alternative energy</li> <li>Green roofs</li> <li>Impervious surface controls</li> </ul>	685.4 <u>(Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ)</u> , 314.4 <u>(Graham Townsend)</u> , 627.5 <u>(Plain and Simple Ltd)</u>	<b>Climate change &amp; stormwater - Reject</b>  I consider that controls to lessen climate change are beyond the scope of the Act. Renewable energy is permitted through the Plan. Council has opted to use Bylaws to manage three waters. Reference is made to the evidence of Mr Norton.
<b>Greater restrictions</b> 9 submission points	Submitters requests more restrictive controls through the likes of increased setbacks, requiring consent for developments greater than two storeys, and generally better protection of sunlight access. Some stated that status quo zone should simply remain.  Submitter #13 also request that all residential streets are notified for any development that breaches standards [‘out of the norm’].	205.28 <u>(Addington Neighbourhood Association)</u> , 561.6 <u>(Deidre Rance)</u> , 469.1, 469.2 <u>(Beverley Nelson)</u> , 454.4 <u>(Steve Hanson)</u> , 70.2 <u>(Paul Wing)</u> , 471.1, 471.2 <u>(Kem Wah Tan)</u> , 13.1 <u>(Andrew Tulloch)</u>	<b>Greater restrictions:</b> <b>Greater restrictions: <del>Accept in-part</del> <u>Reject</u></b>  <del>The proposal seeks to apply a qualifying matter over this area (LPTAA), reducing the potential for medium density development. A recommendation has been made to provide controls to ensure a suburban density is permitted.</del>



Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
			<p><u>The zone is a qualifying matter response to either: the Airport Noise Contour; Tsunami Management Area; or Medium/High Risk Coastal Management Areas. Reference should be made to the s42A report of Sarah Oliver.</u></p> <p><b>Greater restrictions: Reject - #13</b></p> <p>I do not consider that the notification threshold request is appropriate and is ultra varies.</p>
<p><b>Housing diversity</b> 1 submission point</p>	<p>Ara Poutama Aotearoa (Corrections NZ - #259) requested that greater housing choice was provided through permitting housing for that supports requirements under the Sentencing Act, Parole Act and Corrections Act.</p>	<p>259.11 (<a href="#">Ara Poutama Aotearoa</a>)</p>	<p><b>Housing choice - Reject – out of scope</b></p> <p>I consider that the scope of the IPI is restricted, insofar as it cannot consider non-residential activities where MDRS solely applies and is limited through s77G to only implementing a response to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. I therefore recommend that the submission point is considered out of scope.</p>
<p><b>Minor residential units</b> 3 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters request that the minimum net floor area for minor dwellings is either removed or drastically reduced.</p>	<p>803.1 (<a href="#">Tamsin Woods</a>), 796.1 (<a href="#">Justin Woods</a>), 795.1 (<a href="#">Andrew Stevenson</a>)</p>	<p><b>Minor residential units: Reject</b></p> <p>The requested standard would reduce the intended suburban outcomes of the zone/precinct.</p>
<p><b>Oppose QM approach</b> 8 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters request that MDRS or Policy 3 was applied, as required, removing the RS and RSDT zones.</p>	<p>795.3 (<a href="#">Andrew Stevenson</a>), 877.25 (<a href="#">Otautahi Community Housing Trust</a>), 834.82, 834.170 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 823.122 (<a href="#">The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</a>), 800.1 (<a href="#">Ramon Gelonch Roca</a>), 568.12 (<a href="#">Hazel</a>)</p>	<p><b>Oppose QM approach: Reject in-part</b></p> <p><u>The QM intends to respond to the low degree of accessibility and serviceability of outlying suburban areas. While a suburban density has been considered appropriate to manage this, I accept that, as proposed, the QM did not reduce MDRS to the extent necessary to respond to the nature of the QM. I therefore recommend that MRZ is applied and a new Precinct</u></p>

Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
		<p><u>Shanks</u>), 590.12 (<u>Todd Hartshorn</u>)</p>	<p><del>introduced to target specific standards that would otherwise result in a medium density outcome.</del></p> <p><u>The zone is a qualifying matter response to either: the Airport Noise Contour; Tsunami Management Area; or Medium/High Risk Coastal Management Areas. Reference should be made to the s42A report of Sarah Oliver.</u></p>
<p><b>Zoning requests</b></p> <p>5 submission points</p>	<p>The following specific zone requests have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #178: 5B Frome Place: re-zone to MRZ;</li> <li>• #181: Brodie Street: retain RS;</li> <li>• #120: Paparoa Street: retain RS;</li> <li>• #671: High density in New Brighton;</li> <li>• #561: Status quo zoning in Strowan.</li> </ul>	<p>178.3 (<u>Jorge Rodriguez</u>), 181.3 (<u>Jill Young</u>), 120.3 (<u>Sandra Caldwell</u>), 671.4 (<u>Larissa Lilley</u>), 561.6 (<u>Deidre Rance</u>)</p>	<p><b>Zoning requests</b></p> <p>Site specific zoning has been assessed separately, however I provide a brief summary below:</p> <p>5B Frome Place: I agree that this site should be zoned MRZ as it is within the walking catchment of the Orbiter Bus route. I recommend that the request is accepted.</p> <p>Brodie Street: This street is within a relevant residential zone, not subject to QMs. MRZ should apply as a minimum to the street. I recommend the request is rejected.</p> <p>Paparoa Street: The western end of this street is within a walking catchment from the Papanui TCZ. HRZ should apply to this proportion of the street. I recommend the request is rejected.</p> <p>New Brighton: The residential area surrounding the commercial centre (and wider) is subject to a variety of coastal hazard QMs, with RS or RSDT being recommended. Reference is made to the s42A report of Ms Oliver.</p> <p>Strowan Area: This area has relevant residential zones, not subject to QMs. MRZ should apply as a minimum and HRZ should apply within areas subject to Policy 3. I recommend the request is rejected.</p>

Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
<p><b>General opposition to intensification</b></p> <p>3 submission points</p>	<p>A few submitters expressed their opposition to the overall intensification. Council is required to respond to the direction under s77G to implement MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>447.4 (<a href="#">Alex Lowings</a>), 893.4 (<a href="#">Susanne and Janice Antill</a>), 16.2 (<a href="#">Andrea Heath</a>)</p>	<p><b>General opposition to intensification – Reject</b></p> <p>Council is required to respond to the direction under s77G to implement MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</p>

## 14.5 – MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE

### 14.5.1 – ACTIVITY TABLES

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
<b>Considered elsewhere</b>	<i>These submission points relate to matters not addressed in this evidence.</i>	<del>805.26, 805.39</del> (Waka Kotahi (NZ Transport Agency) - WITDRAWN), 217.1 (Catharina Schupbach), 381.10, 381.9, 381.11, 381.12, 381.13, 381.15 (Kate Gregg), 834.179, 834.54 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities), 92.2 (Andrew Laurie), 829.4 (Kiwi Rail)	Please make reference to the following evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airport Noise Contour – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• Residential Character Areas – Ms White</li> <li>• Residential Character Areas – Ms Dixon</li> <li>• Electricity transmission – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• Industrial / Residential interface – Ms Ratka</li> <li>• Railway setback – Ms Oliver</li> </ul>
<b>Support as notified</b>  9 Submission points	Submitters expressed general support for provisions, as well as specific support for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P1 (#834, #184, #191. #696)</li> <li>• Notification threshold for height and height in relation to boundary controls (#62. #86)</li> </ul>	834.177, 834.174 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities), 62.4 (Thomas Calder), 86.4 (Melissa and Scott Alman), 184.5 (University of Canterbury), 191.4 (Logan Brunner), 696.4 (Terence Sissons), 305.3 (Vickie Hearnshaw), 591.12 (Helen Jacka)	<b>Acknowledged.</b>
<b>Framework</b>  2 submission points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (#834) state that PC14 deletes existing rules controlling non-compliance with tree and garden planting, ground floor habitable space, and service spaces. These are all existing Operative Plan rules rather than MDRS rules. Given that they are being retained as built form standards (apart from</li> </ul>	834.176 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities), 798.4 (Wolfbrook)	<p><b>Framework – Reject – 834.176</b></p> <p>The rule operative framework is based on different zone expectations, with thresholds set accordingly. I consider that the thresholds set are appropriate and make reference to evidence by Ms Blair.</p> <p><b>Framework – Accept – 798.4</b></p>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
	<p>the overhang rule), the existing controlled activity status are sought to also be retained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wolfbrook (#798) request that there are no Discretionary Activities for residential activities.</li> </ul>		As stated earlier, I agree that there is a limit of RD for any residential activities. This should be applied throughout.
<p><b>Modification of specific rules</b></p> <p>4 submission points</p>	<p>P3 – Elderly Persons Housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (#834) requests that the rule is either reinstated or an advice note included to allow for a permitted pathway.</li> </ul>	834.175 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<p><b>Modification of specific rules – Accept (#834)</b></p> <p>Reference is made to evidence by Ms Blair.</p>
	<p>RD14 – Building height and maximum number of storeys; and RD16 – Site coverage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Claudia M Staudt (#584) requests that notification of neighbours is required when rules are breached.</li> </ul>	584.4 ( <a href="#">Claudia M Staudt</a> )	<p><b>Modification of specific rules – Reject (#584)</b></p> <p>Specifying notification would be contrary to a s95 assessment under the Act and is considered ultra vires.</p>
	<p>RD21 – Water supply for fire fighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fire and Emergency (#842) requests that the rule reference is updated to 14.15.8, noting an error in rule reference.</li> </ul>	842.30 ( <a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a> )	<b>Accept - Water supply for fire fighting (#842)</b>
	<p>RD27 – Wind assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (#834) requests that the rule is either deleted, a permitted standard created, or a permitted standard created in Chapter 6 (General Rules and Procedures).</li> </ul>	834.178 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<p><b>Modification of specific rules – Accept (#834)</b></p> <p>As a consequence of the recommendation to change permitted heights, I consider it appropriate to create a new permitted standard within Chapter 6. Reference is made to evidence by Ms Blair.</p>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
<b>Residential design principles</b>  3 submission points	Submitters either requested that greater or lesser controls were tied to the Residential Design Principles [RDPs] matter of discretion (14.15.1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitters #720 and #685 request that the RDPs are considered for any breach of built form standards;</li> <li>• Submitter #89 requests that they are removed entirely, specifically from RD1.</li> </ul>	685.32 ( <a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a> ), 720.9 ( <a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a> ), 89.4 ( <a href="#">Andrew Evans</a> )	<b>Reject - Residential design principles</b>  Applying RDPs for every breach would be excessive and not reflect the nature and degree of non-compliance. I also reject the request to remove RDPs from being considered under RD1 as they are appropriate to be relied upon for developments of four units or more.
<b>Greater restrictions / controls – beyond MDRS</b>  24 submissions points	These submitters requested greater restrictions on controls directed by MDRS, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two storeys / two units.</li> <li>• More restrictive height to boundary controls – <i>please see responses under this standard.</i></li> <li>• Requirements for notification for activities either permitted by MDRS density standard or where directed by Clause 5 of MDRS.</li> <li>• Restrict site density</li> </ul> <p>Ara Poutama Aotearoa (Corrections NZ - #259) requests that definitions and controls are modified to provide for housing to support the needs of Courts and Parole Board [i.e. corrections housing].</p> <p>Summerset Group Holdings Limited (#443) and RVA (#811) request that additional controls (delete RD2 and new CA rule) are made for retirement villages.</p>	255.8 ( <a href="#">William Bennett</a> ), 381.8 ( <a href="#">Kate Gregg</a> ), 385.5 ( <a href="#">Claire Williams</a> ), 284.1 ( <a href="#">Tricia Ede</a> ), 340.2 ( <a href="#">Kirsten Templeton</a> ), 13.2 ( <a href="#">Andrew Tulloch</a> ), 295.5 ( <a href="#">Barry Newman</a> ), 398.6 ( <a href="#">Jan Mitchell</a> ), 447.12 ( <a href="#">Alex Lowings</a> ), 460.5 ( <a href="#">Golden Section Property</a> ), 164.6 ( <a href="#">James and Adriana Baddeley</a> ), 165.6 ( <a href="#">Catherine &amp; Peter Baddeley</a> ), 239.4 ( <a href="#">Andrea Floyd</a> ), 61.51 ( <a href="#">Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA)</a> ), 272.13, 272.14, 272.15, 272.16, 272.17 ( <a href="#">Caitriona Cameron</a> ), 297.3 ( <a href="#">Kate Z</a> ), 81.5, 81.6 ( <a href="#">Vivien Binney</a> ), 259.10 ( <a href="#">Ara Poutama Aotearoa</a> ), 443.9 ( <a href="#">Summerset Group Holdings Limited</a> ), 811.50, 811.51 ( <a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a> )	<b>Reject – out of scope</b>  Council is required to implement MDRS in accordance with s77G of the Act, only limiting residential intensification in accordance with s77I of the Act. Requested changes would be contrary to MDRS.  <b>Reject – out of scope - 259.10</b>  I consider modifying such controls beyond the scope of applying MDRS.  <b>Reject <u>Accept</u> in-part – out of scope - 443.9, 811.50, 811.51</b>  <del>I consider modifying such controls beyond the scope of applying MDRS. However, acknowledge that an error has been made in how this has been applied. I recommend that the operative 14.4 sub-chapter rules for retirement villages are applied.</del>  <u>I consider that the MDRS is enabling both ‘residential units’ and ‘buildings’ as per Clauses 2, 4, and Part 2 (Density Standards), which address both matters. Retirement villages conceivably contain both ‘residential units’ and</u>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
			<u>'buildings' throughout complexes. The MDRS does not further seek to modify activity rules specifically to retirement villages and the MDRS should apply accordingly, subject to specific exemptions. Therefore, as MDRS activity subject to density standards, retirement villages are recommended to be a permitted activity, subject to the built form standards.</u>
<b>General opposition to intensification</b>  5 submission points	Submitters expressed their general opposition to the intensification response, particularly permitted activities for three units or three storey buildings/	403.2 ( <a href="#">David Krauth</a> ), 427.4 ( <a href="#">Michelle Warburton</a> ), 451.2 ( <a href="#">Sam Newton</a> ), 902.8 ( <a href="#">Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board</a> ), 141.3 ( <a href="#">Aaron Jaggar</a> )	<b>Reject – out of scope</b>  Council is required to implement MDRS in accordance with s77G of the Act, only limiting residential intensification in accordance with s77I of the Act.
<b>Out of scope</b>	The submitter request that an early determination on the recession plane qualifying matter.	14.5 ( <a href="#">Kathryn Collie</a> )	<b>Reject – out of scope</b>  This submission is not on the content of the plan change.

## 14.5.2 – BUILT FORM STANDARDS

### 14.5.2.1 – SITE DENSITY

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support / Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
117	Ian Tinkler		117.3	Seek Amendment	In areas that are excluded due to infrastructure (like Shirley, as a result of the sewerage system), indicate the cost of mitigation by replacing the inadequate system to allow greater use of that land. Consider migration paths for flooding.	Accept in-part	Vacuum sewer constraints have been identified as a qualifying matter - please refer to evidence of Ms Oliver.  Appropriate flooding control has been considered - please refer to evidence by Ms Ratka.

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support / Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
184	Kelly Bombay for University of Canterbury	University of Canterbury	184.6	Seek Amendment	Support with amendment to the standard (Advice note - There is no site density standard in the RMDRZ) to align with the MDRS. Consequentially, this would resolve the identified reference issue with Rule 8.5.1.2 (C9).	Accept	The rule is a matter of clarification regarding the site density per unit, however lacks this specificity. Recommend it is removed to avoid confusion.
197	Steve Smith		197.6	Seek Amendment	[Impose more density controls]	Acknowledge	
284	Tricia Ede		284.3	Oppose	Seeks three houses on one property be disallowed.	Reject	This approach would be contrary to MDRS and requirements under s77G to apply such standards.
298	Mason Plato		298.3	Oppose	Seek to remove Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject	This approach would be contrary to MDRS and requirements under s77G to apply such standards.
304	Julia Mallett		304.2	Seek Amendment	Increase planting requirements by reducing density/height limits in MDZ.	Reject	This approach would be contrary to MDRS and requirements under s77G to apply such standards.
441	Robin Watson		441.1	Seek Amendment	Oppose changes to the Medium Density Residential Zone, retain the existing density standards.	Reject	This approach would be contrary to MDRS and requirements under s77G to apply such standards.
442	Logan Simpson		442.2	Oppose	Oppose the plan change, housing density needs to reduce.	Reject	This approach would be contrary to MDRS and requirements under s77G to apply such standards.
445	Alison Dockery		445.2	Seek Amendment	Seek that density is restricted to three units per site.	Accept	The rule is a matter of clarification regarding the site density per unit, however lacks this specificity. Recommend it is removed to avoid confusion.



No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support / Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
467	Jillian Schofield		467.3	Oppose	[O]ppose[s] the change in height restrictions that have been proposed and the number of buildings per section in Hornby and surrounding areas [such as] Hei Hei.	Reject	This approach would be contrary to MDRS and requirements under s77G to apply such standards.
468	David Fisher		468.1	Seek Amendment	Oppose increasing building height and density... amend rule to allow 2 houses per section where the section is small and maybe 3 houses on a larger section.	Reject	This approach would be contrary to MDRS and requirements under s77G to apply such standards.
471	Kem Wah Tan		471.3	Seek Amendment	Allow only a maximum of 2 stories buildings and less density per suburb.	Reject	This approach would be contrary to MDRS and requirements under s77G to apply such standards.
701	Ian McChesney		701.3	Seek Amendment	Increase minimum plot sizes for plots with 3+ storey residential buildings.	Reject	This approach would be contrary to MDRS and requirements under s77G to apply such standards.
811	Luke Hinchey for Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	811.52	Oppose	Delete 14.5.2.1.	<del>Accept</del> <u>Reject</u> in-part	The rule is a matter of clarification regarding the site density per unit, however lacks this specificity. Recommend <b>14.5.2.1.1 is removed to avoid confusion, however is clarified and</b> the advice note regarding three waters capacity is still valid and appropriate, <b>albeit is not appropriate under this rule and best served as an advice note.</b>
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.180	Seek Amendment	1. Retain the advice note. 2. Kāinga Ora seek that Council investigate the provision of an online publicly searchable tool to enable timely identification of site constraints.	Accept in-part	The rule is a matter of clarification regarding the site density per unit, however lacks this specificity. Recommend <b>14.5.2.1.1 is removed to avoid confusion, however is clarified and</b> the advice note regarding three waters capacity is still valid and appropriate, <b>albeit is not appropriate under this rule and best served as an advice note..</b>

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support / Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
864	Douglas Corbett		864.4	Seek Amendment	Oppose MRZ in Hornby. Seeks to have this retained at single level housing	Reject	This approach would be contrary to MDRS and requirements under s77G to apply such standards.

#### 14.5.2.3 – BUILDING HEIGHT AND MAXIMUM NUMBER OF STOREYS

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
<b>Support, as notified</b> 8 submission points	Submitters supported the MRZ proposal, as notified.	615.26 ( <a href="#">Analijia Thomas</a> ), 418.1 ( <a href="#">Zoe McLaren</a> ), 834.182 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 656.13 ( <a href="#">Francesca Teague-Wytenburg</a> ), 211.2 ( <a href="#">Pauline McEwen</a> ), 372.17 ( <a href="#">Julia Tokumarū</a> ), 55.10 ( <a href="#">Tobias Meyer</a> ), 519.12 ( <a href="#">James Carr</a> ), 811.54 ( <a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a> )	Acknowledge.
<b>Permitted MRZ height</b> 7 submission points	Submitters seek that the permitted height within the zone is modified, stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consent required for three storeys.</li> <li>• Generally, apply a more restrictive consenting and notification framework.</li> <li>• Better protect sunlight access and amenity.</li> <li>• Remove all controls within central city to focus development here.</li> <li>• Limit development to a 14m maximum.</li> </ul>	629.1 ( <a href="#">James Broadbent</a> ), 310.2 ( <a href="#">Sarah Flynn</a> ), 48.1 ( <a href="#">Russell Vaughan</a> ), 344.9 ( <a href="#">Luke Baker-Garters</a> ), 61.49 ( <a href="#">Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA)</a> ), 902.9 ( <a href="#">Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board</a> ), 462.1 ( <a href="#">Mark Hazeldine</a> )	<b>Permitted MRZ height - Reject:</b> Council is required to implement MDRS and Policy 3 under s77G of the Act. Applying controls more restrictive than standards/requirements set under this direction is only able to be achieved via a qualifying matter (s77I). A qualifying matter for Sunlight Access has been proposed over the whole zone, achieving a more equitable sunlight access through an MDRS density. Lastly, a 14m permitted building height has been proposed to respond to Policy 3. Council is limited to a restricted discretionary activity status for MRZ residential development. Matters of discretion have

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
			been proposed to address concerns raised by submitters.
<b>MRZ Local Centre Intensification Precinct &amp; wider Policy 3 response</b>  10 submission points	Submitters seek the following changes to the precinct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove Precinct and up-zone to HRZ, six storeys (#834).</li> <li>Remove Precinct and just apply MRZ, three storeys (#412).</li> <li>Remove 14m permitted building height limit (#16).</li> <li>General opposition to any Policy 3 response, rather intensification should be focused within central city / Adverse effects on: Sun, ecology, heritage, crime, infrastructure, and does not provide resilience to earthquakes.</li> </ul>	834.183 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 412.1 ( <a href="#">Luke Gane</a> ), 16.3 ( <a href="#">Andrea Heath</a> ), 862.1 ( <a href="#">Lloyd Barclay</a> ), 359.1 ( <a href="#">Kathryn Higham</a> ), 413.3 ( <a href="#">Caroline May</a> ), 666.1 ( <a href="#">Cooper Mallett</a> ), 504.1 ( <a href="#">Diane Gray</a> ), 496.1 ( <a href="#">Chris Rennie</a> ), 682.1 ( <a href="#">Spreydon Resident's Association</a> )	<b>MRZ Local Centre Intensification Precinct &amp; wider Policy 3 response - Reject:</b>  An increased permitted building height is considered appropriate to respond to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. The proposal is to have a commensurate response, with centres permitted to 14m being lesser in scale when compared to other centres. A number of centres are proposed to have additional intensification responses or catchments extended to better respond to Policy 3(d). <del>Reference should be made to section 6.4 of this report.</del>
<b>Modification of height rule</b>  14 submission points	Submitters requested the following changes the MRZ height rule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict any residential development to an absolute maximum of 22m (#338, #339).</li> <li>Allow for 50% of roof elevation [gable ends] to exceed height by 1m (#685).</li> <li>Greater clarity of rule.</li> <li>Seek two storey limit adjoining open space zones to retain privacy of park users.</li> </ul>	338.2 ( <a href="#">Kate Revell</a> ), 339.3 ( <a href="#">Chris Neame</a> ), 685.33, 685.33 ( <a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a> ), 564.5 ( <a href="#">Rachel Hu</a> ), 484.1 ( <a href="#">Louise Tweedy</a> ), 842.31 ( <a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a> ), 304.3 ( <a href="#">Julia Mallett</a> ), 1075.3 ( <a href="#">Diana Shand</a> ), 21.2 ( <a href="#">Grant McGirr</a> ), 295.1 ( <a href="#">Barry Newman</a> ), 584.5 ( <a href="#">Claudia M Staudt</a> ), 665.4 ( <a href="#">Lawrence &amp; Denise May</a> ), 67.9 ( <a href="#">Rachel Davies</a> ), 876.25 ( <a href="#">Alan and Robyn Ogle</a> )	<b>Modification of height rule - Reject:</b>  Controls lesser than MDRS would be contrary to the Act as this can only be achieved through a qualifying matter (s771). This includes: setting an absolute maximum height; any lesser height; greater landscaping requirements; additional notification requirements. A sunlight access qualifying matter has been identified and will still apply to three storey developments. No other qualifying matters have been identified or are considered suitable to address other concerns.  A Low PT Accessibility qualifying matter (LPTAA) has also been identified, ensuring that the maximum extent

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergency service facilities, emergency service towers and communication poles are exempt from this rule (#842).</li> <li>• Greater landscaping control as density increases.</li> <li>• Ensure no sun access is lost.</li> <li>• Require notification for three storey development / when building along southern boundary.</li> <li>• Consider frost effects on footpaths and cycleways.</li> </ul>		<p>of intensified zones is within those areas with the greatest accessibility to public transport or centres, including newly developed areas.</p> <p><b>Regarding exemptions for gable ends - Reject:</b></p> <p>Allotments in Christchurch are typically deeper than they are wider, tending to force developments to be perpendicular to the road, having front doors and gable ends parallel to internal boundaries. Council has applied the Sunlight Access qualifying matter to better protect sun access in residential areas. The exemption of gable ends has the potential to compromise this, with additional shading effects across internal boundaries.</p> <p><b>Exemptions for emergency service facilities and equipment – Accept</b></p> <p>The submitter does not appear to suggest an alternative permitted height for such activities (noting that an ‘unlimited’ height would be inappropriate in a residential context). I recommend that the maximum permitted height in the zone (14m) is provided for emergency service building, with exemptions for associated communication equipment.</p> <p><b>Note on landscaping and frost – Reject in-part:</b></p> <p>MDRS sets landscaping controls and can only be made more onerous if greater density is enabled or there is a breach of permitted standards (i.e. through matter of discretion and consent conditions). Greater landscaping has been required for additional site coverage in HRZ. Lastly, the density provided in MRZ is not considered to have an adverse effect on footpath or cycleways.</p>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
<p><b>Less than MDRS</b></p> <p>5 submission points</p>	<p>These submitters request that permitted heights in MRZ are reduced to only support two storey, with consent and/or notification required for any three storey development.</p>	<p>239.2 (<a href="#">Andrea Floyd</a>), 303.5 (<a href="#">Bron Durdin</a>), 892.3 (<a href="#">Wayne Robertson</a>), 490.1 (<a href="#">Nina Ferguson</a>), 337.1 (<a href="#">Anna Melling</a>)</p>	<p><b>Less than MDRS – Reject:</b></p> <p>Council is required to implement MDRS and Policy 3 under s77G of the Act. Applying controls more restrictive than standards/requirements set under this direction is only able to be achieved via a qualifying matter (s77I).</p>
<p><b>Locational control/variation</b></p> <p>7 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters request that there is some locational variation to how MRZ is applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applied to Cashmere Hills (#316, #250).</li> <li>• Not applied in Ashfield Place / Maidstone Road area (#495).</li> <li>• Limit New Brighton to two storeys (#294).</li> <li>• Limit development in cul de sacs to two storeys (#420).</li> <li>• Down-zone to MRZ in Rugby Street (#28).</li> <li>• Down-zone to MRZ in Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (#381)</li> </ul>	<p>316.3 (<a href="#">Jo Jeffery</a>), 495.2 (<a href="#">Janice Hitchon</a>), 294.2 (<a href="#">Chessa Crow</a>), 250.2 (<a href="#">Ian Dyson</a>), 420.1 (<a href="#">Ritchie Stewart</a>), 28.2 (<a href="#">Alastair Grigg</a>), 381.7 (<a href="#">Kate Gregg</a>)</p>	<p><b>Locational control/variation:</b></p> <p>These areas are specifically addressed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cashmere Hills: The areas within a walkable catchment to bus #1 or the Orbiter Bus are enabled to MRZ, and those outside of this catchment have the LPTAA applied. No other qualifying matter is seen to be applicable. <b>I recommend that this request is accepted in-part.</b></li> <li>• Ashfield Place / Maidstone Road area: This lies within the Airport Noise Contour qualifying matter, with operative zoning proposed to be held. Reference should be made to evidence by Ms Oliver.</li> <li>• New Brighton: this area is covered by multiple coastal hazard qualifying matters that limit residential development to no greater than two storeys (8m). Reference should be made to evidence by Ms Oliver.</li> <li>• Rugby Street, Helmores Lane, Desmond Street, and Rhodes Street: all lie within an identified Policy 3 catchment, having HRZ applied. <b>I recommend that this request is rejected.</b></li> <li>• Cul de sac development: No qualifying matter has been identified regarding traffic; MDRS</li> </ul>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
			must be applied. <b>I recommend that this request is rejected.</b>
<p><b>Generally opposed to intensification</b></p> <p>49 submission points</p>	<p>General opposition to increased heights for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Privacy, sunlight, amenity.</li> <li>• Local environmental effect.</li> <li>• Crime.</li> <li>• Two storey should be maximum.</li> <li>• Earthquake effects.</li> <li>• Implement the post-EQ Blueprint.</li> </ul>	<p>256.1 (<a href="#">Paul Burns</a>), 348.1 (<a href="#">Annette Prior</a>), 203.1 (<a href="#">Steve Petty</a>), 654.7 (<a href="#">Wendy Fergusson</a>), 224.2 (<a href="#">Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)</a>), 460.3 (<a href="#">Golden Section Property</a>), 486.2 (<a href="#">Brian Reynolds</a>), 46.1 (<a href="#">Rachel Best</a>), 410.1 (<a href="#">Teresa Parker</a>), 414.1 (<a href="#">Jenene Parker</a>), 23.3 (<a href="#">Linda Barnes</a>), 171.1 (<a href="#">Paul McNoe</a>), 88.2 (<a href="#">Peter Evans</a>), 807.5 (<a href="#">Howard Pegram</a>), 81.4 (<a href="#">Vivien Binney</a>), 427.2 (<a href="#">Vivien Binney</a>), 467.4 (<a href="#">Jillian Schofield</a>), 473.1 (<a href="#">Nicole Cawood</a>), 355.2 (<a href="#">Elisabeth Stevens</a>), 446.4 (<a href="#">Sarah Lovell</a>), 358.1 (<a href="#">Shona Mcdonald</a>), 451.1 (<a href="#">Sam Newton</a>), 340.3 (<a href="#">Kirsten Templeton</a>), 471.4 (<a href="#">Kem Wah Tan</a>), 9.1 (<a href="#">Mary-Anne Thomson</a>), 447.3 (<a href="#">Alex Lowings</a>), 1039.2 (<a href="#">Geoff Mahan</a>), 448.1 (<a href="#">David Robb</a>), 864.1 (<a href="#">Douglas Corbett</a>), 477.3 (<a href="#">Di Noble</a>), 441.2 (<a href="#">Robin Watson</a>), 449.1 (<a href="#">Mark Paston</a>), 434.1 (<a href="#">Vincent Laughton</a>), 870.3 (<a href="#">Susanne Antill</a>), 893.3 (<a href="#">Susanne and Janice Antill</a>), 468.2 (<a href="#">David Fisher</a>), 409.1 (<a href="#">Brett Morell</a>), 407.1 (<a href="#">Paul May</a>), 456.1 (<a href="#">Michelle Alexandre</a>), 26.1</p>	<p>This would be contrary to MDRS. A sunlight access QM has been identified and will still apply to three storey developments. No other qualifying matters have been identified or are considered suitable to address other concerns. <b>I recommend that this request is rejected.</b></p>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
		( <a href="#">Rosemary Fraser</a> ), 335.3 ( <a href="#">Lorraine Wilmshurst</a> ), 866.1 ( <a href="#">Helen Adair Denize</a> ), 319.1 ( <a href="#">Charlotte Smith</a> ), 230.1 ( <a href="#">Andrew Ott</a> ), 777.1 ( <a href="#">Lisa Winchester</a> ), 298.2 ( <a href="#">Mason Plato</a> ), 297.4 ( <a href="#">Kate Z</a> ), 901.4 ( <a href="#">John Hudson</a> ), 1047.2 ( <a href="#">Anna McKenzie</a> )	

#### 14.5.2.4 – SITE COVERAGE

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
<b>Considered elsewhere</b>	<i>These submission points are beyond the scope of this evidence and are considered elsewhere.</i>	381.16, 381.17 ( <a href="#">Kate Gregg</a> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Character Areas – Ms White</li> </ul>
<b>Support, as notified</b> 2 submission points	Submitters #814 (Carter Group Limited) and #823 (The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch), support the provision, as notified, specifically the exemptions for eaves and overhangs.	814.162 ( <a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a> ), 823.130 ( <a href="#">The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</a> )	<b>Acknowledge</b>
<b>Exclusions of eaves, overhangs, and gutters</b> 9 submission points	Most submitters sought greater clarification or leniency to this provision. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing eaves and overhangs exemption to 600mm, some also stating 200mm for gutters should be added.</li> <li>Increasing to 500mm, overall.</li> <li>Completely discount any eaves, overhangs, or gutters.</li> </ul>	38.1 ( <a href="#">Richard Bigsby</a> ), 684.4 ( <a href="#">Wayne Bond</a> ), 685.34 ( <a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a> ), 720.10 ( <a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a> ), 834.185 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 877.28 ( <a href="#">Otautahi Community Housing Trust</a> ), 903.37 ( <a href="#">Danne Mora Limited</a> ), 914.13 ( <a href="#">Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd</a> ),	<b>Exclusions of eaves, overhangs, and gutters - Accept in-part</b> I agree that the exemption can be made more flexible and recommend a total exemption of 650mm, accounting for any overhang, eave, or gutter, rather than separating out elements. I make reference to evidence by Mr Hattam.

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
		2076.14 ( <a href="#">Ian Cumberpatch Architects Ltd</a> )	
<b>Greater restrictions</b> 3 submission points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitters #519 and #67 requested greater controls on site coverage to manage bulk and sunlight access.</li> <li>Submitter #488 requested that the calculation is clarified to remove the likes of driveways and other communal areas.</li> </ul>	488.1 ( <a href="#">Luke Morreau</a> ), 519.23 ( <a href="#">James Carr</a> ), 67.7 ( <a href="#">Rachel Davies</a> )	<b>Greater restrictions – Reject</b> A more restrictive approach would be contrary to MDRS, with the sunlight access qualifying matter better addressing this effect through height in relation to boundary control. This is likely to have a proxy effect in terms of bulk and coverage. Lastly, the adoption of National Planning Standards definitions and MDRS ensures the likes of driveways are not counted towards building coverage.
<b>Stormwater management</b> 2 submission points	These submitters request that there are greater controls to restrict impervious surface to better manage stormwater effects.	11.3 ( <a href="#">Cheryl Horrell</a> ), 832.15 ( <a href="#">Finn Jackson</a> )	<b>Stormwater management – Reject</b> As previously discussed, Council is able to manage stormwater through Bylaws. I make reference to evidence by Mr Norton.
<b><del>Out of scope</del> – Retirement villages</b> 1 submission point	Submitter #811 (Retirement Village Association) requests controls specifically to support the develop retirement villages <u>and align with the MDRS [and National Planning Standards] relevant to building coverage.</u>	811.55 ( <a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a> )	<b>Retirement villages <del>Reject</del> –<del>out of scope</del> Accept</b> <del>As previously discussed, I consider that this is out of scope within MDRS areas and operative controls should apply.</del> <u>I support that further changes to controls to building coverage to reflect retirement village developments as a s80E related provision consequential on the MDRS. I further recommend that the standard is modified to add ‘development site’ to ensure the standard captures both existing and prospective retirement village, utilising this new defined term proposed as part of PC14.</u>



Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
<b>General opposition to intensification</b> 2 submission points	These submitters expressed a general opposition to the intensification response, as directed, or requested a lesser approach overall.	134.6 ( <a href="#">Terry Blogg</a> ), 742.2 ( <a href="#">Harang Kim</a> )	<b>General opposition to intensification - Reject</b> Council is required to give effect to MDRS through s77G of the Act.

#### 14.5.2.5 – OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE

Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
Cheryl Horrell		11.7	Seek Amendment	Provide enclosed outside private space	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.
Ali McGregor		65.5	Seek Amendment	Provide adequate outdoor space for families.	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.
Michael Tyuryutikov		334.5	Oppose	Retain existing minimal courtyard area rules for residential properties.	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.
Andrew Evans		89.20	Support	Support provisions as notified	Acknowledge	
Luke Hinchey for Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	811.75	Support	Retain Standard 14.6.2.10 as notified.	Acknowledge	

Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.227	Support	Retain [standard] as notified.	Acknowledge	
Luke Hinchey	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	811.75	Support	Decision sought: Retain Standard 14.6.2.10 as notified	Acknowledge	
Luke Hinchey	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	811.56	Seek Amendment	Decision sought: Amend Standard 14.5.2.5 as notified with the exclusion of retirement villages, or amend to include the retirement unit specific carve out as follows: f) For retirement units, standard 14.5.2.5a and 14.5.2.5b apply with the following modifications: i. The outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and ii. A retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space	<del>Reject – out of scope</del> <u>Accept</u>	<del>Retirement village controls are not considered in scope within MDRS only affected areas.</del> <u>Retirement villages contain ‘residential units’ within their complex but I accept that there is variation in the degree of serviceability provided to residents throughout a complex. A complex is likely to be comprehensively designed and therefore an exemption is appropriate, recognising that a complex must meet the operative definition of a ‘retirement village’.</u>
David Fisher		468.3	Support	Oppose increasing building height and density... amend rule to increase outside garden space to attract more families back to these areas.	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.

Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
Cheryl Horrell		11.4	Oppose	Oppose outdoor space provisions. Provide larger area of private outdoor space for each dwelling	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.
Ali McGregor		65.3	Seek Amendment	Provide adequate outdoor space for families.	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.
Rohan A Collett		147.1	Seek Amendment	That all outdoor living spaces are required to be located on the east, north or west sides of dwellings not on the south side.	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.
Alison Dockery		445.3	Seek Amendment	Seeks that the standard requires significant outdoor space for each apartment/ flat or unit.	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.
Andrew Evans		89.7	Seek Amendment	Amend Rule 14.5.2.5 Outdoor living space to require that ground floor [outdoor] living areas have a minimum area of 16sqm (retain current District Plan provision).	Reject <b>in-part</b>	MRZ seeks to replace suburban areas and are more lenient approach is not considered suitable. A reduced OLS of 15m2 has been enabled for smaller units within HRZ. <b><u>The zone also contains a Policy 3 response through the Local Centre Intensification Precinct and I consider that a similar exemption to HRZ is appropriate within the Precinct.</u></b>
Michael Tyuryutikov		334.1	Oppose	Retain existing minimal courtyard area rules for residential properties.	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.

Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.186	Support	Retain rule as notified.	Acknowledge	

#### 14.5.2.6 – MRZ HEIGHT IN RELATION TO BOUNDARY [SUNLIGHT ACCESS QM]

Main Theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
<p><b>Support Sunlight Access approach</b></p> <p>18 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters supported the approach, as notified, endorsing Council’s approach to reflect climatic and daylight angle difference. Other specific points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A financial payment made by developers to neighbours who have &lt;5 months sun per year as a result of developments.</li> <li>Strong support for increased protection along the southern boundary (i.e. northern sun).</li> <li>The high priority of the qualifying matter and positive influence on wellbeing.</li> </ul>	<p>33.2 (<a href="#">Joanne Knudsen</a>), 644.6 (<a href="#">Fay Brorens</a>), 89.8 (<a href="#">Andrew Evans</a>), 791.3 (<a href="#">Marie Dysart</a>), 778.5 (<a href="#">Mary O’Connor</a>), 519.11 (<a href="#">James Carr</a>), 112.1 (<a href="#">Nikki Smetham</a>), 184.7 (<a href="#">University of Canterbury</a>), 196.3 (<a href="#">Brian Gillman</a>), 354.1 (<a href="#">Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board</a>), 428.1 (<a href="#">Sarah Wylie</a>), 475.4 (<a href="#">Rachel Sanders</a>), 63.87 (<a href="#">Kathleen Crisley</a>), 67.1 (<a href="#">Rachel Davies</a>), 686.4 (<a href="#">Robyn Thomson</a>), 762.10 (<a href="#">New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch</a>), 835.17 (<a href="#">Historic Places Canterbury</a>), 918.7 (<a href="#">Geoff Banks</a>)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Support Sunlight Access approach – Acknowledge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A financial contribution has not been evaluated as part of this process. The proposed means to address sunlight loss is needed to be the most efficient means to protecting sunlight. I <b>recommend that these submission points are rejected.</b></li> </ul>

Main Theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
<p><b>Support the approach, with greater restrictions</b></p> <p>58 submission points</p>	<p>Support and further restrict the QM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain operative recession planes.</li> <li>Apply 3m and 45°.</li> <li>Set standard of no less than 3 months no sunlight at ground level / all year round.</li> <li>Accommodate existing neighbouring properties; require notification of breaches on southern boundary.</li> <li>Consider loss of amenity; building separation between buildings.</li> <li>Restrict buildings to 5 storeys.</li> <li>Enough to allow outdoor washing to dry.</li> <li>Angle should decrease as height increases / be more restrictive on narrow sites (&lt;15m) / see in tandem with site coverage.</li> <li>Better consideration of the climate in Christchurch &amp; daylight hours.</li> <li>Be more restrictive in Merivale.</li> <li>Passive heating potential should be better considered.</li> <li>Better consider mental health, wellbeing, privacy.</li> </ul>	<p>491.1 (<a href="#">Juliet Kim</a>), 59.1 (<a href="#">Theo Sarris</a>), 119.5 (<a href="#">Tracey Strack</a>), 164.4 (<a href="#">James and Adriana Baddeley</a>), 381.6 (<a href="#">Kate Gregg</a>), 502.3 (<a href="#">Kyri Kotzikas</a>), 698.3 (<a href="#">Ann-Mary &amp; Andrew Benton</a>), 255.7 (<a href="#">William Bennett</a>), 276.3 (<a href="#">Steve Burns</a>), 406.2 (<a href="#">Michael Andrews</a>), 100.3 (<a href="#">Mary Clay</a>), 205.7, 205.29 (<a href="#">Addington Neighbourhood Association</a>), 295.2 (<a href="#">Barry Newman</a>), 504.6 (<a href="#">Diane Gray</a>), 518.7 (<a href="#">Sarah Meikle</a>), 876.26, 876.4, 876.23 (<a href="#">Alan and Robyn Ogle</a>), 272.4 (<a href="#">Caitriona Cameron</a>), 220.4 (<a href="#">Martin Snelson</a>), 221.4 (<a href="#">Cynthia Snelson</a>), 294.11 (<a href="#">Chessa Crow</a>), 70.3 (<a href="#">Paul Wing</a>), 897.3 (<a href="#">Evelyn Lalahi</a>), 61.54, 61.8 (<a href="#">Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA)</a>), 103.3 (<a href="#">Damian Blogg</a>), 134.4 (<a href="#">Terry Blogg</a>), 425.4 (<a href="#">Tom King</a>), 67.8 (<a href="#">Rachel Davies</a>), 720.13 (<a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a>), 469.3 (<a href="#">Beverley Nelson</a>), 440.2 (<a href="#">Sandi Singh</a>), 584.6 (<a href="#">Claudia M Staudt</a>), 169.1 (<a href="#">Richard Moylan</a>), 653.4 (<a href="#">David McLauchlan</a>), 403.1 (<a href="#">David Krauth</a>), 157.1 (<a href="#">Robin Parr</a>), 334.3 (<a href="#">Michael Tyuryutikov</a>), 21.3 (<a href="#">Grant McGirr</a>), 222.9, 222.6 (<a href="#">Deans Avenue Precinct Society Inc</a>), 353.1 (<a href="#">Roger Conroy</a>), 188.4 (<a href="#">Riccarton Bush - Kilmarnock Residents' Association</a>), 31.1, 31.3 (<a href="#">Mike Currie</a>), 414.3 (<a href="#">Jenene Parker</a>), 679.3 (<a href="#">Tony Dale</a>), 337.2 (<a href="#">Anna Melling</a>), 201.1 (<a href="#">Amanda Parfitt</a>), 23.7 (<a href="#">Linda Barnes</a>), 301.1 (<a href="#">Shayne Andreasend</a>), 367.18 (<a href="#">John Bennett</a>), 303.4 (<a href="#">Bron Durdin</a>), 104.3 (<a href="#">Ann Clay</a>), 580.3 (<a href="#">Darin Cusack</a>), 851.4 (<a href="#">Robert Leonard Broughton</a>), 735.1 (<a href="#">Paula Rowell</a>)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated</b></p>	<p><b>Support the approach, with greater restrictions – Reject</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reporting completed as part of the evaluation reporting shows that operative controls are inappropriate to achieve medium and high density typologies.</li> <li>MDRS and NPS-UD are purposefully enabling to aid the transition of lower density housing to being more intensified. Council must give effect to this direction.</li> <li>The qualifying matter is intended to apply equally across urban residential zones. MDRS controls are fundamentally designed to more easily provide for infill development in existing areas. Applying a more restrictive qualifying matter over established areas defeats this purpose.</li> <li>Having a ‘reactive plane control’ that increases based on height is unduly restrictive and would prevent intensification that Council is required to enable. Further, narrow sites would naturally be restricted through the angle of the plane over a site; this acts as a means to infer a greater setback.</li> <li>The angles proposed seek to ensure that the most beneficial sun access is maintained, applying a more restrictive approach on east and west boundaries, and greater restriction along the southern boundary to protect northerly plane where the sun is most prominent. The northern boundary, where this would affect the southern sun access simply applies the MDRS angle due to having limited influence on sun access.</li> </ul>

Main Theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apply along road boundary / Apply bespoke approach for narrow streets to avoid shadowing across road / Consider safety effects of frosts of footpaths and cycleways.</li> <li>Only enable for greenfield areas, restrict in established areas.</li> <li>Better protect morning sun / Winter sun access.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</a>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The density that MRZ is unlikely to have a significant impact on road shadowing due to most roads being of a width whereby the shadow is unlikely to cover the entire street width. The majority of suburban streets have footpaths on either side of the street, allowing pedestrians to use a sunlit path. Reference is made to the HRZ discussion on this matter.</li> <li>Please refer to evidence by Mr Liley for passive heading effects.</li> <li>Regarding the requirement for notification, this approach is ultra vires as it pre-determines an assessment required under the Act.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support, with use of alternate metric</b></p> <p>4 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters support the approach, but seek the use of the Australian sunlight standard, some referencing a minimum of 2 hours of daily sunlight access.</p>	<p>385.2 (Claire Williams), 258.3 (Stephen Bryant), 673.9 (Anne Ott), 674.2 (David Ott)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Support, with use of alternate metric – Reject</b></p> <p>Setting an hourly or time-based metric means that designs and compliance are more difficult. Applying this as a built form standard is seen as the most effective means to apply the qualifying matter.</p> <p>Reference is made to evidence by Mr Hattam, who notes that the Australian standard has been met through the Sunlight Access qualifying matter and reflected in a built form standard to improve practical application and understandability.</p>
<p><b>Support, with interface transition</b></p>	<p>Submitters requested that the transition between the following zones / overlays is better considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abuts any lower density.</li> </ul>	<p>720.11 (Mitchell Coll), 685.37 (Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ), 710.4 (Michelle Trusttun)</p>	<p><b>Support, with interface transition – Reject</b></p> <p>The purpose of the sunlight access qualifying matter is to ensure adequate and equitable sunlight access across MRZ and HRZ areas. Such an approach would be beyond</p>

Main Theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
3 submission points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Between MRZ and RS or RSDT.</li> <li>With any RHA or RCA, particularly along the northern (southern) face.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	modifying controls to the extent necessary (as per s771). It is noted that RHA's have a proposed interface overlay for any adjoining HRZ areas.
<b>MDRS modification</b>  1 submission point	Submitter seeks modification of MDRS substandard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apply plane to road boundary to better consider narrow roads.</li> </ul>	685.38 ( <b>Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</b> )  <b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b> <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a>	<b>MDRS modification – Reject</b>  As previously, the density that MRZ is unlikely to have a significant impact on road shadowing due to most roads being of a width whereby the shadow is unlikely to cover the entire street width. Reference is made to evidence by Mr Hattam regarding this matter.
<b>Modification of proposed rule</b>  6 submission points	Submitters seeks that the rule is further modified to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus more on site coverage and setbacks to address issue;</li> <li>Improve rule clarity;</li> <li>Increase height where plane is taken (i.e. higher than 3m) to better enable tall buildings;</li> </ul>	519.22 ( <b>James Carr</b> ), 903.38 ( <b>Danne Mora Limited</b> ), 914.14 ( <b>Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd</b> ), 734.5 ( <b>Marie Byrne</b> ), 55.2 ( <b>Tobias Meyer</b> ), 413.4 ( <b>Caroline May</b> )  <b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b> <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a>	<b>Modification of proposed rule – Reject</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The height to boundary control is a dynamic built form standard that can affect both setback and site coverage and seen as the most effective means of addressing sunlight access.</li> <li>Central city focus – Loss of sunlight effects will still be felt in this location as the minimum height is only two storeys (7m). Exemptions have still been made to enable greater building height in HRZ</li> </ul>

Main Theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only apply along southern boundary;</li> <li>• Support rules for perimeter block development [across zone] but at a reduced scale (12m or 40% depth).</li> <li>• Central city focus; only apply outside 4 Avenues.</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a>	<p>areas. Reference should be made to themes on this section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rule drafting is based on the framework applied through MDRS Clause 12. Additional diagrams are able to be provided within the rule to better articulate how the qualifying matter approach and other exemptions would be applied.</li> <li>• Perimeter block development has been enabled in areas further intensified through Policy 3. It seeks to both respond to the intensification direction and to act as further incentive to develop within these areas. Extending this beyond intensified catchments could act as a disincentive for concentrating development within these areas whilst also potentially reducing the ability to provide for housing choice (Policy 1(a)).</li> <li>• Regarding the exempt above 12m: Mr Hattam has provided further detail on this in reporting. He details that the exemption allows a logical and simple building at a safe distance from the boundary. With high buildings, the angle of the sun is such that it will not come above the top of the building for much of the year regardless of the recession plane and it is more effective to ensure sun is received through the gaps in the buildings. Intent is to manage this impact through discretionary framework whilst allowing for development opportunities.</li> </ul>
<b>MRZ exemptions</b>	<p>Submitters <b>support</b> proposed exemptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the Local Centre Intensification Precinct, increase height before the</li> </ul>	<p>676.6, 676.7 (<b>Jack Gibbons</b>), 685.35 (<b>Canterbury / Westland Branch of</b></p>	<p><b>MRZ exemptions – Reject</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allotments in Christchurch are typically deeper than they are wider, tending to force</li> </ul>



Main Theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
9 submission points	<p>plane is applied (to 15m) and reduce setback exemption to 2m [in relation to 12m building exemption – 14.5.2.6.b.iv.B].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exempt gable ends where “the upper 50% of a gable roof, measured vertically”, with an appropriate illustration.</li> <li>Enable perimeter block development, when additional landscaping / tree planning is provided.</li> <li>Reduce setback requirements for buildings &gt;12m.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">Architectural Designers NZ</a>), 720.12 (<a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a>), 121.20 (<a href="#">Cameron Matthews</a>)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	<p>developments to be perpendicular to the road, having front doors and gable ends parallel to internal boundaries. Council has applied the Sunlight Access qualifying matter to better protect sun access in residential areas. The exemption of gable ends has the potential to compromise this, with additional shading effects across internal boundaries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference is made to the above regarding perimeter block development exemptions.</li> <li>Please refer to evidence of Mr Hattam regarding further exemption considerations.</li> </ul>
	<p>Submitters <b>oppose</b> proposed exemptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve clarity of 12m building exemption [14.5.2.6.b.iv.B]</li> <li>Remove 14.5.2.6.b.iv.B;</li> <li>Remove MDRS exemption, perimeter block, and 12m building height control</li> </ul>	<p>63.25 (<a href="#">Kathleen Crisley</a>), 696.6 (<a href="#">Terence Sissons</a>), 686.3 (<a href="#">Robyn Thomson</a>), 743.5 (<a href="#">Matthew Gibbons</a>)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above, additional illustrative material can be added to the rule to help detail its application [<b>NB reference is made to diagrams included on the hearing statement of Ike Kleynbos dated 1 November 2023, pages 16-19</b>].</li> <li>The exemption for buildings above 12m seeks to ensure that control is still reserved over parts of the building that are likely to have the greatest shading effect (&lt;12m close to the boundary). Setbacks are required to be met that align with boundary/site orientation, adjusting based on the degree of shading influence.</li> </ul>
<b>Oppose, remove the qualifying matter</b>	<p>Submitters opposed the qualifying matter on the basis of:</p>	<p>834.187, 834.76 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 344.2 (<a href="#">Luke Baker-Garters</a>), 14.1, 14.6 (<a href="#">Kathryn Collie</a>), 12.1 (<a href="#">Guy and</a></p>	<p><b>Oppose, remove the qualifying matter – Reject</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference is made to s32 material, additional commentary in section 7.3 of this report, and</li> </ul>

Main Theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
195 submission points  [~181 proforma]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of evidence; does not meet s77L.</li> <li>Not greatly different to areas currently enabled for Medium Density.</li> <li>MDRS should apply.</li> <li>Cities in northern hemisphere have greater intensification and have high quality living environment.</li> <li>Protects land values of existing dwellings.</li> <li>Modelling has understated effect.</li> <li>Less efficient land use that will reduce affordability / restricts housing delivery / restricts 3-storey development.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">Anna Parbury</a>), 417.2 (<a href="#">Viso NZ Limited</a>), 1049.7 (<a href="#">Dylan Lange</a>), 233.7 (<a href="#">Paul Clark</a>), 262.5 (<a href="#">Alfred Lang</a>), 263.5 (<a href="#">Harley Peddie</a>), 264.7 (<a href="#">Aaron Tily</a>), 265.7 (<a href="#">John Bryant</a>), 266.7 (<a href="#">Alex Hobson</a>), 267.7 (<a href="#">Justin Muirhead</a>), 268.7 (<a href="#">Clare Marshall</a>), 269.7 (<a href="#">Yvonne Gilmore</a>), 270.7 (<a href="#">Rob Harris</a>), 271.7 (<a href="#">Pippa Marshall</a>), 273.7 (<a href="#">Ian Chesterman</a>), 274.7 (<a href="#">Robert Fleming</a>), 342.6 (<a href="#">Adrien Taylor</a>), 345.7 (<a href="#">Monique Knaggs</a>), 346.7 (<a href="#">George Laxton</a>), 347.7 (<a href="#">Elena Sharkova</a>), 350.5 (<a href="#">Felix Harper</a>), 361.4 (<a href="#">James Gardner</a>), 362.5 (<a href="#">Cynthia Roberts</a>), 363.6 (<a href="#">Peter Galbraith</a>), 364.10 (<a href="#">John Reily</a>), 365.6 (<a href="#">Andrew Douglas-Clifford</a>), 366.7 (<a href="#">Olivia Doyle</a>), 370.7 (<a href="#">Simon Fitchett</a>), 372.7 (<a href="#">Julia Tokumaru</a>), 373.7 (<a href="#">Mark Stringer</a>), 374.8 (<a href="#">Michael Redepenning</a>), 375.8 (<a href="#">Aidan Ponsonby</a>), 379.7 (<a href="#">Indiana De Boo</a>), 384.8 (<a href="#">Christopher Seay</a>), 387.8 (<a href="#">Christopher Henderson</a>), 389.6 (<a href="#">Emma Coumbe</a>), 391.8 (<a href="#">Ezra Holder</a>), 392.8 (<a href="#">Ella McFarlane</a>), 393.8 (<a href="#">Sarah Laxton</a>), 394.7 (<a href="#">Lesley Kettle</a>), 395.8 (<a href="#">Emily Lane</a>), 415.11 (<a href="#">Blake Thomas</a>), 416.8 (<a href="#">Anake Goodall</a>), 503.2 (<a href="#">Jamie Lang</a>), 505.8 (<a href="#">Jarred Bowden</a>), 507.2, 507.6 (<a href="#">Paul Young</a>), 510.3 (<a href="#">Ewan McLennan</a>), 512.11 (<a href="#">Harrison McEvoy</a>), 514.6 (<a href="#">Ann Vanschevensteen</a>), 515.7 (<a href="#">Zachary Freiberg</a>), 516.9 (<a href="#">Jessica Nimmo</a>), 517.7 (<a href="#">Alex McNeill</a>), 519.18 (<a href="#">James Carr</a>), 520.7 (<a href="#">Amelie Harris</a>), 521.7 (<a href="#">Thomas Garner</a>), 522.7 (<a href="#">Lisa Smailes</a>), 523.8 (<a href="#">Adam Currie</a>), 524.7 (<a href="#">Daniel Tredinnick</a>), 525.7 (<a href="#">Gideon Hodge</a>), 527.7 (<a href="#">Kaden Adlington</a>), 528.6 (<a href="#">Lesley Clouston</a>), 529.7 (<a href="#">Daniel Carter</a>), 531.8 (<a href="#">Claire Cox</a>), 532.7 (<a href="#">Albert Nisbet</a>), 533.7 (<a href="#">Frederick</a></p>	<p>evidence presented by Mr Hattam and Mr Liley. This further evidence also addresses modelling approaches undertaken for the qualifying matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per Mr Hattam’s evidence, the view taken on Northern Hemisphere cities discounts the master planning work undertaken at scale to achieve this. There are arguably more restrictions overall under this regime. Mr Hattam notes the restrictive/prescriptive planning regimes in northern hemisphere – eg all buildings discretionary (UK) or set building envelopes (Netherlands).</li> <li>Reporting shows that better protecting sunlight within and adjoining sites is also likely to increase the commercial feasibility of infill development. Such multi-unit developments are also likely to increase their overall attractiveness, increasing the propensity of people to occupy a denser residential dwelling. The approach assists the overall transition to a denser urban form.</li> <li>The approach of the qualifying matter has been applied equally across urban residential areas (noting various exemptions, some zone-based) and is not seen to targeted to a particular cohort.</li> <li>Reference is made to the s32 on qualifying matters (Part 1 - Table 6, from page 37). This details the low degree of overall impact that the qualifying matter approach is likely to have within MRZ. Overall housing supply provided through PC14 is likely to be in excess of 50 years of demand.</li> </ul>

Main Theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
		<p> <u>Markwell</u>), 534.3 (<u>Donna Barber</u>), 537.5  <u>(Matt Johnston)</u>, 538.3 (<u>Barnaba Auia</u>), 539.3  <u>(Lucy Hayes)</u>, 540.3 (<u>Ben Close</u>), 541.3  <u>(Amelia Hamlin)</u>, 542.3 (<u>Ben Helliwell</u>), 544.3  <u>(David Davidson)</u>, 545.2 (<u>James Hoare</u>), 547.3  <u>(Amanda Ng)</u>, 548.3 (<u>Ethan Gullery</u>), 549.3  <u>(Tineek Corin)</u>, 550.3 (<u>Sam Mills</u>), 551.3  <u>(Henry Seed)</u>, 552.3 (<u>David Moore</u>), 553.3  <u>(Josh Flores)</u>, 554.3 (<u>Fraser Beckwith</u>), 555.3  <u>(James Cunniffe)</u>, 557.3 (<u>Peter Beswick</u>),  559.3 (<u>Mitchell Tobin</u>), 560.3 (<u>Reece</u>  <u>Pomeroy</u>), 562.3 (<u>Rob McNeur</u>), 563.8 (<u>Peter</u>  <u>Cross</u>), 565.9 (<u>Angela Nathan</u>), 566.8 (<u>Bruce</u>  <u>Chen</u>), 567.9 (<u>Mark Mayo</u>), 568.9 (<u>Hazel</u>  <u>Shanks</u>), 570.9 (<u>Christine Albertson</u>), 571.9  <u>(James Harwood)</u>, 572.9 (<u>Yu Kai Lim</u>), 573.9  <u>(Jeff Louttit)</u>, 574.9 (<u>Henry Bersani</u>), 575.9  <u>(Jeremy Ditzel)</u>, 576.11 (<u>Juliette Sargeant</u>),  577.10 (<u>James Robinson</u>), 578.9 (<u>Jamie</u>  <u>Dawson</u>), 587.9 (<u>Ciaran Mee</u>), 588.9 (<u>David</u>  <u>Lee</u>), 589.9 (<u>Krystal Boland</u>), 590.9 (<u>Todd</u>  <u>Hartshorn</u>), 591.9 (<u>Helen Jacka</u>), 594.5 (<u>Hao</u>  <u>Ning Tan</u>), 595.3 (<u>Logan Sanko</u>), 596.3  <u>(Hayley Woods)</u>, 597.3 (<u>Karl Moffatt-</u>  <u>Vallance</u>), 598.3 (<u>Caleb Sixtus</u>), 601.3 (<u>Jack</u>  <u>Hobern</u>), 602.3 (<u>Devanh Patel</u>), 603.3 (<u>Evan</u>  <u>Ross</u>), 604.3 (<u>Daniel Morris</u>), 606.3 (<u>Alanna</u>  <u>Reid</u>), 607.3 (<u>Mathew Cairns</u>), 608.3 (<u>Denisa</u>  <u>Dumitrescu</u>), 610.3 (<u>Alexia Katisipis</u>), 611.3,  611.8 (<u>Ailbhe Redmile</u>), 612.3 (<u>Hamish</u>  <u>McLeod</u>), 613.3 (<u>Noah Simmonds</u>), 614.3  <u>(Matthew Coulthurst)</u>, 615.3 (<u>Analijia</u>  <u>Thomas</u>), 616.3 (<u>Elizabeth Oquist</u>), 617.3  <u>(Tegan Mays)</u>, 618.3 (<u>Lance Woods</u>), 619.3  <u>(Oscar Templeton)</u>, 620.3 (<u>Izak Dobbs</u>), 623.3  <u>(Peter Dobbs)</u>, 624.3 (<u>Daniel Scott</u>), 628.3 </p>	

Main Theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
		<p>(<a href="#">Tom Crawford</a>), 632.3 (<a href="#">Aimee Harper</a>), 633.3 (<a href="#">James Dunne</a>), 634.3 (<a href="#">Georgia Palmer</a>), 635.3, 635.6 (<a href="#">Suzi Chisholm</a>), 639.8 (<a href="#">Rory Evans Fee</a>), 640.3 (<a href="#">Steven Watson</a>), 641.3 (<a href="#">Andrew Treadwell</a>), 642.3 (<a href="#">Sophie Harre</a>), 643.9 (<a href="#">Keegan Phipps</a>), 645.3 (<a href="#">Laura McGill</a>), 646.7 (<a href="#">Archie Manur</a>), 648.3 (<a href="#">Brennan Hawkins</a>), 649.2 (<a href="#">Peter Stanger</a>), 650.3 (<a href="#">Charlie Lane</a>), 651.3 (<a href="#">Jess Green</a>), 652.3 (<a href="#">Declan Cruickshank</a>), 655.7 (<a href="#">Daymian Johnson</a>), 656.7 (<a href="#">Francesca Teague-Wytenburg</a>), 658.8 (<a href="#">Ben Thorpe</a>), 660.7 (<a href="#">Bray Cooke</a>), 661.8 (<a href="#">Edward Parkes</a>), 662.8 (<a href="#">Bryce Harwood</a>), 718.7 (<a href="#">Gareth Holler</a>), 719.7 (<a href="#">Andrew Cockburn</a>), 72.6 (<a href="#">Rosemary Neave</a>), 721.6 (<a href="#">Ethan Pasco</a>), 722.3 (<a href="#">Nick Leslie</a>), 724.4 (<a href="#">Alan Murphy</a>), 733.8 (<a href="#">Michael Hall</a>), 738.7 (<a href="#">Pim Van Duin</a>), 752.7 (<a href="#">Amanda Smithies</a>), 753.9 (<a href="#">Piripi Baker</a>), 754.9 (<a href="#">Alex Shaw</a>), 783.3 (<a href="#">Roman Shmakov</a>), 808.3 (<a href="#">Josh Garmonsway</a>), 832.7 (<a href="#">Finn Jackson</a>), 837.7 (<a href="#">Sylvia Maclaren</a>), 839.7 (<a href="#">Jacinta O'Reilly</a>), 840.6 (<a href="#">Rosa Shaw</a>), 841.10 (<a href="#">Jess Gaisford</a>), 843.7 (<a href="#">Allan Taunt</a>), 844.7 (<a href="#">Hayden Smythe</a>), 846.10 (<a href="#">Lauren Bonner</a>), 847.9 (<a href="#">Will Struthers</a>), <del>261.7</del> (<a href="#">WITHDRAWN</a>), 713.9 (<a href="#">Girish Ramlugun</a>), 715.9 (<a href="#">Sara Campbell</a>), 717.9 (<a href="#">Jonty Coulson</a>), 859.2 (<a href="#">Ministry of Housing and Urban Development</a>), 444.5 (<a href="#">Joseph Corbett-Davies</a>), 599.1 (<a href="#">David Townshend</a>), 121.4 (<a href="#">Cameron Matthews</a>), 189.4 (<a href="#">Matt Edwards</a>), 191.14 (<a href="#">Logan Brunner</a>), 811.58 (<a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a>)</p>	

Main Theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
		<p><i>Please note that sub-points 713.9, 715.9, 117.9 were incorrectly summarised as 'support'.</i></p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	
<p><b>General opposition to intensification</b></p> <p>13 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters generally opposed the intensification direction. Some cited effects on winter sun access, traffic congestion, and privacy, amongst other concern.</p>	<p>46.3 (<b>Rachel Best</b>), 198.1 (<b>Megan Walsh</b>), 203.3 (<b>Steve Petty</b>), 410.2 (<b>Teresa Parker</b>), 435.3 (<b>Madeleine Thompson</b>), 454.5 (<b>Steve Hanson</b>), 477.5 (<b>Di Noble</b>), 864.3 (<b>Douglas Corbett</b>), 870.15 (<b>Susanne Antill</b>), 893.16 (<b>Susanne and Janice Antill</b>), 901.2 (<b>John Hudson</b>), 409.2 (<b>Brett Morell</b>), 441.3 (<b>Robin Watson</b>)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>General opposition to intensification – Reject</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council is required to give effect to the direction of MDRS. The proposed Sunlight QM provides a balanced approach that provides for greater sunlight access whilst enabling three storey development.</li> </ul>

#### 14.5.2.7 – MINIMUM BUILDING SETBACKS

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
<b>Considered elsewhere</b>	<i>These submission points are beyond the scope of this evidence and are considered elsewhere.</i>	381.18 ( <a href="#">Kate Gregg</a> ), 834.66 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 829.9, 829.5 ( <a href="#">Kiwi Rail</a> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Character Areas – Ms White</li> <li>• Railway setbacks – Ms Oliver</li> </ul>
<b>Support as notified</b> 1 submission point	The submitter supports the proposed rule, as notified.	89.9 ( <a href="#">Andrew Evans</a> )	<b>Acknowledge</b>
<b>Garage doors</b> 2 submission points	Submitters #685 (Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ) #720 (Mitchell Coll) request that that a sub-clause is added to ensure that garage doors do not extend over the road boundary.	685.39 ( <a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a> ), 720.14 ( <a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a> )	<p><b>Garage doors - Reject</b></p> <p>While I agree that such a control is beneficial, the setback control is directed by the MDRS density standard, which is tied to ‘buildings’. This definition includes garages, therefore having a control for garage doors opening may have a proxy effect of increasing building setbacks.</p>
<b>Accessory building exemption</b> 8 submission points	<p>A number of different requests were made for this rule. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that ‘nil’ is stated to be clear that no setback shall apply (#903, #914, #293).</li> <li>• Remove the performance criteria (#877, #834).</li> <li>• Reduce the exempted length from 10.1m to 6.2m (#685, #720).</li> <li>• The exclusion is removed (#811).</li> </ul>	<p>877.29 (<a href="#">Otautahi Community Housing Trust</a>), 834.188 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 903.39 (<a href="#">Danne Mora Limited</a>), 914.15 (<a href="#">Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd</a>), 720.15 (<a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a>), 685.41 (<a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a>), 293.2 (<a href="#">Exsto Architecture</a>), 811.60 (<a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a>),</p>	<p><b>Accessory building exemption</b></p> <p><b>Accept in-part – #903, #914, #293</b></p> <p>I accept that greater clarity is needed, however reinstating Nil may not achieve this.</p> <p><b>Reject – remaining submission points</b></p> <p>The exemption is carried over from the operative Plan and ensures adequate flexibility for common accessory buildings, with additional flexibility. Removing performance criteria is considered inappropriate as remaining built form standards would ineffectively manage potential overshadowing, dominance, and privacy effects.</p>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
<b>Exclusions of eaves, overhangs, and gutters</b> 4 submission points	Submitters requested the following regarding this exemption: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be clear that exemption only applies when dimensions are met (#811).</li> <li>• Increase to 600mm, with 200m for gutters (#834).</li> <li>• Decrease to 300mm overall along the road boundary (#685).</li> <li>• Increase to 600mm, with 50% of any overhang greater than 300mm included in coverage (#684).</li> </ul>	811.60 ( <a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a> ), 684.5 ( <a href="#">Wayne Bond</a> ), 834.188 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 685.40 ( <a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a> )	<b>Exclusions of eaves, overhangs, and gutters - Accept in-part</b> As per response to site coverage exemption, I agree that the exemption can be made more flexible and recommend a total exemption of 650mm, accounting for any overhang, eave, or gutter, rather than separating out elements. I make reference to evidence by Mr Hattam.
<b>Corner sites</b> 1 submission point	Submitter #38 requests that the clarity of the rule for setbacks on corner sites is improved.	38.3 ( <a href="#">Richard Bigsby</a> )	<b>Corner sites - Accept in-part</b> I agree that the application for corner sites is unclear, however the rule is an MDRS density standard. I have interpreted the corner site inclusion to note that there are no rear boundaries for such sites and only side boundary controls would apply. As the setback control is the same, I do not see this has having any material effect. Clarity could be improved with an explanatory <a href="#">note or diagram</a> , <a href="#">perhaps referencing Figure 1</a> .
<b>Advice note</b> 1 submission point	Fire and Emergency (842) requests that the following advice note is appended to building setback standards: <p><i>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource</i></p>	842.32 ( <a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a> )	<b>Advice note – Accept #842.32</b>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
	<i>consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</i>		
<b>Greater restrictions</b> 18 submission points	<p>Most submitters sought that setbacks were increased to better protect sunlight access and reduce privacy and dominance effects. Some made specific reference to the management of window sizes that would overlook living areas as part of the assessment process.</p> <p>Submitters #710 and #734 sought that greater restrictions are applied along heritage interfaces. Here, reference is made to evidence by Ms Dixon and Ms Richmond.</p> <p>Submitter #876 requests that safety effects of increased shade and frost upon the cycleways and footpaths within the zone are better considered.</p>	653.1 ( <a href="#">David McLauchlan</a> ), 23.1 ( <a href="#">Linda Barnes</a> ), 701.8 ( <a href="#">Ian McChesney</a> ), 734.3 ( <a href="#">Marie Byrne</a> ), 383.1 ( <a href="#">Colin Dunn</a> ), 431.3 ( <a href="#">Sonia Bell</a> ), 519.24 ( <a href="#">James Carr</a> ), 469.4 ( <a href="#">Beverley Nelson</a> ), 710.1, 710.2 ( <a href="#">Michelle Trusttum</a> ), 679.4 ( <a href="#">Tony Dale</a> ), 220.7 ( <a href="#">Martin Snelson</a> ), 221.7 ( <a href="#">Cynthia Snelson</a> ), 222.11 ( <a href="#">Deans Avenue Precinct Society Inc.</a> ), 673.10 ( <a href="#">Anne Ott</a> ), 674.1 ( <a href="#">David Ott</a> ), 876.27 ( <a href="#">Alan and Robyn Ogle</a> ), 272.5 ( <a href="#">Caitriona Cameron</a> )	<b>Greater restrictions - Reject in-part</b> Applying greater restrictions would be contrary to MDRS and s77G of the Act. However, I accept that there can be consideration of privacy and safety effects as part of the matters of discretion if there is a breach of the MDRS standard.
<b>General opposition to intensification response</b> 4 submission points	These submitters expressed a general opposition to the intensification response, as directed, or requested a lesser approach overall.	134.5 ( <a href="#">Terry Blogg</a> ), 1047.3 ( <a href="#">Anna McKenzie</a> ), 504.7 ( <a href="#">Diane Gray</a> ), 901.3 ( <a href="#">John Hudson</a> )	<b>General opposition to intensification response - Reject</b> Council is required to give effect to MDRS through s77G of the Act.



14.5.2.8 – OUTLOOK SPACE PER UNIT

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
673	Anne Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Accept in-part	Council is required to apply the applicable MDRS density standard. Consideration of privacy has been considered as part of Matters of Discretion.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Add a further subclause to subclause (i) reading, “be contained within the property boundaries.”	Reject	Such a control would be beyond the MDRS density standard.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Rewrite the subclause [(i)(i)] to, “be clear and unobstructed by buildings or fences (excluding any doors or windows opening into an outlook space from the principal living room); and	Reject <b><u>in-part</u></b>	Such a control would be beyond the MDRS density standard. <b><u>It is noted that the standard requires buildings do not obstruct outlook, however a fence would not be considered a ‘building’ under National Planning Standards.</u></b>
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	Add a further subclause to clause (i) reading, “be contained within the property boundaries.”	<b><u>Reject Acknowledge</u></b>	<b><u>Such a control would be beyond the MDRS density standard. This control is already captured: Clause 16(5) mentions that outlook spaces may be over driveways and footpaths</u></b>

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
						<u>"within the site". National Planning Standards definition of 'site' ensures that outlooks space is contained within the legal parcel boundaries, with the exception that this may be over "over a public street or other public open space".</u>
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	<p>Rule 14.5.2.8 (i)(i) Outlook Space per Unit</p> <p>Rewrite the subclause to, "be clear and unobstructed by buildings or fences (excluding any doors or windows opening into an outlook space from the principal living room); and"</p>	Reject <u>in-part</u>	Such a control would be beyond the MDRS density standard. <u>It is noted that the standard requires buildings do not obstruct outlook, however a fence would not be considered a 'building' under National Planning Standards.</u>

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
811	Luke Hinchey for Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Seek Amendment	[S]eeks to amend Standard 14.5.2.8 as follows to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages: 14.5.2.8 Outlook space per unit ... j. For retirement units, clause a applies with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.	<del>Reject</del> — <u>Out of scope</u> <u>Accept in-part</u>	<del>Retirement village controls in MDRS only affected areas are considered out of scope of this Plan Change.</del> <u>Retirement villages would contain ‘residential units’ and the MDRS would apply. I consider that a retirement village complex is likely to contain different degrees of residential servicing and therefore different living areas. Further, I consider that the outlook space is intended to both align with MDRS outdoor living and also to provide separation between such spaces across site boundaries. Given the comprehensive designed nature of retirement village, I consider that an exemption should apply along the perimeter of a retirement village complex and respond to the nature of residential occupancy.</u>
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Support	14.5.2.8 – Outlook space Retain the rule as notified.	Acknowledge	

**14.5.2.9 – STREET SCENE AMENITY AND SAFETY – FENCES**

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
30	Doug Latham		Seek Amendment	Amend Rule 14.5.2.9 'Street scene amenity and safety - fences' to revert to current provisions.	Accept in-part	I accept that 1.5m is inadequate to screen outdoor living areas and accept the recommendation from Mr Hattam to increase this to 1.8m.
38	Richard Bigsby		Seek Amendment	[Amend 14.5.2.9-Street scene amenity and safety - fences] to allow for a fence of a greater height as a permitted activity, provided that visual transparency / interaction / engagement with the street is still achieved [, provide] concession for corner allotments, where sites have greater lengths of frontage [and] allow for a solid section of 1.8m tall fencing to be established to provide visual and acoustic privacy to living areas. [Seeks] that the existing fencing provisions are retained.	Accept in-part	I accept that 1.5m is inadequate to screen outdoor living areas and accept the recommendation from Mr Hattam to increase this to 1.8m.
89	Andrew Evans		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to 14.5.2.9 a. i. to require fence heights to be 1.8m (not 1.5m), or; Provide for 1.5m fencing height and amend to have 0.3m above this to be partially transparent.	Accept in-part	I accept that 1.5m is inadequate to screen outdoor living areas and accept the recommendation from Mr Hattam to increase this to 1.8m.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
684	Wayne Bond		Seek Amendment	[That] "i" be removed, with "ii" [new i] amended as follows: Location will read "Road boundary"; Fence height standard will read "Access visibility spay area 1.0m. Balance boundary width 1.8m."	Accept in-part	I accept that 1.5m is inadequate to screen outdoor living areas and accept the recommendation from Mr Hattam to increase this to 1.8m.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Rewrite to "Any fencing provided shall meet the following standards, being the maximum permitted height above the minimum floor level."	Reject in-part	While I accept that greater clarity of where height is measured from is needed, I do not accept that greater heights are appropriate in Flood Management Areas.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Rewrite the heading to "Fencing and Screening"	Accept	
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	<p>Rule 14.5.2.9 (a) - Street Scene Amenity and Safety - Fences</p> <p>Rewrite the rule to, "Any fencing provided shall meet the following standards, being the maximum permitted height above the minimum floor level."</p> <p>Rewrite the rule heading to, "Fencing and Screening".</p>	Reject in-part	<p>While I accept that greater clarity of where height is measured from is needed, I do not accept that greater heights are appropriate in Flood Management Areas.</p> <p>I accept that the name can be changed.</p>

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
814	Jo Appleyard for Carter Group Limited	Carter Group Limited	Oppose	Oppose Rule 14.5.2.9. Seek that this be deleted.	Reject	Council is able to apply related provisions under s80E of the Act.
823	Jo Appleyard for The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Oppose	Delete all new or amended provisions, to the extent that they conflict with or are less enabling than the mandatory MDRS and/or impose additional constraints relative to the status quo.	Reject	Council is able to apply related provisions under s80E of the Act.
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Seek Amendment	14.5.2.9 - fencing [sic] Retain clause (iii) as notified. Delete clauses (i) and (ii) and replace with the following (Operative Plan rule and associated diagrams reinstated):	Accept <b><u>in-part</u></b>	<b><u>I consider that the rule structure is fit-for-purpose. The rule changes operative standard and the operative diagrams are no longer applicable.</u></b>

#### 14.5.2.10 – WINDOWS TO STREET

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	[Specify that t]he area is measured on the visible interior faces of walls.	Accept in-part	A new definition for street-facing facades has been proposed to address this issue.
186	Bob Burnett		Oppose	Oppose requirement for 20% glazed area to street frontage in particular on southern facing housing.	Reject in-part	Council is required to implement the MDRS density standard, making this more lenient as appropriate. Such orientation-based issues can be considered through consent.
762	Daniel Crooks for New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	Seek Amendment	[Introduce Clause or amend proposed rule] to address thermal performance of windows, including overheating or loss of heat depending on the orientation.	Reject	Council is required to implement the MDRS density standard, only making this more lenient as appropriate.
673	Anne Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Reject in-part	Council is required to implement the MDRS density standard, only making this more lenient as appropriate.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
519	James Carr		Seek Amendment	Seeks a visual connection rule be added to the zone.	Reject	Council is required to implement the MDRS density standard, only making this more lenient as appropriate.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	That the area calculation excludes any garage walls.	Reject in-part	Council is required to implement the MDRS density standard, only making this more lenient as appropriate. A definition has been added to make this clearer, however applying the control as requested would act as an incentive to only have garage walls facing the street, resulting in the opposite effect of what the intention of the rule is.
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Seek Amendment	14.5.2.10 – Windows to the street 1. Retain clauses (a)-(d) as notified. 2. Delete clause (e).	Reject in-part	I accept that the wording in e) could be clearer and recommend changes accordingly.



No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
811	Luke Hinchey for Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Seek Amendment	amend Standard 14.5.2.10 as follows to provide for retirement units: 14.5.2.10 Windows to street a. Any residential unit or retirement unit, facing the a public street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors.	<b>OUT-OF-SCOPE – Reject Accept in-part</b>	<b><u>Retirement village controls in MDRS only areas are out of scope.</u></b> <b><u>Retirement villages will contain residential units and will be subject to the standard. I agree that a more bespoke approach is needed for retirement villages considering their occupancy and the passive surveillance intent of the MDRS standard. I recommend that the rule only apply to public streets for retirement villages; a reduced 15% glazing requirement is applied; and percentage is measured the façade is measured across the total street facing façade of buildings facing a public road.</u></b>
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Amend subclause (c) from 12m to 6m	Reject	The 12m exemption is considered appropriate to address a variety of dwelling forms and only applies to street-facing facades, which has proposed to be defined in the Plan.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	<p>Amend subclause (c) from 12m to 6m</p> <p>The area is measured on the visible interior faces of walls. This is the area of wall that occupants experience so it is a more realistic measure.</p> <p>The area of measurement is more clearly defined, is it from finished floor level to finished ceiling level, or from ground level?</p> <p>That the area calculation excludes any garage walls. This is the approach taken by, for example, the Selwyn District Council.</p> <p>Amend subclause (e) from 17.5% to 15%.</p>	Reject in-part	<p>The 12m exemption is considered appropriate to address a variety of dwelling forms and only applies to street-facing facades, which has proposed to be defined in the Plan.</p> <p>The rule has been recommended to be further modified to permit 15% under specific conditions.</p>
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	[That t]The area of measurement is more clearly defined, is it from finished floor level to finished ceiling level, or from ground level?	Accept in-part	The diagram included addresses where this is measured from, but accept that greater clarity can be provided, as required.
89	Andrew Evans		Seek Amendment	Amend 14.5.2.10 b. to remove all mention of a single gable exclusion and replace to exclude all roof spaces.	Reject in-part	The exclusion as notified is intended to operate as per the submission point.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Amend subclause (e) from 17.5% to 15%.	Accept in-part	The rule has been recommended to be further modified to permit 15% under specific conditions.
235	Geordie Shaw		Seek Amendment	[That the standard allows more flexibility in achieving the intent of the policies]	Accept in-part	The rule has been recommended to be further modified to permit 15% under specific conditions.
89	Andrew Evans		Seek Amendment	Amend 14.5.2.10 a. to be 15% of street facing facade to be in glazing (proposed is 20%). or alternatively amend 14.5.2.10e to have concession to being 15% (proposed is 17.5%)	Accept in-part	The rule has been recommended to be further modified to permit 15% under specific conditions.
762	Daniel Crooks for New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	Seek Amendment	[A]dd clarification to the rule that the 'single gable' can apply to each street facing unit on the site. Consideration should also be given to allow mono pitch roofs of a reasonable slope 25+° (half gable roofs) to also be accommodated for in this rule.	Accept in-part	This is addressed in the definition of street-facing façade and the diagram included. However, I accept that greater clarity could be provided in the diagram.
903	Andrew Mactier for Danne Mora Limited	Danne Mora Limited	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.5.2.11 to ensure the term 'road' is identified as a definition.	Reject	This is already defined in Chapter 2.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
762	Daniel Crooks for New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	Seek Amendment	[Amend text to address spelling mistake on 14.5.2.10 e. i. “highter”]	Accept	
55	Tobias Meyer		Support	Retain Rule 14.5.2.10 - Windows to street	Acknowledge	

#### 14.5.2.11 – MINIMUM UNIT SIZE

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Support	Retain rule as notified.	Acknowledge	
914	Julie Comfort for Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd	Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.5.2.11 to ensure the term ‘road’ is identified as a definition.	Reject	This is defined in Chapter 2.

**14.5.2.12 – GROUND FLOOR HABITABLE ROOM**

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Seek Amendment	<p>14.5.2.12 – Ground floor habitable room Amend the rule as follows:</p> <p>a. Any building that includes a residential unit shall:</p> <p>i. Where the residential unit fronts a road or public open space, unless built over a separate ground floor residential unit, have a habitable room located at ground floor level with a minimum internal dimension of 3 metres; and</p> <p>ii. Any residential unit shall have at least 50% of any ground floor area as habitable rooms.</p> <p>a. Where a residential unit fronts a road or public open space, it shall have a habitable room with a minimum internal dimension of 3 metres located at the ground floor level facing the frontage. This rule does not apply to upper-level units that are built over a separate ground floor residential unit; and</p> <p>b. Where the permitted height limit is over 11m (refer to Rule 14.5.2.3), a</p>	Accept in-part	I refer to recommendations by Mr Hattam.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
				<p>minimum of 50% of the ground floor area across the site shall be occupied by habitable spaces and/or indoor communal living space. This area may include pedestrian access to lifts, stairs, and foyers.</p> <p>c. This rule does not apply to residential units in a retirement village.</p>		
673	Anne Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Reject in-part	Privacy considerations are considered through matters of discretion.
823	Jo Appleyard for The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Oppose	Delete all new or amended provisions, to the extent that they conflict with or are less enabling than the mandatory MDRS and/or impose additional constraints relative to the status quo.	Accept in-part	Provisions proposed are not intended to restrict MDRS density standards. Council is required to implement MDRS across all relevant residential standards, only making this more lenient as appropriate, or when giving effect to Policy 3.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
814	Jo Appleyard for Carter Group Limited	Carter Group Limited	Oppose	Oppose Rule 14.5.2.12. Seek that this be deleted.	Reject	Provisions proposed are not intended to restrict MDRS density standards. Council is required to implement MDRS across all relevant residential standards, only making this more lenient as appropriate, or when giving effect to Policy 3.
293	Lincoln Platt for Exsto Architecture	Exsto Architecture	Seek Amendment	Amend the wording of clause (ii), provision 14.5.2.12 to 'shall have at least 50% of any ground floor area as habitable rooms'.	Reject	The rule is designed to be applied any residential unit at the ground floor within a site.

#### 14.5.2.13 – SERVICE, STORAGE, AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
184	Kelly Bombay for University of Canterbury	University of Canterbury	Support	Support in part. Concerned about the prescriptiveness of this rule and the potential for perverse, albeit unintentional, design outcomes for a development This is a similar concern with Rule 14.6.2.11(a)(ii) in the High Density Residential Zone	Accept in-part	I accept that greater clarity should be provided for the rule and it's application.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
798	Bjorn Dunlop for Wolfbrook	Wolfbrook	Seek Amendment	Clarify Storage requirement	Accept	I accept that greater clarity should be provided for the rule.
798	Bjorn Dunlop for Wolfbrook	Wolfbrook	Seek Amendment	Amend waste management space requirement to be more flexible for communal bin areas and waste management plans.	Accept	I recommend that a new Controlled Activity is added for communal bins, reflective of the <b>prospective Waste Management and Minimisation</b> bylaw <b>2023 changes</b> .
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Seek Amendment	14.5.2.13 - storage 1. Retain clause (a).  2. Delete clause (b).  3. Alternatively storage could be addressed as an assessment matter for developments of 4 or more units.	Reject	Internal storage controls are important to ensure that housing is designed for multiple household types and improves the transition to a more intensified urban form.
30	Doug Latham		Seek Amendment	Amend Rule 14.5.2.13 'Service, storage, and waste management spaces' to reduce storage volumes required and/or allow bedroom & garage storage to be included.	Reject	Internal storage controls are important to ensure that housing is designed for multiple household types and improves the transition to a more intensified urban form.



No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
89	Andrew Evans		Oppose	Seek to remove requirement for storage space.	Reject	Internal storage controls are important to ensure that housing is designed for multiple household types and improves the transition to a more intensified urban form.
798	Bjorn Dunlop for Wolfbrook	Wolfbrook	Seek Amendment	Washing line space should not be a dedicated area if a fold down system is proposed.	Reject	Such an approach is likely to lead to perverse outcomes, increasing conflicts in outdoor areas. I refer to evidence by Mr Hattam and Ms Blair.
814	Jo Appleyard for Carter Group Limited	Carter Group Limited	Oppose	Oppose 14.5.2.13. Seek that this be deleted.	Reject	This caters for the day-to-day needs of residents. Internal storage controls are important to ensure that housing is designed for multiple household types and improves the transition to a more intensified urban form.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
762	Daniel Crooks for New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	Seek Amendment	[Amend rule to] clearly establish or define a minimum size for the 'garage' i.e. 5.5 x 3.1 for single car (as per current council guidelines) to allow for storage to be co-located in the garage by increasing its size to suit i.e. storage at the end of a garage.	Accept	This <u>will</u> improve clarity of the rule and recommend is adopted.
112	Nikki Smetham		Support	[Retain minimum storage standard]	Acknowledge	
811	Luke Hinchey for Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Seek Amendment	Either delete Built Form Standard 14.5.2.13. or amend Standard 14.5.2.13 as follows to provide for retirement units: 14.5.2.13 Service, storage and waste management spaces [Standard as notified] This standard does not apply to retirement villages or their associated units within.	<del>Reject</del> — <b>Out of Scope</b> <b>Accept</b>	<b><u>I consider that this rule should not apply to residential units within a retirement village given their comprehensive design and degree of residential servicing throughout.</u></b>

#### 14.5.2.14 – WATER SUPPLY FOR FIRE FIGHTING

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Neutral - no decision given	Acknowledge
842	Lydia Shirley for Fire and Emergency	Fire and Emergency	Support	Retain Rule 14.5.2.14 - Water supply for firefighting as notified.	Acknowledge

#### 14.5.2.15 – GARAGING AND CARPORT BUILDING LOCATION

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
811	Luke Hinchey for Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Seek Amendment	[S]eek[s] to amend Standard 14.5.2.15 to exclude retirement units.	Accept in-part	<b><u>Operative retirement village controls should apply in MRZ.</u></b> <b><u>I consider the rule appropriate where a retirement village fronts a public road; specific exclusion(s) should be made accordingly.</u></b>

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Seek Amendment	<p>14.5.2.15 – Garage location Amend the rule as follows:</p> <p>14.5.2.15 garaging and carport building and parking area location</p> <p>When developing four or more residential units on a single site, where a residential unit fronts towards a road, any garage, or carport shall be located at least 1.2 metres behind the front façade of a residential unit.</p>	Accept in part	I agree with the proposed changes, however also recommend that parking area and street-facing façade should be noted in the rule.
798	Bjorn Dunlop for Wolfbrook	Wolfbrook	Seek Amendment	Amend to control garaging on the street facing boundary only as that is the primary view.	Accept in part	I agree that the application of the rule should simply be for street-facing units and recommend changes accordingly.
823	Jo Appleyard for The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Oppose	Delete all new or amended provisions, to the extent that they conflict with or are less enabling than the mandatory MDRS and/or impose additional constraints relative to the status quo.	Accept in part	Council is able to apply related provisions under s80E of the Act where this does not impede MDRS density standards from being achieved.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
814	Jo Appleyard for Carter Group Limited	Carter Group Limited	Oppose	Oppose Rule 14.5.2.15. Seek that this be deleted.	Reject	Council is able to apply related provisions under s80E of the Act where this does not impeded MDRS density standards from being achieved.

#### 14.5.2.16 – BUILDING REFLECTIVITY

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Amend subclause (a) from 30% to 45% LRV.	Reject	The operative LRV rating is sought to be retained within residential hills.
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	Amend subclause (a) from 30% to 45% LRV.	Reject	The operative LRV rating is sought to be retained within residential hills.

834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Oppose	14.5.2.16 – Building reflectivity; and RD29 Delete rule.	Reject	The operative LRV rating is sought to be retained within residential hills.
-----	--	------------------------------------	--------	--	--------	---

#### 14.5.2.17 – LOCATION OF OUTDOOR MECHANICAL VENTILATION

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	Amend subclause (a) to require outdoor units visible from the street to be screened.	Accept	I agree and recommend changes accordingly.
762	Daniel Crooks for New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	Seek Amendment	[Remove or re-write rule to clarify the intention with regard to aesthetics, acoustics or comfort]	Accept-in part	The principal reason for the rule is to better manage street amenity and connectivity. Changes have been recommended to simplify the rule accordingly.
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Oppose	14.5.2.17 – Location of outdoor mechanical ventilation; And RD30 Delete the rule.	Reject	The principal reason for the rule is to better manage street amenity and connectivity. Changes have been recommended to simplify the rule accordingly.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
52	Gavin Keats		Seek Amendment	Amend 14.5.2.17 to require that noisy plants, such as heat pumps, hot water heat pumps, inverters be installed in an acoustically isolated plant room.	Reject	The principal reason for the rule is to better manage street amenity and connectivity. Changes have been recommended to simplify the rule accordingly. The requested control would be excessive and are best managed through district-wide acoustic controls.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Amend subclause (a) to require outdoor units visible from the street to be screened.	Accept	I agree and recommend changes accordingly.
823	Jo Appleyard for The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Oppose	Delete all new or amended provisions, to the extent that they conflict with or are less enabling than the mandatory MDRS and/or impose additional constraints relative to the status quo.	Reject	The principal reason for the rule is to better manage street amenity and connectivity. Changes have been recommended to simplify the rule accordingly.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
814	Jo Appleyard for Carter Group Limited	Carter Group Limited	Oppose	Oppose Rule 14.5.2.17. Seek that this be deleted.	Reject	The principal reason for the rule is to better manage street amenity and connectivity. Changes have been recommended to simplify the rule accordingly.
89	Andrew Evans		Oppose	Retain the current provisions.	Reject	The principal reason for the rule is to better manage street amenity and connectivity. Changes have been recommended to simplify the rule accordingly.



## 14.6 – HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE

### 14.6.1 – ACTIVITY TABLES

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
<b>Considered elsewhere</b>	<i>These submission points relate to matters not addressed in this evidence.</i>	<b><u>805.27 (Waka Kotahi (NZ Transport Agency) – WITHDRAWN)</u></b> , 1048.28 <b><u>(Cameron Matthews)</u></b> , 834.213 <b><u>(Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities)</u></b>	Please make reference to the following evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airport Noise Contour – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• Residential Character Areas – Ms While</li> <li>• Residential Character Areas – Ms Dixon</li> <li>• Electricity transmission – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• Industrial / Residential interface – Ms Ratka</li> <li>• Railway setback – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• Landscaping and Tree Canopy – Ms Hansbury</li> </ul>
<b>Support, as notified</b> 166 submission points	These 157 submitters expressed broad support for the proposed council intensification response, specifically enabling residential buildings of six and 10-storeys.	72.3 <b><u>(Rosemary Neave)</u></b> , 191.8 <b><u>(Logan Brunner)</u></b> , 233.12 <b><u>(Paul Clark)</u></b> , 262.10 <b><u>(Alfred Lang)</u></b> , 263.10 <b><u>(Harley Peddie)</u></b> , 264.12 <b><u>(Aaron Tily)</u></b> , 265.12 <b><u>(John Bryant)</u></b> , 266.12 <b><u>(Alex Hobson)</u></b> , 267.12 <b><u>(Justin Muirhead)</u></b> , 268.12 <b><u>(Clare Marshall)</u></b> , 269.12 <b><u>(Yvonne Gilmore)</u></b> , 270.12 <b><u>(Rob Harris)</u></b> , 271.12 <b><u>(Pippa Marshall)</u></b> , 273.12 <b><u>(Ian Chesterman)</u></b> , 274.12, 274.13 <b><u>(Robert Fleming)</u></b> , 305.4 <b><u>(Vickie Hearnshaw)</u></b> , 342.10 <b><u>(Adrien Taylor)</u></b> , 345.12 <b><u>(Monique Knaggs)</u></b> , 346.12 <b><u>(George Laxton)</u></b> , 347.12 <b><u>(Elena Sharkova)</u></b> , 350.9 <b><u>(Felix Harper)</u></b> , 361.8 <b><u>(James Gardner)</u></b> , 362.10 <b><u>(Cynthia Roberts)</u></b> , 365.11 <b><u>(Andrew Douglas-Clifford)</u></b> , 366.12 <b><u>(Olivia Doyle)</u></b> , 370.12 <b><u>(Simon Fitchet)</u></b> , 371.8 <b><u>(Nkau Ferguson-spence)</u></b> ,	<b>Acknowledge</b>

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
		<p>372.12 (<a href="#">Julia Tokumaru</a>), 373.12 (<a href="#">Mark Stringer</a>), 374.12 (<a href="#">Michael Redepenning</a>), 375.12 (<a href="#">Aidan Ponsonby</a>), 379.11 (<a href="#">Indiana De Boo</a>), 384.12 (<a href="#">Christopher Seay</a>), 387.12 (<a href="#">Christopher Henderson</a>), 389.10 (<a href="#">Emma Coumbe</a>), 391.12 (<a href="#">Ezra Holder</a>), 392.12 (<a href="#">Ella McFarlane</a>), 393.12 (<a href="#">Sarah Laxton</a>), 394.11 (<a href="#">Lesley Kettle</a>), 395.12 (<a href="#">Emily Lane</a>), 415.8 (<a href="#">Blake Thomas</a>), 416.5 (<a href="#">Anake Goodall</a>), 503.10 (<a href="#">Jamie Lang</a>), 505.5 (<a href="#">Jarred Bowden</a>), 510.6 (<a href="#">Ewan McLennan</a>), 512.13 (<a href="#">Harrison McEvoy</a>), 515.12 (<a href="#">Zachary Freiberg</a>), 516.12 (<a href="#">Jessica Nimmo</a>), 517.12 (<a href="#">Alex McNeill</a>), 519.15 (<a href="#">James Carr</a>), 520.12 (<a href="#">Amelie Harris</a>), 521.12 (<a href="#">Thomas Garner</a>), 522.12 (<a href="#">Lisa Smailes</a>), 523.5 (<a href="#">Adam Currie</a>), 524.12 (<a href="#">Daniel Tredinnick</a>), 525.12 (<a href="#">Gideon Hodge</a>), 527.12 (<a href="#">Kaden Adlington</a>), 529.12 (<a href="#">Daniel Carter</a>), 531.5 (<a href="#">Claire Cox</a>), 532.11 (<a href="#">Albert Nisbet</a>), 533.12 (<a href="#">Frederick Markwell</a>), 537.10 (<a href="#">Matt Johnston</a>), 541.4 (<a href="#">Amelia Hamlin</a>), 542.4 (<a href="#">Ben Helliwell</a>), 544.4 (<a href="#">David Davidson</a>), 551.13 (<a href="#">Henry Seed</a>), 552.12 (<a href="#">David Moore</a>), 553.4 (<a href="#">Josh Flores</a>), 554.4 (<a href="#">Fraser Beckwith</a>), 555.13, 555.4 (<a href="#">James Cunniffe</a>), 557.4 (<a href="#">Peter Beswick</a>), 558.3 (<a href="#">Jan-Yves Ruzicka</a>), 559.4 (<a href="#">Mitchell Tobin</a>), 560.4 (<a href="#">Reece Pomeroy</a>), 562.4 (<a href="#">Rob McNeur</a>), 563.11 (<a href="#">Peter Cross</a>), 567.12 (<a href="#">Mark</a></p>	

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
		<p> <a href="#">Mayo</a>), 575.12 (<a href="#">Jeremy Ditzel</a>), 576.8 (<a href="#">Juliette Sargeant</a>), 577.13 (<a href="#">James Robinson</a>), ,578.12 (<a href="#">Jamie Dawson</a>), 586.6 (<a href="#">Joe Clowes</a>), 587.12 (<a href="#">Ciaran Mee</a>), 588.12 (<a href="#">David Lee</a>), 589.12 (<a href="#">Krystal Boland</a>), 594.9 (<a href="#">Hao Ning Tan</a>), 595.4 (<a href="#">Logan Sanko</a>), 596.4 (<a href="#">Hayley Woods</a>), 597.4 (<a href="#">Karl Moffatt-Vallance</a>), 598.4 (<a href="#">Caleb Sixtus</a>), 600.6 (<a href="#">Maggie Lawson</a>), 601.4 (<a href="#">Jack Hobern</a>), 603.4 (<a href="#">Evan Ross</a>), 604.4 (<a href="#">Daniel Morris</a>), 606.4 (<a href="#">Alanna Reid</a>), 607.4 (<a href="#">Mathew Cairns</a>), 608.4 (<a href="#">Denisa Dumitrescu</a>), 609.3 (<a href="#">Morgan Patterson</a>), 610.4 (<a href="#">Alexia Katisipis</a>), 612.4 (<a href="#">Hamish McLeod</a>), 613.4 (<a href="#">Noah Simmonds</a>), 614.4 (<a href="#">Matthew Coulthurst</a>), 615.4 (<a href="#">Analijia Thomas</a>), 616.4 (<a href="#">Elizabeth Oquist</a>), 617.4 (<a href="#">Tegan Mays</a>), 618.4 (<a href="#">Lance Woods</a>), 619.4 (<a href="#">Oscar Templeton</a>), 620.4 (<a href="#">Izak Dobbs</a>), 622.8 (<a href="#">Ella Herriot</a>), 628.4 (<a href="#">Tom Crawford</a>), 632.4 (<a href="#">Aimee Harper</a>), 634.4 (<a href="#">Georgia Palmer</a>), 635.4 (<a href="#">Suzi Chisholm</a>), 639.5 (<a href="#">Rory Evans Fee</a>), 640.4 (<a href="#">Steven Watson</a>), 641.4 (<a href="#">Andrew Treadwell</a>), 642.4 (<a href="#">Sophie Harre</a>), 643.12 (<a href="#">Keegan Phipps</a>), 645.4 (<a href="#">Laura McGill</a>), 646.12 (<a href="#">Archie Manur</a>), 648.4 (<a href="#">Brennan Hawkins</a>), 649.4 (<a href="#">Peter Stanger</a>), 650.4 (<a href="#">Charlie Lane</a>), 651.4 (<a href="#">Jess Green</a>), 652.4 (<a href="#">Declan Cruickshank</a>), 655.12 (<a href="#">Daymian Johnson</a>), 658.5 (<a href="#">Ben Thorpe</a>), 661.5 (<a href="#">Edward Parkes</a>), </p>	

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
		<p>662.5 (<a href="#">Bryce Harwood</a>), 713.12 (<a href="#">Girish Ramlugun</a>), 714.8 (<a href="#">Russell Stewart</a>), 715.12 (<a href="#">Sara Campbell</a>), 717.12 (<a href="#">Jonty Coulson</a>), 719.12 (<a href="#">Andrew Cockburn</a>), 721.5 (<a href="#">Ethan Pasco</a>), 722.4 (<a href="#">Nick Leslie</a>), 724.7 (<a href="#">Alan Murphy</a>), 727.7 (<a href="#">Birdie Young</a>), 733.12 (<a href="#">Michael Hall</a>), 738.11 (<a href="#">Pim Van Duin</a>), 752.12 (<a href="#">Amanda Smithies</a>), 753.12 (<a href="#">Piripi Baker</a>), 754.12 (<a href="#">Alex Shaw</a>), 808.4 (<a href="#">Josh Garmonsway</a>), 832.12 (<a href="#">Finn Jackson</a>), 837.12 (<a href="#">Sylvia Maclaren</a>), 839.12 (<a href="#">Jacinta O'Reilly</a>), 840.12 (<a href="#">Rosa Shaw</a>), 843.12 (<a href="#">Allan Taunt</a>), 844.12 (<a href="#">Hayden Smythe</a>), 1049.12 (<a href="#">Dylan Lange</a>), 846.7 (<a href="#">Lauren Bonner</a>), 918.11 (<a href="#">Geoff Banks</a>), 254.3 (<a href="#">Emma Besley</a>), <del>261.12</del>(<a href="#">Withdrawn</a>)</p>	
	<p>These 9 submission points expressed support for specific provisions, as notified, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retaining the activity status of activities throughout HRZ (#61);</li> <li>Retaining P1 (#237, #191);</li> <li>Retaining P6, P7, P12, P13, C1, C2, and RD1 (#237);</li> <li>Retaining RD5 (#556).</li> </ul>	<p>61.26, 61.27, 61.28, 61.25 (<a href="#">Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA)</a>), 237.36, 237.34, 237.35 (<a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a>), 191.5 (<a href="#">Logan Brunner</a>), 556.8 (<a href="#">Winton Land Limited</a>)</p>	<p><b>Acknowledge</b></p>
<p><b>Building height</b> 4 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters raised several points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10-storeys area should be increased to 35-storeys (#602);</li> <li>Opposed to 10-storey (32m) heights (#237);</li> </ul>	<p>602.8 (<a href="#">Devanh Patel</a>), 237.6 (<a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a>), 121.23 (<a href="#">Cameron Matthews</a>), 834.212</p>	<p><b>Building height:</b>  <b>Reject – 602.8, 237.6</b></p>

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase permitted heights to at least 6 storeys (#121);</li> </ul> Delete RD7 and RD8, replace with one rule for height non-compliances and retain notified matters of discretion (#834).	<a href="#">(Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities)</a>	<p><i>Please refer to assessment under the built form standard.</i></p> <p><b>Accept – 121.23, 834.212</b></p> <p>As a consequence of recommendation to the building height built form standard, RD rules must be updated. Reference is made to assessment under the built form standard.</p>
<p><b>Reduce central city heights</b></p> <p>1 submission point</p>	Robert J Manthei (#200) requests that buildings do not exceed 12m within the HRZ in the 4 Avenues.	200.7 <a href="#">(Robert J Manthei)</a>	<p><b>Reduce central city heights:</b></p> <p><b>Reject</b></p> <p>Council is required to provide for an intensification response in accordance with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, which requires at least six storeys to be enabled surrounding the city centre zone.</p>
<p><b>Central city focus</b></p> <p>3 submission points</p>	These submitters requested that any HRZ intensification is limited to the central city, with submitter #671 also requesting that this should also apply to the [former] Red Zone land [SPOARC].	81.1, 81.2 <a href="#">(Vivien Binney)</a> , 671.2 <a href="#">(Larissa Lilley)</a>	<p><b>Central city focus:</b></p> <p><b>Reject</b></p> <p>Council is required to provide for an intensification response in accordance with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Only a few sites within the former Red Zone are considered to lie within a Policy 3(c) catchment, but a qualifying matter has been proposed over this are to restrict intensification. Reference is made to evidence by Ms Hansbury.</p>
<p><b>Framework</b></p> <p>1 submission point</p>	Wolfbrook (#798) request that there are no Discretionary Activities for residential activities.	798.5 <a href="#">(Wolfbrook)</a>	<p><b>Framework:</b></p> <p><b>Accept</b></p>

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
			As stated earlier, I agree that there is a limit of RD for any residential activities. This should be applied throughout.
<b>Specific rules</b> 12 submission points	D1 – Education facility, spiritual activity, health care facility, or preschool activities:  Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (#834) requests that education, spiritual, health, pre-school activities are located inside the Four Avenues. Adopt the MRZ provisions/ activity status for such activities located in the HRZ outside the Four Avenues.	834.215 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<b>Specific rules:</b> <b>Accept - 834.215</b>  I agree that this is a result of using the RCC sub-chapter has a basis for the HRZ chapter. The framework outlined in the operative Plan under 14.5.1.RD8 should be adopted for such activities outside of the central city, as defined in Chapter 2.
	P10 – Retirement Villages  RVA (#811) supports this as notified.	811.68 ( <a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a> )	<b>Acknowledge</b>
	RD1 – Cultural activity at 52 Rolleston Avenue:  Fire and Emergency (#842) requests that the rule reference is updated, noting an error in rule reference.	842.34 ( <a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a> )	<b>Accept - 842.34</b>
	RD2 – Number of units, garaging, and habitable rooms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (#834) requests that duplication between RD2 and RD6 is addressed.</li> <li>• Andrew Evans (#89) requests that no reference is made to 14.15.1 (Residential Design Principles), leaving no matters of discretion for the non-compliance.</li> </ul>	834.202 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 89.13 ( <a href="#">Andrew Evans</a> )	<b>Accept in-part - 834.202, 89.13</b>  I acknowledge that there is duplication between RD2 and RD6, which should be addressed. Reference is made to the evidence of Ms Blair. However, I recommend that the request to remove reference to 14.15.1 is inappropriate and unworkable.

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
	RD4 – Retirement villages:  Fire and Emergency (#842) requests that the rule reference is updated, noting an error in rule reference.	842.35 ( <a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a> )	<b>Accept</b> - 842.35
	RD5 – Retirement villages:  Fire and Emergency (#842) requests that the rule reference is updated, noting an error in rule reference.	842.36 ( <a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a> )	<b>Accept</b> - 842.36
	RD7 & RD8 – Buildings between 14-20m/20-32m; buildings over 20/32m:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Winton Land Limited (#556) requests for the rule to make reference to six storeys, or reference 23m, retaining the 32m control, and associated standards. The submitter also requests for any breach to be exempt from any form of notification and for the HRZ Precincts to be removed.</li> <li>Submitters #61 and #237 request for matters of discretion to be broadened, restricting height to 20m and for the recession plane to be identified.</li> </ul>	556.9, 556.10 ( <a href="#">Winton Land Limited</a> ), 61.4 ( <a href="#">Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA)</a> ), 237.40 ( <a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a> )	<b>Accept in part</b> - 556.9, 556.10  As previous, it has been recommend that the permitted heights are modified and all HRZ Precincts are removed, largely addressing this request. <b><u>A single HRZ Precinct has been recommended (Central City Residential Precinct), focusing on the areas directly surrounding CCZ and enabling building heights of 39m. I do not consider the notification exemption clause appropriate.</u></b>  <b>Reject</b> – 61.4, 237.40  This does not adequately respond to the NPS-UD.
	RD17 – Wind effects for buildings above 20m:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (#834) requests that the rule is removed and replaced with a permitted standard, which could be under Chapter 6 (General Rules and Procedures).</li> </ul>	834.214 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<b>Accept in-part</b> – 834.214  As a consequence of the recommendation to change permitted heights, I consider it appropriate to create a new permitted standard within Chapter 6. The height reference should be 22m to align with permitted HRZ heights. Reference is made to evidence by Ms Blair.

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Winton Land Limited (#556) requests that the height threshold is increased to 23m.</li> </ul>		
<b>Notification</b> 11 submission points	A number of submitters requested changes to notification thresholds across HRZ rules, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (#834) and Otautahi Community Housing Trust (#877) request that notification thresholds are updated across rules.</li> </ul>	877.34 ( <a href="#">Otautahi Community Housing Trust</a> ), 834.200 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<b>Notification:</b> <b>Accept in-part</b> – 877.34, 834.200  I accept that notification thresholds should be reviewed as a consequence of wider recommended changes to the framework and to better address Clause 5 of MDRS. Reference is made to the evidence of Ms Blair.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitters #222, #584, #165, #164 request that the RD9 (Height in relation to boundary) and RD10 (Setbacks) are amended to require limited notification. Victoria Neighbourhood Association (#61) also request this is extended to RD13 (Landscaping and tree canopy cover) and RD21 (Mechanical ventilation), or any increase in height.</li> <li>Susan Barrett (#236) requests that notification is required for anything over two storeys.</li> </ul>	222.12 ( <a href="#">Deans Avenue Precinct Society Inc</a> ), 164.7 ( <a href="#">James and Adriana Baddeley</a> ), 165.5 ( <a href="#">Catherine &amp; Peter Baddeley</a> ), 61.52, 61.37 ( <a href="#">Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA)</a> ), 584.9 ( <a href="#">Claudia M Staudt</a> ), 236.1 ( <a href="#">Susan Barrett</a> )	<b>Reject</b> – 222.12, 164.7, 165.5, 61.52, 584.9, 61.37, 236.1  Specifying notification would be contrary to a s95 assessment under the Act and is considered ultra vires. Such an approach is also likely to be contrary to Clause 5 of MDRS.
	Submitters express support for limited notification not being precluded for non-compliances relating to height or height in relation to boundary.	62.5 ( <a href="#">Thomas Calder</a> ), 86.5 ( <a href="#">Melissa and Scott Alman</a> )	<b>Acknowledge</b>



Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
<b>Residential design principles</b>  3 submission points	Submitters #720 (Mitchell Coll) and #685 (Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ) request that the residential design principles (RDPs) are considered for any breach of built form standards;	685.55 ( <a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a> ), 720.25, 720.24 ( <a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a> )	<b>Residential design principles (RDPs):</b>  <b>Reject</b> - 720.25, 685.55, 720.24  I reject the request to remove RDPs from being considered under RD1 as they are appropriate to be relied upon for developments of four units or more.
<b>Consideration of commercial activities</b>  1 submission point	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (#834) requests that a new rule is created to allow for retail, office, and commercial services as a restricted discretionary activity at the ground floor.	834.216 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<b>Consideration of commercial activities:</b>  <b>Reject</b> - 834.216  I consider such an approach to be contrary to the centres-based approach under the NPS-UD. Reference is made to the evidence of Mr Lightbody.
<b>Inconsistent with Act and NPS-UD</b>  2 submission points	Submitters #814 (Carter Group Limited) and #823 (The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch) both seek that RD6 to RD23 are removed in their entirety as they are considered Inconsistent with Act and NPS-UD, or if considered appropriate, should be a Controlled Activity.	814.171 ( <a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a> ), 823.137 ( <a href="#">The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</a> )	<b>Inconsistent with Act and NPS-UD:</b>  <b>Reject</b> - 814.171, 823.137  This change relates to all newly proposed activity standards for HRZ. Removing this activity standard is an inappropriate means to manage effects. I consider that the threshold that is set is appropriate and has been provided by the Act and NPS-UD. Reference is made to section 6.2 of this report.
<b>Greater restrictions / controls – beyond MDRS</b>  11 submissions points	These submitters requested greater restrictions on controls directed by MDRS, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose six storeys.</li> <li>• Requirements for notification for activities either permitted by MDRS density standard or where directed by Clause 5 of MDRS.</li> <li>• Notification at southern boundary and Planes.</li> </ul>	771.2 ( <a href="#">Sarah Griffin</a> ), 13.3 ( <a href="#">Andrew Tulloch</a> ), 398.5 ( <a href="#">Jan Mitchell</a> ), 447.13 ( <a href="#">Alex Lowings</a> ), 460.6 ( <a href="#">Golden Section Property</a> ), 239.5 ( <a href="#">Andrea Floyd</a> ), 297.5 ( <a href="#">Kate Z</a> ), 376.6, 295.6 ( <a href="#">Barry Newman</a> ), 385.6, 259.12 ( <a href="#">Ara Poutama Aotearoa</a> )	<b>Greater restrictions / controls – beyond MDRS:</b>  <b>Reject – out of scope</b>  Council is required to implement MDRS in accordance with s77G of the Act, only limiting residential intensification in accordance with s77I of the Act. Requested changes would be contrary to MDRS.

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater controls to protect privacy and site density.</li> </ul> <p>Ara Poutama Aotearoa (Corrections NZ - #259) requests that definitions and controls are modified to provide for housing to support the needs of Courts and Parole Board [i.e. corrections housing].</p>		<p><b>Reject – out of scope - 259.12</b></p> <p>I consider modifying such controls beyond the scope of applying MDRS.</p>
<p><b>General opposition to intensification</b></p> <p>5 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters expressed their general opposition to the intensification response, particularly permitted activities for three units or three storey buildings/</p>	<p>427.5 (<a href="#">Michelle Warburton</a>), 141.4 (<a href="#">Aaron Jaggar</a>), 142.2 (<a href="#">Sue Sunderland</a>)</p>	<p><b>General opposition to intensification:</b></p> <p><b>Reject – out of scope - 427.5, 141.4, 142.2</b></p> <p>Council is required to implement MDRS in accordance with s77G of the Act, only limiting residential intensification in accordance with s77I of the Act.</p>
<p><b>Out of scope</b></p>	<p>The submitter request that an early determination on the recession plane qualifying matter.</p>	<p>14.7 (<a href="#">Kathryn Collie</a>)</p>	<p><b>Out of scope:</b></p> <p><b>Reject – out of scope - 14.7</b></p> <p>This submission is not on the content of the plan change.</p>

## 14.6.2 – HRZ BUILT FORM STANDARDS

### 14.6.2.1 – BUILDING HEIGHT

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
<p><b>Support, as notified</b></p> <p>35 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters supporting the HRZ proposal, specifically citing the 6 to 10 storey response and the housing supply that would be delivered. Others stated that the approach aligns with the intent of the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>793.4 (<a href="#">Fiona Bennetts</a>), 600.7 (<a href="#">Maggie Lawson</a>), 191.7 (<a href="#">Logan Brunner</a>), 237.5 (<a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a>), 595.8 (<a href="#">Logan Sanko</a>), 596.8 (<a href="#">Hayley Woods</a>), 597.8 (<a href="#">Karl Moffatt-Vallance</a>), 598.8 (<a href="#">Caleb Sixtus</a>), 601.8 (<a href="#">Jack Hobern</a>), 603.8 (<a href="#">Evan Ross</a>), 604.8 (<a href="#">Daniel Morris</a>), 606.8 (<a href="#">Alanna Reid</a>), 550.5 (<a href="#">Sam Mills</a>), 418.2 (<a href="#">Zoe McLaren</a>), 624.12 (<a href="#">Daniel Scott</a>), 656.12 (<a href="#">Francesca Teague-Wytenburg</a>), 137.1 (<a href="#">Diane Hide</a>), 594.10 (<a href="#">Hao Ning Tan</a>), 637.2, 637.6 (<a href="#">James Ballantine</a>), 254.10 (<a href="#">Emma Besley</a>), 551.14 (<a href="#">Henry Seed</a>), 552.13 (<a href="#">David Moore</a>), 553.13 (<a href="#">Josh Flores</a>), 554.13 (<a href="#">Fraser Beckwith</a>), 558.10 (<a href="#">Jan-Yves Ruzicka</a>), 560.13 (<a href="#">Reece Pomeroy</a>), 562.13 (<a href="#">Rob McNeur</a>), 563.12 (<a href="#">Peter Cross</a>), 559.13 (<a href="#">Mitchell Tobin</a>), 557.9 (<a href="#">Peter Beswick</a>), 631.3 (<a href="#">Matt Pont</a>), 507.9 (<a href="#">Paul Young</a>), 372.16 (<a href="#">Julia Tokumaru</a>), 724.9 (<a href="#">Alan Murphy</a>), 811.69 (<a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a>)</p>	<p>Acknowledge.</p>
<p><b>Permitted building height</b></p>	<p>Submitters seek the following regarding permitted building height in HRZ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend to reflect bordering higher density: 22m bordering CCZ, 16m bordering TCZ,</li> </ul>	<p>280.1 (<a href="#">David Brown</a>), 229.3 (<a href="#">Jennifer Smith</a>), 749.4 (<a href="#">Ryman Healthcare Limited</a>), 834.218 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 556.12</p>	<p><b>Permitted building height:</b></p> <p>I agree that greater building heights should be permitted to better give effect to the direction under the NPS. Note that under section 6.2, I discuss how</p>

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
17 submission points	<p>18m Boarding Larger TCZ, 12m bordering any other centre (#685, #720).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain 14m building height (#280, #16, #61).</li> <li>• Reduce to two storey (#229).</li> <li>• Reduce to 11m (#28).</li> <li>• Increase to 20m permitted [esp. on Park Tce] (#749).</li> <li>• Increase to 22m permitted (#834).</li> <li>• Increase to 23m permitted (#556, #814, #823).</li> <li>• Increase to 36m permitted around Riccarton, Hornby, and Papanui centres (#834).</li> <li>• Retain heights in Central City / Remove all height control in Central City and focus development here.</li> <li>• Only permit four storeys in any residential area.</li> <li>• Generally, apply a more restrictive threshold.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">(Winton Land Limited)</a>, 814.172  <a href="#">(Carter Group Limited)</a>, 823.138 <a href="#">(The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch)</a>, 685.56 <a href="#">(Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ)</a>, 720.26 <a href="#">(Mitchell Coll)</a>, 378.1 <a href="#">(Marina Steinke)</a>, 481.1 <a href="#">(Cindy Gibb)</a>, 28.1 <a href="#">(Alastair Grigg)</a>, 16.4 <a href="#">(Andrea Heath)</a>, 310.3 <a href="#">(Sarah Flynn)</a>, 45.2 <a href="#">(Kelvin Lynn)</a>, 344.10 <a href="#">(Luke Baker-Garters)</a>, 61.50 <a href="#">(Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA))</a></p>	<p>‘enabling’ can be an activity status of anywhere between and including Permitted to Restricted Discretionary. Consideration of notification thresholds must also be considered, alongside how zone objectives and policies set development outcomes in a way that supports the outcomes sought under the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Building heights are proposed to change from being permitted up to 14m, and then RDA thereafter, to being the full height that the zone anticipates. However, the consent trigger of &gt;3 units remains due to the relative importance of site layout, practicality, and building design – exacerbated as density increases.</p> <p>I support the increase of permitted heights to better give effect to the NPS-UD direction. Council has demonstrated that a height of 20m is adequate to provide for six storey development, however I support further modification of this to better enable six storey development and architectural and building design variation and innovation. I recommend that the permitted building height is increased to 22m, subject to specific form controls.</p> <p>Regarding the request by #685 and #720, the building heights proposed a less than the heights proposed to respond to Policy 3. <b>I recommend the request is rejected.</b></p> <p>The metropolitan centres response by Kainga Ora (#834) has been considered by Mr Lightbody, who maintains that Riccarton, Hornby, and Papanui Centres do not meet the criteria to be a metropolitan centre. However, building heights within these centres are proposed to be increased to enable 10 storey development (32m). I support this recommendation.</p>

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
			<p>Accordingly, <b>I recommend that the requested 36m permitted building height around these centres is rejected.</b></p> <p>Regarding a greater focus on the central city. I agree with submitters who state that the centre should have the greatest focus.</p> <p>The NPS-UD requires that greater intensification is progressed within the central city. There is a scale and significance element to this, with the largest centres required to have the greatest building heights. The notified proposal was to have 10-storeys surround the central city, due to the levels of services, transport, and housing demand within and around the centre. As earlier noted, I accept that this level could be increased to increase the incentives of development within and around the central city. Enabled building heights and controls should be seen to be commercially feasible in order to be attractive and focus development around the centre. I therefore partially accept those submissions seeing to increase this height, recommending this is increased to 12-storeys.</p> <p>Land within the central city (4 Avenues) is considered stand out, both in terms of its positioning in the current Plan and historically through the city's development. I therefore believe there is merit in also having an enabled building height which is greater than six storeys – i.e. introducing a third tier of building height for residential development within the walkable catchment from the central city.</p> <p>Recommendation included in this report accordingly propose that the future intensified 10-storey area is increased to 12-storey. Council is however required to provide a full Policy 3 response, which includes</p>

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
			<p>commercial centres outside of the city centre. I therefore reject any submission requesting a permitted building height less than 22m in height.</p> <p>As noted earlier, the Plan Change does not consider the greater enablement of specific land use activities, such as retirement villages, <b>however are subject to any increase in built form due to the MDRS and/or Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</b></p>
<p><b>Modification(s) to proposed rule</b></p> <p><del>11</del> 12 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters seek further modification of rule, being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require geotechnical assessment for any development over 10m.</li> <li>Require notification and consent for anything above 2 storeys.</li> <li>General improvements in clarity.</li> <li>Check applications for compliance with rule.</li> <li>Emergency service facilities, emergency service towers and communication poles are exempt from this rule (#842)</li> <li>Lower heights to protect sun access / ensure not loss of sun access.</li> <li>Better protect neighbouring privacy.</li> <li>Increase wind assessment threshold to avoid unnecessary consenting and encourage six storey development.</li> <li>Exemption for gable ends.</li> </ul>	<p>564.6 (<a href="#">Rachel Hu</a>), 236.2 (<a href="#">Susan Barrett</a>), 320.1 (<a href="#">Mark Figgitt</a>), 842.37 (<a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a>), 696.5 (<a href="#">Terence Sissons</a>), 1075.4 (<a href="#">Diana Shand</a>), 337.3 (<a href="#">Anna Melling</a>), 21.4 (<a href="#">Grant McGirr</a>), 295.3 (<a href="#">Barry Newman</a>), 67.10 (<a href="#">Rachel Davies</a>), 242.4 (<a href="#">Property Council New Zealand</a>), 685.33 (<a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a>), 34.2, 34.3 (<a href="#">Andrew McNaught</a>)</p>	<p><b>Modification(s) to proposed rule:</b></p> <p>The geotechnical assessment threshold is largely established within the delegation afforded to Council through the Building Act, outside of those areas of high natural hazard risk. I have discussed this with Council’s Senior Geotechnical Engineer, Ms Hebert, who has advised that site-specific geotechnical assessment and specific engineering design with geotechnical input is required for any residential development above two storeys, as is required for building two storeys or less in areas with high liquefaction vulnerability (like TC3).</p> <p><b>I therefore recommend that this request is rejected.</b></p> <p>Wind has been considered as part of the proposal and is proposed to be set at a threshold that is above permitted heights [i.e. buildings above 22m].</p> <p><b>I therefore recommend that this request is rejected</b></p> <p><b>Exemptions for emergency service facilities and equipment:</b></p>

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Remove building height standard (#34)</a></li> </ul>		<p>The submitter does not appear to suggest an alternative permitted height for such activities (noting that an ‘unlimited’ height would be inappropriate in a residential context). <b>I recommend that the maximum permitted height in the zone (14m) is provided for emergency service buildings, with exemptions for associated communication equipment.</b></p> <p><b>Regarding exemptions for gable ends - Reject:</b></p> <p>Allotments in Christchurch are typically deeper than they are wider, tending to force developments to be perpendicular to the road, having front doors and gable ends parallel to internal boundaries. Council has applied the Sunlight Access qualifying matter to better protect sun access in residential areas. The exemption of gable ends has the potential to compromise this, with additional shading effects across internal boundaries.</p> <p><b>Rule structure, clarity, and applying more restrictive controls</b></p> <p>The building height rule has been redrafted due to the application of a ‘full’ permitted building height. This has simplified its application and the consenting pathway. Controls that would restrict Policy 3 development would be contrary to s77G without an identifiable qualifying matter and <b>I therefore recommend submissions are rejected.</b></p> <p><b><u>Removal of rule – reject:</u></b></p>

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
			<p><u>I consider it necessary to apply a maximum building height standard within HRZ, with a consenting framework thereafter to consider the effects of greater heights on a case-by-case basis.</u></p>
<p><b>Minimum building height</b></p> <p>13 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters raised the following points regarding the proposal to have a minimum building height of 7m in HRZ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach counterproductive, impractical and overly restrictive / not enabling under NPS-UD.</li> <li>• Single storey development should be allowed in suburbs.</li> <li>• It must state two storey (#30).</li> <li>• Also add provision that developments must be greater than 3 units (#685).</li> <li>• Increase this to being no less than what is permitted in HRZ [14m] and permitted heights boarding commercial centres increased (#685).</li> <li>• Must be 3-4 storeys as minimum (#147).</li> <li>• Bottom units would have lesser sunlight access (as per sunlight access) and have poor health outcomes / amenity effects in existing suburban areas.</li> <li>• Single level dwellings should be permitted for older persons housing.</li> </ul>	<p>638.9 (<a href="#">Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc</a>), 720.27 (<a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a>), 237.41 (<a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a>), 147.4, 685.57 (<a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a>), 625.10 (<a href="#">Pamela-Jayne Cooper</a>), 220.9 (<a href="#">Martin Snelson</a>), 221.9 (<a href="#">Cynthia Snelson</a>), 758.1 (<a href="#">Tosh Prodanov</a>), 772.1 (<a href="#">Robert Braithwaite</a>), 30.11 (<a href="#">Doug Latham</a>), 867.2 (<a href="#">Robina Dobbie</a>), 903.36 (<a href="#">Danne Mora Limited</a>)</p>	<p><b>Minimum building height:</b></p> <p>Significant enablement is provided in HRZ areas when compared to operative Plan rezoning. The objective is to seek a transition to a higher density urban form. Residential s32 reporting showed that, despite RMD anticipating up to three storey development, almost 40% of development remains for single level dwellings (page 112). Setting a minimum baseline seeks to ensure that at least <i>some</i> form of intensification is progressed in the zone. While a greater level of height may better reflect zone outcomes, this may be considered infeasible for a variety of reasons (ground conditions, site dimensions, site layout, site size, expense of lifts and/or fire regulation(s), etc.) and therefore two storeys is seen as a balanced approach between enabling housing while not artificially restricting housing development.</p> <p>Older persons housing is possible at level, with a number of retirement villages in Christchurch adopting a multi-level building design. However, I acknowledge that this only addresses a small proportion of the market. <b>I therefore recommend that matters of discretion better consider older persons housing.</b></p> <p>Building height is used as a means to avoid conflating the definition of what constitutes a separate level, for example, whether a mezzanine is defined as a separate floor. A minimum building height of 7m likely forces a landowner/developer to build to two storeys,</p>



Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
			<p>since it is unlikely that a single storey dwelling of such a height is commercially feasible.</p> <p>I agree that the rule could potentially add an unintended complication for one-off developments or extensions. In light of this, and the request by #685, I <b>recommend that the rule is modified to only apply to development of 3 units or greater.</b></p>
<b>Maximum height control</b>	<p>Submitters seek that there is either an absolute maximum for residential units of five storeys (#276.1), or a maximum height of 22m.</p>	<p>276.1 (<a href="#">Steve Burns</a>), 338.3 (<a href="#">Kate Revell</a>), 339.4 (<a href="#">Chris Neame</a>)</p>	<p><b>Maximum height control:</b></p> <p>As discussed earlier, MDRS sets a maximum activity status of restricted discretionary, limiting the application of a maximum threshold. I <b>therefore recommend the submissions on this matter are rejected.</b></p>
<p><b>Greater location control/variation</b></p> <p>5 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters seek that there is greater variation in where HRZ is applied and to what degree. Points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Height limit of two-storey near Lacebark Lane close to local industrial and commercial zones (#349.9)</li> <li>• Manage interface between MRZ and HRZ; ensure that MRZ heights and planes applied (#330.1)</li> <li>• 10-storey HRZ area increased to 35-storey (#602.4)</li> <li>• Up to eight storeys within areas with good walkability (#55)</li> </ul>	<p>602.4 (<a href="#">Devanh Patel</a>), 349.3 (<a href="#">Stephen Deed</a>), 330.1 (<a href="#">John Stackhouse</a>), 55.6 (<a href="#">Tobias Meyer</a>), 834.218 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>)</p>	<p><b>Greater location control/variation:</b></p> <p>Addressing the requests in turn:</p> <p>Lacebark Lane is largely covered by the Residential-Industrial Interface qualifying matter. Reference should be made to evidence by Ms Ratka.</p> <p>Applying a more restrictive approach to MRZ along the HRZ boarder would not meet the requirements of Policy 3. I <b>therefore recommend that this submission is rejected.</b></p> <p>I do not support increasing the 10-storey area to 35-storeys due to the potential to adversely impact on the future economic viability of the central city. Such a height would not be seen to provide a scaled approach to centres and would not meet the requirements of a</p>

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incentivise within 5km of CCZ (#55)</li> <li>Increase intensification around centres (#55)</li> <li>Increase to 36m permitted around Riccarton, Hornby, and Papanui centres (#834).</li> </ul>		<p>Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. <b>I therefore recommend that this submission is rejected.</b></p> <p><i>Requests for greater intensification around specific centres, increases in catchments (#55, #834)</i></p> <p>Sections 6.3 and 6.4 of <a href="#">the s42A this report of Ike Kleynbos dated 11 August 2023</a> details recommended changes to catchments and levels of intensification. To summarise: greater intensification has been recommended around CCZ (12-storeys); all catchments around centres (except for large Local Centres) have a greater catchment; further rationalisation of zone boundaries has been recommended; greater intensification within Large Town Centres has been recommended by Mr Lightbody; and eight storeys has only been recommended as compensation for lost capacity around the Riccarton Town Centre.</p>
<p><b>More restrictive than MDRS</b></p> <p>1 submission point</p>	<p>Submitter seeks that permitted building level is set at two storeys, requiring consent at three.</p>	<p>239.3 (<a href="#">Andrea Floyd</a>)</p>	<p><b>More restrictive than MDRS – out of scope:</b></p> <p>As discussed above, such an approach would be contrary to s77G of the Act.</p>
<p><b>Opposed to Policy 3 response</b></p> <p>23 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters are generally opposed to the proposed Policy 3 intensification response, specifically stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus should be on the central city, only / suburban areas limited to 3 storeys.</li> </ul>	<p>862.2 (<a href="#">Lloyd Barclay</a>), 636.2 (<a href="#">Rod Corbett</a>), 892.4 (<a href="#">Wayne Robertson</a>), 359.2 (<a href="#">Kathryn Higham</a>), 902.19 (<a href="#">Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board</a>), 864.2 (<a href="#">Douglas Corbett</a>), 413.5 (<a href="#">Caroline</a>)</p>	<p><b>Opposed to Policy 3 response:</b></p> <p>The greater focus of intensification around CCZ has been discussed earlier. Council is required to enable at least 3 storeys (MDRS) and provide for a greater intensification response through Policy 3 of the NPS,</p>

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally opposed to intensification beyond 3 storeys;</li> <li>• Exempt block bounded by Riccarton Rd, Harakeke St, Kilmarnock St and the railway line; retain Suburban Residential Transitional Zone.</li> <li>• Opposed to six storeys in Hornby;</li> <li>• Opposed to six storeys in Merivale;</li> <li>• Better respond to traffic and amenity effects.</li> </ul>	<p><u>May</u>), 177.1 (<u>David Lang</u>), 666.2 (<u>Cooper Mallett</u>), 504.3 (<u>Diane Gray</u>), 571.27 (<u>James Harwood</u>), 81.3 (<u>Vivien Binney</u>), 34.1 (<u>Andrew McNaught</u>), 890.2 (<u>Graham William Hill</u>), 889.2 (<u>Susanne Elizabeth Hill</u>), 712.2 (<u>Robyn Pollock</u>), 450.1 (<u>Lee Houghton</u>), 71.1 (<u>Laurie Shearer</u>), 160.2 (<u>Simon Smith</u>), 496.2 (<u>Chris Rennie</u>), 10.2 (<u>Colleen Borrie</u>), 712.1 (<u>Robyn Pollock</u>), 142.4 (<u>Sue Sunderland</u>)</p>	<p>including at least six storeys. Providing for a building form less than this would be contrary to the Act (s77G and s77I).</p> <p>The above applies for requests around Riccarton, <u>Papanui</u> (Large Town Centre Policy 3 catchment), Hornby (Large Town Centre Policy 3 catchment), <u>Linwood, North Halswell, Shirley (Town Centre Policy 3 catchment)</u> and Merivale, <u>Sydenham, Church Corner</u> (Large Local Centre Policy 3 catchment).</p>
<p><b>Generally opposed to intensification</b></p> <p>30 submission points</p>	<p>General opposition to increase building heights; retain status quo generally sought. Other factors raised are effects on: privacy, amenity, housing supply, green spaces, and traffic.</p>	<p>225.7 (<u>Michael Dore</u>), 348.2 (<u>Annette Prior</u>), 203.2 (<u>Steve Petty</u>), 654.6 (<u>Wendy Fergusson</u>), 224.3 (<u>Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)</u>), 486.5 (<u>Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)</u>), 460.4 (<u>Golden Section Property</u>), 410.3 (<u>Teresa Parker</u>), 414.2 (<u>Jenene Parker</u>), 23.4 (<u>Linda Barnes</u>), 171.2 (<u>Paul McNoe</u>), 807.6 (<u>Howard Pegram</u>), 427.3 (<u>Michelle Warburton</u>), 467.5 (<u>Jillian Schofield</u>), 473.2 (<u>Nicole Cawood</u>), 408.1 (<u>William Menzel</u>), 422.1 (<u>Peter Troon</u>), 471.5 (<u>Kem Wah Tan</u>), 447.5 (<u>Alex Lowings</u>), 477.4 (<u>Di Noble</u>), 449.2 (<u>Mark Paston</u>), 434.2 (<u>Vincent Laughton</u>), 870.4 (<u>Susanne Antill</u>), 456.2 (<u>Michelle Alexandre</u>), 1047.4 (<u>Anna McKenzie</u>), 335.4 (<u>Lorraine Wilmshurst</u>), 866.2 (<u>Helen Adair</u>)</p>	<p><b>Generally opposed to intensification:</b></p> <p>These submissions request a scale of development that is less than MDRS or the requirements of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. <b>I recommend that submissions are considered out of scope and rejected.</b></p>

Theme	Points	Submission point(s)	Response
		<a href="#">Denize</a> ), 230.2 ( <a href="#">Andrew Ott</a> ), 777.2 ( <a href="#">Lisa Winchester</a> ), 297.6 ( <a href="#">Kate Z</a> )	

#### 14.6.2.2 – HRZ HEIGHT IN RELATION TO BOUNDARY (SUNLIGHT ACCESS QM)

Main theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
<p><b>Support Sunlight Access approach</b></p> <p>14 submission points</p>	<p>Support the qualifying matter, as notified. Submitter #644 also requests that a financial contribution is applied and paid to neighbouring properties when sunlight is less than 5 months in the year.</p>	<p>644.5 (<a href="#">Fay Brorens</a>), 276.4 (<a href="#">Steve Burns</a>), 196.4 (<a href="#">Brian Gillman</a>), 112.8 (<a href="#">Nikki Smetham</a>), 354.2 (<a href="#">Waimāero Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board</a>), 762.11, 762.46 (<a href="#">New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch</a>), 63.29 (<a href="#">Kathleen Crisley</a>), 89.14 (<a href="#">Andrew Evans</a>), 428.2 (<a href="#">Sarah Wylie</a>), 55.3 (<a href="#">Tobias Meyer</a>), 791.4 (<a href="#">Marie Dysart</a>), 835.18 (<a href="#">Historic Places Canterbury</a>), 918.8 (<a href="#">Geoff Banks</a>)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Support Sunlight Access approach – Acknowledge</b></p> <p>A financial contribution has not been evaluated as part of this process. The proposed means to address sunlight loss is needed to be the most efficient means to protecting sunlight. <b>I recommend that this submission point is rejected.</b></p>
<p><b>Support, with greater restrictions</b></p> <p>40 submission points</p>	<p>Support, with greater restriction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better protect winter sun.</li> <li>Modify to 3m and 45°.</li> </ul>	<p>584.8 (<a href="#">Claudia M Staudt</a>), 119.6 (<a href="#">Tracey Strack</a>), 502.4 (<a href="#">Kyri Kotzikas</a>), 205.30 (<a href="#">Addington Neighbourhood Association</a>), 406.3 (<a href="#">Michael Andrews</a>), 861.2 (<a href="#">Julie Robertson-Steel</a>), 61.9 (<a href="#">Julie Robertson-Steel</a>), 103.4 (<a href="#">Damian Blogg</a>), 104.4 (<a href="#">Ann Clay</a>), 100.4 (<a href="#">Mary Clay</a>), 674.9 (<a href="#">David Ott</a>),</p>	<p><b>Support, with greater restrictions – Reject</b></p> <p><b>Please refer to responses on MRZ submissions.</b></p> <p>Regarding consideration of narrow roads: I support this approach and recommend adopting a 1:1 ratio approach, as per the advice of Mr Hattam. Reference</p>

Main theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support sunlight for existing homes; amenity; solar panels.</li> <li>• Limit to 5 storeys.</li> <li>• Concern about mental health effects.</li> <li>• Enable outdoor washing line drying.</li> <li>• Greater restrictions in Merivale.</li> <li>• Greater controls over sunlight, safety, privacy, environmental factors and aesthetics.</li> <li>• Require notification for breaches at southern boundary.</li> <li>• Require notification of any breach.</li> <li>• Apply recession plane at round boundary for narrow roads.</li> </ul>	<p>360.3 (<a href="#">Rebecca West</a>), 220.5 (<a href="#">Martin Snelson</a>), 221.5 (<a href="#">Cynthia Snelson</a>), 851.3 (<a href="#">Robert Leonard Broughton</a>), 70.5 (<a href="#">Paul Wing</a>), 67.11, 67.2 (<a href="#">Rachel Davies</a>), 330.4, 330.2 (<a href="#">John Stackhouse</a>), 272.6 (<a href="#">Caitriona Cameron</a>), 169.2 (<a href="#">Richard Moylan</a>), 653.5 (<a href="#">David McLauchlan</a>), 52.1 (<a href="#">Gavin Keats</a>), 45.3 (<a href="#">Kelvin Lynn</a>), 23.6 (<a href="#">Linda Barnes</a>), 337.4 (<a href="#">Anna Melling</a>), 164.5 (<a href="#">James and Adriana Baddeley</a>), 188.5 (<a href="#">Riccarton Bush - Kilmarnock Residents' Association</a>), 237.42 (<a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a>), 734.6 (<a href="#">Marie Byrne</a>), 425.5 (<a href="#">Tom King</a>), 61.38, 61.6 (<a href="#">Heather Duffield</a>), 736.2 (<a href="#">Hannah Wilson Black</a>), 414.4 (<a href="#">Jenene Parker</a>), 222.7 (<a href="#">Deans Avenue Precinct Society Inc.</a>), 367.19 (<a href="#">John Bennett</a>), 876.5 (<a href="#">Alan and Robyn Ogle</a>), 580.4 (<a href="#">Darin Cusack</a>)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	<p>should be made to recommendations for building height.</p>
<p><b>Support, with use of alternate metric</b></p> <p>3 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters support the approach, but seek the use of the Australian sunlight standard, some referencing a minimum of 2 hours of daily sunlight access.</p>	<p>385.3 (<a href="#">Claire Williams</a>), 258.4 (<a href="#">Stephen Bryant</a>), 673.3 (<a href="#">Anne Ott</a>)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary</b></p>	<p><b>Support, with use of alternate metric – Reject</b></p> <p>Please refer to responses on MRZ submissions.</p>

Main theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
		<p><u><a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">Evidence of Ike Kleynbos: https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></u></p>	
<p><b>HRZ exemptions</b></p> <p>18 submission points</p>	<p><b>Support</b> exemptions, with following additions/modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater enablement of buildings above 12m (14.6.2.2.b) through removing setback controls or generally more permissive for taller buildings</li> <li>Add exemptions for gable ends, measured as “the upper 50% of a gable roof, measured vertically”</li> <li>Supportive of perimeter block enablement (14.6.2.2c.iv), enabling further: for six storey buildings; greater depths; more responsive depth; simplify approach</li> <li>Remove entirely or relax recession planes for buildings in HRZ.</li> <li>Apply MDRS recession plane along E/W boundaries.</li> </ul>	<p>676.2, 676.1 (<b>Jack Gibbons</b>), 191.13, 191.19 (<b>Logan Brunner</b>), 685.58 (<b>Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</b>), 720.28 (<b>Mitchell Coll</b>), 189.3, 189.10 (<b>Matt Edwards</b>), 121.22 (<b>Cameron Matthews</b>), 199.2 (<b>Joshua Wight</b>), 187.10, 187.3 (<b>Tom Logan</b>), 834.219 (<b>Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</b>)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos: <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></b></p>	<p><b>HRZ exemptions – Reject</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I have discussed the effect of removing the QM from HRZ. He has advised that this could affect upper level setback distances which would reduce sunlight access and separation. It would not manage long 3 storey development as well, and combined with exemptions this could have a greater impact. Main result is that it allows common 3 storey development close to the boundary where its impact could be significant. In HRZ the MDRS provide neither the highest capacity nor the best protection for neighbours amenity.</li> <li>Allotments in Christchurch are typically deeper than they are wider, tending to force developments to be perpendicular to the road, having front doors and gable ends parallel to internal boundaries. Council has applied the Sunlight Access qualifying matter to better protect sun access in residential areas. The exemption of gable ends has the potential to compromise this, with additional shading effects across internal boundaries.</li> </ul>

Main theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 20m depth still allows for a typical development, even with MDRS front yard setback. There are also options to step the rear of the building down at the rear, or focus development on the centre of the site where no recession planes apply. This has been considered this and a balanced approach has been proposed between providing opportunities with and managing building depths. Nothing inherent about 20m that means it is the most appropriate depth to build, balanced with its impact on neighbours.</li> <li>• Sunlight on the E/W is still of high value (morning and evening light) and accounts for about 20-30% of all sunlight access at the ground floor. Retain the proposal.</li> <li>• A balanced approach is needed with the qualifying matter to ensure that provisions are still practical and able to deliver an intensified urban form. The perimeter block development is part of this approach to make the most efficient use of existing allotments and help incentivise the amalgamation of allotments. Increasing controls to permit six storey developments along the boundary would have a significant impact. Tall buildings have instead been enabled through an exemption for buildings above 12m, focusing development on the centre of the sites to reduce significant shading effects.</li> </ul>

Main theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
	<p><b>Oppose</b> exemptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More restrictive approach for buildings above 12m (14.6.2.2.b); remove.</li> <li>• More prerequisites for perimeter block exemption (14.6.2.2c.iv).</li> <li>• Remove all exemptions to have more sunlight access.</li> <li>• More requirements for exemptions to apply: consider section size, aspect, and street width.</li> </ul>	<p>63.78 (<a href="#">Kathleen Crisley</a>), 625.11, 61.40, 61.41 (<a href="#">Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA)</a>), 638.11 (<a href="#">Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc</a>)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Oppose recession plane exemptions – Reject</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tall buildings have been enabled through an exemption for buildings above 12m, focusing development on the centre of the sites to reduce significant shading effects.</li> <li>• Narrow road consideration is detailed below.</li> <li>• Exemption in HRZ are intended to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Better enable the development on perimeter block development, increasing efficient land use and promoting site amalgamation;</li> <li>○ Better enable tall, high density, buildings through removing recession plane requirements above 12m, when complying with orientation-specific boundary setbacks;</li> <li>○ Accord with remaining elements of Clause 12 MDRS density standard unaffected by the qualifying matter.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Further MDRS modification</b></p> <p>4 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters seek modification of MDRS substandard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply plane to road boundary to better consider narrow roads.</li> <li>• Remove exemption of applying plane from far side of ROW.</li> </ul>	<p>685.59 (<a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a>), 720.29 (<a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a>), 315.9, 315.2 (<a href="#">Denis Morgan</a>)</p> <p><b>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary Evidence of Ike Kleynbos:</b>  <a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Further MDRS modification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is potential for six storey buildings or greater to have a shadow impact that crosses a whole street and be cast on parallel units. This would be most acute for roads oriented across and east/western axis. Mr Hattam has provided additional commentary on this matter. Evidence</li> </ul>



Main theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
		<a href="#">Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a>	<p>suggests a 1:1 approach, whereby greater control should be applied for six storey buildings. The suggested approach is to require a 4m setback for any part of the building above 14m in height where the legal width of a road is 18m or less. This ensure that there is a sufficient ‘void’ to account for smaller roads and reduce sunlight loss across a road. Reference is made to evidence by Mr Hattam for further discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sunlight access qualifying matter is only able to reduce controls to the extent necessary. The ROW exemption described is contained within MDRS density standard Clause 12 and reflects the lack of sunlight access need across accessways.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Oppose, remove the qualifying matter</b></p> <p>148 submission points</p> <p>[~132 proforma]</p>	<p>Oppose the qualifying matter for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar Northern Hemisphere cities have greater densities, including USA, and are highly liveable.</li> <li>Planes not greatly different from current Medium Density areas, where widths are less than 15m.</li> <li>MDRS should apply; approach restricts 3-storey development and constrains housing supply, decreasing affordability.</li> <li>Capacity modelling is inaccurate.</li> </ul>	<p>814.173 (<a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a>), 823.139 (<a href="#">The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</a>), 121.5 (<a href="#">Cameron Matthews</a>), 344.3 (<a href="#">Luke Baker-Garters</a>), 556.13 (<a href="#">Winton Land Limited</a>), 14.2, 14.8 (<a href="#">Kathryn Collie</a>), 834.77 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 12.2, 417.3, 599.2 (<a href="#">David Townshend</a>), 191.15 (<a href="#">Logan Brunner</a>), 189.5 (<a href="#">Matt Edwards</a>), 783.4 (<a href="#">Roman Shmakov</a>), 656.8 (<a href="#">Francesca Teague-Wytenburg</a>), 727.3 (<a href="#">Birdie Young</a>), 514.7 (<a href="#">Ann Vanschevensteen</a>), 1049.8 (<a href="#">Dylan Lange</a>), 507.3 (<a href="#">Paul Young</a>), 512.5 (<a href="#">Harrison McEvoy</a>), 519.17 (<a href="#">James Carr</a>), 370.8 (<a href="#">Simon Fitchett</a>), 373.8 (<a href="#">Mark Stringer</a>), 415.10 (<a href="#">Blake Thomas</a>), 416.7 (<a href="#">Anake Goodall</a>), 523.7 (<a href="#">Adam Currie</a>), 724.5 (<a href="#">Alan Murphy</a>), 662.7</p>	<p><b>Oppose, remove the qualifying matter – Reject</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please refer to responses on MRZ submissions.</li> <li>Reporting by the The Property Group has highlighted that scale sites for high density development are seldomly found, requiring the amalgamation of existing sites in order to get the yield to be commercially feasible (i.e. economies of scale). Evidence presented by Mr Hattam shows that the HRZ controls provide for a higher capacity when compared to MRZ controls. Proposals have sought to ensure that both smaller sites and scale sites are able to achieve a</li> </ul>

Main theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach delays housing delivery.</li> <li>• Does not meet s77L requirements.</li> <li>• Modelling used is inaccurate and understates effect.</li> </ul>	<p>(<a href="#">Bryce Harwood</a>), 505.7 (<a href="#">Jarred Bowden</a>), 528.5 (<a href="#">Lesley Clouston</a>), 531.7 (<a href="#">Claire Cox</a>), 639.7 (<a href="#">Rory Evans Fee</a>), 658.7 (<a href="#">Ben Thorpe</a>), 661.7 (<a href="#">Edward Parkes</a>), 721.7 (<a href="#">Ethan Pasco</a>), 754.10 (<a href="#">Alex Shaw</a>), 753.10 (<a href="#">Piripi Baker</a>), 624.7 (<a href="#">Daniel Scott</a>), 733.9 (<a href="#">Michael Hall</a>), 846.11 (<a href="#">Lauren Bonner</a>), 524.8 (<a href="#">Daniel Tredinnick</a>), 527.8 (<a href="#">Kaden Adlington</a>), 529.8 (<a href="#">Daniel Carter</a>), 537.6 (<a href="#">Matt Johnston</a>), 517.8 (<a href="#">Alex McNeill</a>), 267.8 (<a href="#">Justin Muirhead</a>), 520.8 (<a href="#">Amelie Harris</a>), 521.8 (<a href="#">Thomas Garner</a>), 522.8 (<a href="#">Lisa Smailes</a>), 346.8 (<a href="#">George Laxton</a>), 347.8 (<a href="#">Elena Sharkova</a>), 345.8 (<a href="#">Monique Knaggs</a>), 263.6 (<a href="#">Harley Peddie</a>), 266.8 (<a href="#">Alex Hobson</a>), 268.8 (<a href="#">Clare Marshall</a>), 269.8 (<a href="#">Yvonne Gilmore</a>), 533.8 (<a href="#">Frederick Markwell</a>), 553.9 (<a href="#">Josh Flores</a>), 847.8 (<a href="#">Will Struthers</a>), 262.6 (<a href="#">Alfred Lang</a>), 264.8 (<a href="#">Aaron Tily</a>), 265.8 (<a href="#">John Bryant</a>), 270.8 (<a href="#">Rob Harris</a>), 342.7 (<a href="#">Adrien Taylor</a>), 350.6 (<a href="#">Felix Harper</a>), 361.5 (<a href="#">James Gardner</a>), 363.7 (<a href="#">Peter Galbraith</a>), 364.9 (<a href="#">John Reily</a>), 365.7 (<a href="#">Andrew Douglas-Clifford</a>), 366.8 (<a href="#">Olivia Doyle</a>), 372.8 (<a href="#">Julia Tokumaru</a>), 374.9 (<a href="#">Michael Redepinning</a>), 375.9 (<a href="#">Aidan Ponsonby</a>), 379.8 (<a href="#">Indiana De Boo</a>), 384.9 (<a href="#">Christopher Seay</a>), 387.9 (<a href="#">Christopher Henderson</a>), 389.7 (<a href="#">Emma Coumbe</a>), 391.9 (<a href="#">Ezra Holder</a>), 392.9 (<a href="#">Ella McFarlane</a>), 394.8 (<a href="#">Lesley Kettle</a>), 395.9 (<a href="#">Emily Lane</a>), 507.7 (<a href="#">Paul Young</a>), 510.4 (<a href="#">Ewan McLennan</a>), 532.8 (<a href="#">Albert Nisbet</a>), 832.8 (<a href="#">Finn Jackson</a>), 839.8 (<a href="#">Jacinta O'Reilly</a>), 841.9 (<a href="#">Jess Gaisford</a>), 843.8 (<a href="#">Allan Taunt</a>), 844.8 (<a href="#">Hayden Smythe</a>), 578.8 (<a href="#">Jamie Dawson</a>), 590.8 (<a href="#">Todd Hartshorn</a>), 565.8 (<a href="#">Angela Nathan</a>), 568.8</p>	<p>level of high density development that responds to site sizes: permitter block development for smaller sites; no recession planes for buildings above 12m, when specific setbacks are achieved. These setbacks align with other provisions proposed, such as communal outdoor living areas and outlook space. In addition, a bonus building coverage has been proposed to help incentivising amalgamation of sites.</p>

Main theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
		<p> <a href="#">(Hazel Shanks)</a>, 573.8 <a href="#">(Jeff Louttit)</a>, 575.8 <a href="#">(Jeremy Ditzel)</a>, 576.10 <a href="#">(Juliette Sargeant)</a>, 587.8 <a href="#">(Ciaran Mee)</a>, 589.8 <a href="#">(Krystal Boland)</a>, 591.8 <a href="#">(Helen Jacka)</a>, 643.8 <a href="#">(Keegan Phipps)</a>, 393.9 <a href="#">(Sarah Laxton)</a>, 567.8 <a href="#">(Mark Mayo)</a>, 570.8 <a href="#">(Christine Albertson)</a>, 571.8 <a href="#">(James Harwood)</a>, 572.8 <a href="#">(Yu Kai Lim)</a>, 577.9 <a href="#">(James Robinson)</a>, 588.8 <a href="#">(David Lee)</a>, 646.8 <a href="#">(Archie Manur)</a>, 837.8 <a href="#">(Sylvia Maclaren)</a>, 840.9 <a href="#">(Rosa Shaw)</a>, 652.9 <a href="#">(Declan Cruickshank)</a>, 612.6 <a href="#">(Hamish McLeod)</a>, 613.6 <a href="#">(Noah Simmonds)</a>, 615.24 <a href="#">(Analijia Thomas)</a>, 633.4 <a href="#">(James Dunne)</a>, 271.8 <a href="#">(Pippa Marshall)</a>, 273.8 <a href="#">(Ian Chesterman)</a>, 274.8 <a href="#">(Robert Fleming)</a>, 557.6 <a href="#">(Peter Beswick)</a>, 718.8 <a href="#">(Gareth Holler)</a>, 555.9 <a href="#">(James Cunniffe)</a>, 233.8 <a href="#">(Paul Clark)</a>, 554.9 <a href="#">(Fraser Beckwith)</a>, 559.9 <a href="#">(Mitchell Tobin)</a>, 560.9 <a href="#">(Reece Pomeroy)</a>, 562.9 <a href="#">(Rob McNeur)</a>, 563.7 <a href="#">(Peter Cross)</a>, 713.10 <a href="#">(Girish Ramlugun)</a>, 719.8 <a href="#">(Andrew Cockburn)</a>, 752.8 <a href="#">(Amanda Smithies)</a>, 660.8 <a href="#">(Bray Cooke)</a>, 715.10 <a href="#">(Sara Campbell)</a>, 362.6 <a href="#">(Cynthia Roberts)</a>, <del>261.8 (WITHDRAWN)</del>, 503.3 <a href="#">(Jamie Lang)</a>, 516.10 <a href="#">(Jessica Nimmo)</a>, 72.7 <a href="#">(Rosemary Neave)</a>, 566.9 <a href="#">(Bruce Chen)</a>, 515.8 <a href="#">(Zachary Freiberg)</a>, 574.8 <a href="#">(Henry Bersani)</a>, 655.8 <a href="#">(Daymian Johnson)</a>, 738.8 <a href="#">(Pim Van Duin)</a>, 525.8 <a href="#">(Gideon Hodge)</a>, 551.12 <a href="#">(Henry Seed)</a>, 552.11 <a href="#">(David Moore)</a>, 717.10 <a href="#">(Jonty Coulson)</a>, 859.3 <a href="#">(Ministry of Housing and Urban Development)</a>, 811.70 <a href="#">(Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc)</a> </p> <p> <b><u>NOTE: Submissions and further submissions on the Sunlight Access QM has been collated in Appendix 1 to the Supplementary</u></b> </p>	

Main theme	Points	Submission point number	Response
		<a href="https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf">Evidence of Ike Kleynbos: https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Supplementary-evidence-report-of-Ike-Kleynbos-dated-15-September-2023-Appendix-1.pdf</a>	

#### 14.6.2.3 – HRZ SETBACKS

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
<b>Considered else where</b>	<i>These submission points are beyond the scope of this evidence and are considered elsewhere.</i>	381.16, 381.17 ( <a href="#">Kate Gregg</a> ), 829.11 ( <a href="#">Kiwi Rail</a> ), 685.61 ( <a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Character Areas – Ms White</li> <li>• Railway setback – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• Trees and Financial Contributions – Ms Hansbury</li> </ul>
<b>Support, as notified</b> 2 submission points	Submitters supports 14.6.2.12 as notified.	811.71 ( <a href="#">Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc</a> ), 89.15 ( <a href="#">Andrew Evans</a> )	<b>Acknowledge</b>
<b>Front yard control</b> 3 submission points	Submitters #685 (Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ) #720 (Mitchell Coll) request that that a sub-clause is added to ensure that garage doors do not extend over the road boundary.	783.6 ( <a href="#">Roman Shmakov</a> ), 720.30 ( <a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a> ), 685.60 ( <a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a> )	<b>Front yard control - Reject</b>  While I agree that such a control is beneficial, the setback control is directed by the MDRS density standard, which is tied to ‘buildings’. This definition includes garages, therefore having a control for garage

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
	Submitter #783 (Roman Shmakov) requests that any perimeter block development should be exempt from front boundary setbacks.		doors opening may have a proxy effect of increasing building setbacks.  Regarding perimeter block development exemption, I consider that the 1.5m setback is still appropriate to facilitate perimeter block development and mitigates conflicts between residents/visitors and pedestrians. Reference is made to the evidence of Mr Hattam.
<b>Accessory building exemption</b>  8 submission points	A number of different requests were made for this rule. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify that the rule exempts internally accessed garages (#834).</li> <li>The exclusion is removed (#638, #208).</li> </ul>	638.6 ( <a href="#">Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc</a> ), 205.13 ( <a href="#">Addington Neighbourhood Association</a> ), 834.220 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<b>Accessory building exemption - Accept – #834</b>  <b>Accessory building exemption - Reject – #638, #208</b>  The exemption is carried over from the operative Plan and ensures adequate flexibility for common accessory buildings, with additional flexibility. Removing performance criteria is considered inappropriate as remaining built form standards would ineffectively manage potential overshadowing, dominance, and privacy effects.
<b>Side and rear boundaries</b>  1 submission point	Jack Gibbons (#676) requested that setbacks along all side and rear boundaries is reduced to 0m (no setback).	676.4 ( <a href="#">Jack Gibbons</a> )	<b>Side and rear boundaries - Reject</b>  This approach would ineffectively manage boundary effects and I consider MDRS standards to be sufficiently lenient to provide for other means of reducing setbacks, i.e. common walls.
<b>Exclusions of eaves, overhangs, and gutters</b>  3 submission points	Submitters requested the following regarding this exemption:	834.220 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 685.62 ( <a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural</a> )	<b>Exclusions of eaves, overhangs, and gutters - Accept in-part</b>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase to 600mm, with 200m for gutters (#834).</li> <li>Decrease to 300mm overall along the road boundary (#685, #720).</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Designers NZ</a> , 720.32 ( <a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a> )	As per response to site coverage exemption, I agree that the exemption can be made more flexible and recommend a total exemption of 650mm, accounting for any overhang, eave, or gutter, rather than separating out elements. I make reference to evidence by Mr Hattam.
<b>Out of scope – Development Contributions</b> 1 submission point	The New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch (#762) requests that the Council develops a proposal where the public domain can accommodate for building setbacks over time, such as development contributions to aid in street upgrades in lieu of having a setback.	762.25 ( <a href="#">New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch</a> )	<b>Development Contributions - Reject – out of scope</b> The consideration of development contributions lies outside of the District Plan and is not part of PC14.
<b>Advice note</b> 1 submission point	Fire and Emergency (842) requests that the following advice note is appended to building setback standards:  <i>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</i>	842.38 ( <a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a> )	<b>Advice note – Accept - #842.38</b>
<b>Greater restrictions</b> 18 submission points	Most submitters sought that setbacks were increased to better protect sunlight access and reduce privacy and dominance effects. Some made specific reference to the management of window sizes that	23.2 ( <a href="#">Linda Barnes</a> ), 701.9 ( <a href="#">Ian McChesney</a> ), 734.4 ( <a href="#">Marie Byrne</a> ), 383.2 ( <a href="#">Colin Dunn</a> ), 57.3 ( <a href="#">Debbie Smith</a> ), 469.6 ( <a href="#">Beverley Nelson</a> ), 653.2 ( <a href="#">David McLauchlan</a> ), 221.8 ( <a href="#">Cynthia Snelson</a> ), 360.1 ( <a href="#">Rebecca</a> )	<b>Greater restrictions - Reject in-part</b> Applying greater restrictions would be contrary to MDRS and s77G of the Act.  <b>Greater restrictions - Accept in-part - #685</b>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
	<p>would overlook living areas as part of the assessment process.</p> <p>Submitter #685 requested that there was greater control for narrow streets, applying a setback of 11.5m the centreline of roads.</p> <p>Submitters #734 sought that greater restrictions are applied along heritage interfaces. Here, reference is made to evidence by Ms Dixon and Ms Richmond.</p>	<p><u>West</u>), 220.8 (<u>Martin Snelson</u>), 673.4 (<u>Anne Ott</u>), 674.8 (<u>David Ott</u>)</p>	<p>Within HRZ controls, narrower streets have sought to be considered through applying greater setbacks via the height control built form standard.</p>

#### 14.6.2.4 – HRZ OUTLOOK SPACE

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
673	Anne Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Accept in-part	Council is required to apply the applicable MDRS density standard. Consideration of privacy has been considered as part of Matters of Discretion.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
674	David Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Accept in-part	Council is required to apply the applicable MDRS density standard. Consideration of privacy has been considered as part of Matters of Discretion.
674	David Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Accept in-part	Council is required to apply the applicable MDRS density standard. Consideration of privacy has been considered as part of Matters of Discretion.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Add a further subclause to subclause (i) reading, "be contained within the property boundaries."	Reject	Such a control would be beyond the MDRS density standard.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Rewrite the subclause [i.i] to, "be clear and unobstructed by buildings or fences (excluding any doors or windows opening into an outlook space from the principal living room); and"	<b>Reject Acknowledge</b>	<b><u>Such a control would be beyond the MDRS density standard. This control is already captured: Clause 16(5) states that outlook spaces may be over driveways and footpaths "within the site". National Planning Standards definition of 'site' ensures that outlooks space is contained</u></b>



No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
						<u>within the legal parcel boundaries, with the exception that this may be over "over a public street or other public open space".</u>
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	Rule 14.6.2.4 (i) - Outlook Space Add a further subclause to subclause (i) reading, "be contained within the property boundaries."	<b>Reject</b> <u>Acknowledge</u>	<del>Such a control would be beyond the MDRS density standard.</del> <u>This control is already captured: Clause 16(5) states that outlook spaces may be over driveways and footpaths "within the site". National Planning Standards definition of 'site' ensures that outlooks space is contained within the legal parcel boundaries, with the exception that this may be over "over a public street or other public open space".</u>
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	Rule 14.6.2.4 (i)(i) Outlook Space Rewrite the subclause to, "be clear and unobstructed by buildings or fences (excluding any doors or windows opening into an outlook space from the principal living room); and"	Reject <u>in-part</u>	Such a control would be beyond the MDRS density standard. <u>It is noted that the standard requires buildings do not obstruct outlook, however a fence would not be considered a 'building' under National Planning Standards.</u>

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
811	Luke Hinchey for Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Support	Retain Standard 14.6.2.4 as notified.	Acknowledge	
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Support	Retain [standard] as notified.	Acknowledge	

#### 14.6.2.5 – HRZ BUILDING SEPERATION

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
89	Andrew Evans		Seek Amendment	Oppose the provision as notified.	Reject in-part	I accept that the clarity of the rule can be improved as it is intended to only to apply internal to a development site. I recommend that changes are made accordingly.
121	Cameron Matthews		Seek Amendment	Remove 10m High Density Residential Zone building separation rule – 14.6.2.5.	Reject <b>in-part</b>	I accept that the clarity of the rule can be improved as it is intended to only to apply internal to a development site. I recommend that changes are made accordingly.
814	Jo Appleyard for Carter Group Limited	Carter Group Limited	Oppose	Oppose Rule 14.6.2.5. Seek that this is deleted.	Reject <b>in-part</b>	I accept that the clarity of the rule can be improved as it is intended to only to apply internal to a development site. I recommend that changes are made accordingly.
823	Jo Appleyard for The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Oppose	Delete	Reject <b>in-part</b>	I accept that the clarity of the rule can be improved as it is intended to only to apply internal to a development site. I recommend that changes are made accordingly.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Amend the clause to read, "Residential units above 12 metres in height above ground level must be separated from any other residential units on the same site by at least 10 metres measured horizontally, except where a common wall is included.	Accept in-part	I accept that the clarity of the rule can be improved as it is intended to only to apply internal to a development site. I recommend that changes are made accordingly. Common wall exemption is already included in setback and height in relation to boundary controls.
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	Amend the clause to read, "Residential units above 12 metres in height above ground level must be separated from any other residential units on the same site by at least 10 metres measured horizontally, except where a common wall is included."	Accept in-part	I accept that the clarity of the rule can be improved as it is intended to only to apply internal to a development site. I recommend that changes are made accordingly. Common wall exemption is already included in setback and height in relation to boundary controls.
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Seek Amendment	Delete the rule and replace as follows: Any parts of a building located more than 12m above ground level shall be separated by at least 10m from any other buildings on the same site that are also located more than 12m above ground level. Or alternatively, delete the rule entirely.	Accept in-part	I accept that the clarity of the rule can be improved as it is intended to only to apply internal to a development site. I recommend that changes are made accordingly. Common wall exemption is already included in setback and height in relation to boundary controls.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
673	Anne Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Reject	Privacy is considered in matters of discretion. Council is required to apply MDRS and Policy 3 accordingly.
674	David Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Reject	Privacy is considered in matters of discretion. Council is required to apply MDRS and Policy 3 accordingly.

#### 14.6.2.6 – HRZ FENCING AND SCREENING

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
30	Doug Latham		Seek Amendment	Amend Rule 14.6.2.6 'Fencing and screening' to revert to current provisions.	Reject	Council is able to apply related provisions under s80E of the Act.
89	Andrew Evans		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to 14.5.2.9 a. i. to require fence heights to be 1.8m (not 1.5m), or; Provide for 1.5m fencing height and amend to have 0.3m above this to be partially transparent.	Accept in-part	I accept that 1.5m is inadequate to screen outdoor living areas and accept the recommendation from Mr Hattam to increase this to 1.8m.
684	Wayne Bond		Seek Amendment	[That] "i" be removed, with ['ii' / new 'i'] amended as follows: Location will read "Road boundary"; Fence height standard will read "Access visibility spay area 1.0m. Balance boundary width 1.8m."	Accept in-part	I accept that 1.5m is inadequate to screen outdoor living areas and accept the recommendation from Mr Hattam to increase this to 1.8m.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Rewrite the rule to, "Any fencing provided shall meet the following standards, being the maximum permitted height above the minimum floor level."	Reject in-part	While I accept that greater clarity of where height is measured from is needed, I do not accept that greater heights are appropriate in Flood Management Areas.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	Rule 14.6.2.6 (a) Rewrite the rule to, "Any fencing provided shall meet the following standards, being the maximum permitted height above the minimum floor level."	Reject in-part	While I accept that greater clarity of where height is measured from is needed, I do not accept that greater heights are appropriate in Flood Management Areas.
814	Jo Appleyard for Carter Group Limited	Carter Group Limited	Oppose	Oppose 14.6.2.6. Seek that this be deleted.	Reject	Council is able to apply related provisions under s80E of the Act.
823	Jo Appleyard for The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Oppose	Delete	Reject	Council is able to apply related provisions under s80E of the Act.
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Seek Amendment	Retain clause (iii) relating to internal boundaries as notified. Delete clauses (i) and (ii) and replace with the following (Operative Plan rule and associated diagrams reinstated):	Reject in-part	Council is able to apply related provisions under s80E of the Act.

#### 14.6.2.8 – HRZ WINDOWS TO STREET

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
673	Anne Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Reject in-part	Council is required to implement the MDRS density standard, making this more lenient as appropriate. Such orientation-based issues can be considered through consent.
762	Daniel Crooks for New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	Seek Amendment	[Introduce Clause or amend proposed rule] to address thermal performance of windows, including overheating or loss of heat depending on the orientation.	Reject	Council is required to implement the MDRS density standard, only making this more lenient as appropriate.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	That the area calculation exclude any garage walls.	Reject in-part	Council is required to implement the MDRS density standard, only making this more lenient as appropriate. A definition has been added to make this clearer, however applying the control as requested would act as an incentive to only have garage walls facing the street, resulting in the opposite effect of what the intention of the rule is.



No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
674	David Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Reject in-part	Council is required to implement the MDRS density standard, only making this more lenient as appropriate. Privacy issues have been considered in matters of discretion.
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Seek Amendment	Delete clause (e). Retain clause (a)-(d) as notified.	Reject in-part	I accept that the wording in e) could be clearer and recommend changes accordingly.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	[Require that t]he area be measured on the visible interior faces of walls.	Reject	The 12m exemption is considered appropriate to address a variety of dwelling forms and only applies to street-facing facades, which has proposed to be defined in the Plan.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Amend subclause (c) from 12m to 6m	Reject	The 12m exemption is considered appropriate to address a variety of dwelling forms and only applies to street-facing facades, which has proposed to be defined in the Plan.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	<p>Rule 14.6.2.8</p> <p>Amend subclause (c) from 12m to 6m</p> <p>The area be measured on the visible interior faces of walls. This is the area of wall that occupants experience so is a more realistic measure.</p> <p>The area of measurement be more clearly defined, is it from finished floor level to finished ceiling level, or from ground level?</p> <p>That the area calculation exclude any garage walls.</p> <p>Amend subclause (e) from 17.5% to 15%.</p>	Reject in-part	<p>The 12m exemption is considered appropriate to address a variety of dwelling forms and only applies to street-facing facades, which has proposed to be defined in the Plan.</p> <p>The rule has been recommended to be further modified to permit 15% under specific conditions.</p>
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	[That t]he area of measurement be more clearly defined, is it from finished floor level to finished ceiling level, or from ground level?	Accept in-part	The diagram included addresses where this is measured from, but accept that greater clarity can be provided, as required.
89	Andrew Evans		Seek Amendment	Amend 14.6.2.8. b. to remove all mention of a single gable exclusion and replace to exclude all roof spaces.	Reject in-part	The exclusion as notified is intended to operate as per the submission point.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
638	Garth Wilson for Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc	Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc	Seek Amendment	[Remove] exemptions for street-facing glazing	Reject	The exemptions still provide for ample glazing along a street-facing façade.
235	Geordie Shaw		Seek Amendment	[That the standard allows more flexibility in achieving the intent of the policies]	Accept in-part	The rule has been recommended to be further modified to permit 15% under specific conditions and exemptions are recommended to be further refined.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Amend subclause (e) from 17.5% to 15%.	Accept in-part	The rule has been recommended to be further modified to permit 15% under specific conditions.
89	Andrew Evans		Seek Amendment	Amend 14.6.2.8 a. to be 15% of street facing facade to be in glazing (proposed is 20%). or alternatively amend 14.6.2.8 e. to have concession to being 15% (proposed is 17.5%)	Accept in-part	The rule has been recommended to be further modified to permit 15% under specific conditions.
903	Andrew Mactier for Danne Mora Limited	Danne Mora Limited	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.6.2.8 to ensure the term 'road' is identified as a definition.	Reject	This is already defined in Chapter 2.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
914	Julie Comfort for Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd	Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.6.2.8 to ensure the term 'road' is identified as a definition.	Reject	This is already defined in Chapter 2.
55	Tobias Meyer		Support	Retain Rule 14.6.2.8 - Windows to street.	Acknowledge	
811	Luke Hinchey for Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Support	Retain Standard 14.6.2.8 as notified.	Acknowledge	

14.6.2.9 – HRZ GROUND FLOOR HABITABLE ROOM

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Seek Amendment	<p>Amend the rule as follows:</p> <p>a. Any building that includes a residential unit shall:</p> <p>i. Where the residential unit fronts a road or public open space, unless built over a separate ground floor residential unit, have a habitable room located at ground floor level with a minimum internal dimension of 3 metres; and</p> <p>ii. Any residential unit shall have at least 50% of any ground floor area as habitable rooms. a. Where a residential unit fronts a road or public open space, it shall have a habitable room with a minimum internal dimension of 3 metres located at the ground floor level facing the frontage. This rule does not apply to upper-level units that are built over a separate ground floor residential unit; and</p> <p>b. have at least 50% of any ground floor area as habitable rooms, except on sites where at least 25% of the building footprint is more than 4 storeys, which shall have at least 30% of any ground floor area as habitable rooms. A minimum of 50% of the ground floor area across the</p>	Accept in-part	I refer to recommendations by Mr Hattam.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
				site shall be occupied by habitable spaces and/or indoor communal living space. This area may include pedestrian access to lifts, stairs, and foyers		
673	Anne Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Reject in-part	Privacy considerations are considered through matters of discretion.
674	David Ott		Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to require assessment of privacy issues and outlook, particularly with respect to acceptable window sizes overlooking neighbouring living areas, as part of the assessment process for all developments.	Reject in-part	Privacy considerations are considered through matters of discretion.
78	Linda Blake		Seek Amendment	Supports Sunlight Access Qualifying Matters but opposes requiring a minimum of 30-50% of habitable ground floor rooms 14.6.2.9 condemns those living in ground floors adjacent to multistorey buildings to no sun for 3 months, as seasonal affective disorder (SAD) of reduced sun is a recognized medical condition and no sun for several months is not healthy.	Reject	The sunlight access QM has been designed to improve sunlight access and the habitable room control increases passive surveillance.

#### 14.6.2.10 – HRZ OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
11	Cheryl Horrell		Seek Amendment	Provide enclosed outside private space	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.
65	Ali McGregor		Seek Amendment	Provide adequate outdoor space for families.	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.
334	Michael Tyuryutikov		Oppose	Retain existing minimal courtyard area rules for residential properties.	Reject	Council is required to apply MDRS density standards in accordance with s77G of the Act.
89	Andrew Evans		Support	Support provisions as notified	Acknowledge	
811	Luke Hinchey for Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Support	Retain Standard 14.6.2.10 as notified.	Acknowledge	
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Support	Retain [standard] as notified.	Acknowledge	

**14.6.2.11 – HRZ SERVICE, STORAGE, AND WASTE MANAGEMENT**

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
184	Kelly Bombay for University of Canterbury	University of Canterbury	Support	Support in part. Concerned about the prescriptiveness of this rule and the potential for perverse, albeit unintentional, design outcomes for a development. Similar concern with Rule 14.5.2.13 (a)(ii) in the Medium Residential Zone.	Accept in-part	I accept that greater clarity should be provided for the rule and its application.
798	Bjorn Dunlop for Wolfbrook	Wolfbrook	Seek Amendment	Clarify Storage requirement	Accept	I accept that greater clarity should be provided for the rule.
798	Bjorn Dunlop for Wolfbrook	Wolfbrook	Seek Amendment	Amend waste management space requirement to be more flexible for communal bin areas and waste management plans.	Accept	I recommend that a new Controlled Activity is added for communal bins, reflective of the prospective bylaw changes.
30	Doug Latham		Seek Amendment	Amend Rule 14.6.2.11 'Service, storage, and waste management' to reduce storage volumes required and/or allow bedroom & garage storage to be included.	Reject	Internal storage controls are important to ensure that housing is designed for multiple household types and improves the transition to a more intensified urban form.



No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Seek Amendment	Delete clause (b). Retain clause (a), noting that if outdoor storage is addressed as an urban design assessment matter then a separate rule may be unnecessary.	Reject	Internal storage controls are important to ensure that housing is designed for multiple household types and improves the transition to a more intensified urban form.
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	14.6.2.11 (a)(i) Amend subclause (a)(i) to, “Each residential unit shall have sufficient accessible, useable and screened space for the storage and use of three wheelie bins, or provision for shared waste storage facilities.”	Reject	It would not be possible to measure this as a performance standard; specific dimensions or areas are needed.
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Amend subclause (a)(i) to, “Each residential unit shall have sufficient accessible, useable and screened space for the storage and use of three wheelie bins, or provision for shared waste storage facilities.”	Reject	It would not be possible to measure this as a performance standard; specific dimensions or areas are needed.
798	Bjorn Dunlop for Wolfbrook	Wolfbrook	Seek Amendment	Washing line space should not be a dedicated area if a fold down system is proposed.	Reject	Such an approach is likely to lead to perverse outcomes, increasing conflicts in outdoor areas. I refer to evidence by Mr Hattam and Ms Blair.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
89	Andrew Evans		Oppose	Oppose the provisions as notified and seek to have it removed.	Reject	This caters for the day-to-day needs of residents. Internal storage controls are important to ensure that housing is designed for multiple household types and improves the transition to a more intensified urban form.
112	Nikki Smetham		Support	[Retain minimum storage standard]	Acknowledge	

#### 14.6.2.12 – HRZ BUILDING COVERAGE

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
<b>Considered else where</b>	<i>These submission points are beyond the scope of this evidence and are considered elsewhere.</i>	381.16, 381.17 ( <a href="#">Kate Gregg</a> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Character Areas – Ms White</li> </ul>
<b>Support, as notified</b> 1 submission points	Submitters supports 14.6.2.12 as notified.	237.38 ( <a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a> )	<b>Acknowledge</b>
<b>Exclusions of eaves, overhangs, and gutters</b> 4 submission points	Submitters #685 (Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ) #720 (Mitchell Coll) request that a total exclusion of 300mm for overhangs, eaves, and gutters should apply.  Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities (#834) and Otautahi Community Housing Trust (#877) requested	685.74 ( <a href="#">Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</a> ), 720.40 ( <a href="#">Mitchell Coll</a> ), 834.229 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 877.31	<b>Exclusions of eaves, overhangs, and gutters - Reject in-part</b>  As per MRZ response, I agree that an overall exemption removes ambiguity, however an overall exemption of 650mm is considered appropriate. I make reference to evidence by Mr Hattam.

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
	that the overhangs and eaves exemption is increased to 600m and 200m of gutter is also exempted.	<a href="#">(Otautahi Community Housing Trust)</a>	
<b>60% site coverage pathway</b>	<p>Most submitters made request for further modification of the proposal to permit 60% site coverage in HRZ under specific conditions. The following requests were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the performance criteria, permitting 60% as of right (#89, #683, #685, #720, #834, #877).</li> <li>Decrease site width requirement to 12m (#685 and #720).</li> <li>Remove no parking requirement (#61).</li> </ul>	<p>61.7 <a href="#">(Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA))</a>, 89.24 <a href="#">(Andrew Evans)</a>, 638.8 <a href="#">(Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc)</a>, 676.16 <a href="#">(Jack Gibbons)</a>, 685.73, 685.75 <a href="#">(Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ)</a>, 720.39, 720.41 <a href="#">(Mitchell Coll)</a>, 834.229 <a href="#">(Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities)</a>, 877.31 <a href="#">(Otautahi Community Housing Trust)</a></p>	<p><b>60% site coverage pathway - Reject</b></p> <p>I accept that an increased site coverage in HRZ should generally be expected, however do believe that specific performance criteria are necessary to achieve quality outcomes. I make reference to the evidence of Mr Hattam.</p>
<p><b>Remove HRZ site coverage</b></p> <p>4 submission points</p>	<p>These submitters request that the site coverage rule should be removed in it's entirety, stating that the rule is too restrictive to achieve high density housing and is more restrictive than the current RCC controls [which does not manage site coverage].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter #676 requests that the rule is either removed, or increased to 80-90% site coverage for corner sites.</li> </ul>	<p>676.16 <a href="#">(Jack Gibbons)</a>, 556.15 <a href="#">(Winton Land Limited)</a>, 814.178 <a href="#">(Carter Group Limited)</a>, 823.144 <a href="#">(The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch)</a></p>	<p><b>Remove HRZ site coverage - Reject</b></p> <p>Urban Design reporting to date has found that 50% site coverage is sufficient to achieve a high density urban form and when considered alongside all other standards, HRZ and MRZ offer greater yields than CDP zones. Reporting by The Property Group has found within HRZ areas there is a need to incentives to amalgamate sites in order to increase the chances of a transition to a higher density urban form. The notified proposal has therefore sought to introduce a 'bonus' site coverage of 10% when specific conditions were met. Importantly, a development site dimension of 25m is required. Again, this new term 'development site' is purposefully used which enables the applicant to develop across multiple legal parcel sites and legally amalgamate sites</p>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
			<p>upon completion of the land use consent or construction. This reflects the 'land use led' subdivision process that MDRS envisions.</p> <p>When considering the transition from operative controls to MDRS or NPS-UD control, it is important to remember that MDRS is considered the baseline that applies across all relevant residential zones – Council is required to implement MDRS across all relevant residential zones (s77G). It means that, for building coverage, 50% building coverage is the minimum that must be achieved and Council must consider how Policy 3 requirements are relevant to further modifying MDRS controls under s77H of the Act.</p> <p>The controls as notified are consider appropriate and reference is made to the evidence of Mr Hattam.</p>
<p><b>Stormwater management</b> 2 submission points</p>	<p>These submitters request that there are greater controls to restrict impervious surface to better manage stormwater effects.</p>	<p>11.6 (<a href="#">Cheryl Horrell</a>), 832.16 (<a href="#">Finn Jackson</a>)</p>	<p><b>Stormwater management - Reject</b></p> <p>As previously discussed, Council is able to manage stormwater through Bylaws. I make reference to evidence by Mr Norton.</p>
<p><b>Greater restrictions</b> 3 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters requested greater controls on site coverage to manage bulk and sunlight access, with submitter #422 specifically stating that density of inner city dwellings should reduce.</p>	<p>67.12 (<a href="#">Rachel Davies</a>), 197.7 (<a href="#">Steve Smith</a>), 422.2 (<a href="#">Peter Troon</a>)</p>	<p><b>Greater restrictions - Reject</b></p> <p>A more restrictive approach would be contrary to MDRS, with the sunlight access qualifying matter better addressing this effect through height in relation to boundary control. A more intensive housing form is anticipated through Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD.</p>
<p><b>General opposition to intensification</b></p>	<p>These submitters expressed a general opposition to the intensification response, as directed, or requested a lesser approach overall.</p>	<p>467.6 (<a href="#">Jillian Schofield</a>), 471.6 (<a href="#">Kem Wah Tan</a>)</p>	<p><b>General opposition to intensification - Reject</b></p>

Theme	Points	Submission point	Response
2 submission points			Council is required to give effect to MDRS through s77G of the Act.

#### 14.6.2.13 – HRZ WATER SUPPLY FOR FIRE FIGHTING

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Neutral	Acknowledge

#### 14.6.2.14 – GARAGING AND CARPORT LOCATION

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
877	Ed Leeston for Otautahi Community Housing Trust	Otautahi Community Housing Trust	Seek Amendment	<p>[Regarding 14.6.2.14] Delete the rule and replace as follows: 14.6.2.14 garaging and carports</p> <p>Where a residential unit fronts towards a road, any garage or carport shall be located at least 1.2 metres behind the front façade of a residential unit.</p>	Accept in part	I agree with the proposed changes, however also recommend that parking area and street-facing façade should be noted in the rule.

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
798	Bjorn Dunlop for Wolfbrook	Wolfbrook	Seek Amendment	Amend to control garaging on the street facing boundary only as that is the primary view.	Accept in part	I agree that the application of the rule should simply be for street-facing units and recommend changes accordingly.
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Seek Amendment	Delete the rule and replace as follows: 14.6.2.14 garaging and carports Where a residential unit fronts towards a road, any garage or carport shall be located at least 1.2 metres behind the front façade of a residential unit.	Accept in part	I agree with the proposed changes, however also recommend that parking area and street-facing façade should be noted in the rule.

#### 14.6.2.15 – LOCATION OF OUTDOOR MECHANICAL VENTILATION

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
52	Gavin Keats		Seek Amendment	Amend 14.5.2.17 to require that noisy plants, such as heat pumps, hot water heat pumps, inverters be installed in an acoustically isolated plant room.	Reject	The principal reason for the rule is to better manage street amenity and connectivity. Changes have been recommended to simplify the rule accordingly. The requested control would be excessive and are best managed through district-wide 134coustic controls.
720	Mitchell Coll		Seek Amendment	Amend subclause (a) to require outdoor units visible from the street to be screened.	Accept	I agree and recommend changes accordingly. <b><u>Further, the rule should be reflective of fencing already being provided along a boundary in close proximity and other means to achieve screening.</u></b>

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Seek Amendment	Amend subclause (a) to require outdoor units visible from the street to be screened.	Accept	I agree and recommend changes accordingly. <b><u>Further, the rule should be reflective of fencing already being provided along a boundary in close proximity and other means to achieve screening.</u></b>
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Oppose	Delete the [standard].	Reject	The principal reason for the rule is to better manage street amenity and connectivity. Changes have been recommended to simplify the rule accordingly.
89	Andrew Evans		Oppose	Oppose proposed provisions and seeks to retain current.	Reject	The principal reason for the rule is to better manage street amenity and connectivity. Changes have been recommended to simplify the rule accordingly.

#### 14.6.2.16 – HRZ MINIMUM UNIT SIZE

No.	Name	Organisation	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation	Reasoning
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Support	Retain [standard] as notified.	Acknowledge	
638	Garth Wilson for Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc	Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc	Seek Amendment	[Increase minimum unit sizes]	Reject	Minimum unit sizes are considered appropriate for each typology.
422	Peter Troon		Seek Amendment	[Reduce] the density of inner city dwellings.	Reject	Minimum unit sizes are considered appropriate for each typology.
758	Tosh Prodanov		Oppose	Remove 14.6.2.16 Minimum unit size from the proposed PC14 (Plan Change 14).	Reject	Minimum unit sizes are considered appropriate for each typology.



## 14.7 – RESIDENTIAL HILLS ZONE

Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
<b>Considered elsewhere</b>	<i>These submission points are beyond the scope of this evidence and are considered elsewhere.</i>	853, 853 ( <a href="#">Lyttelton Port Company Limited</a> ), 571 ( <a href="#">James Harwood</a> ), 615 ( <a href="#">Analiija Thomas</a> ), 834 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 854, 854 ( <a href="#">Orion New Zealand Limited (Orion)</a> ), 878 ( <a href="#">Transpower New Zealand Limited</a> ), 443 ( <a href="#">Summerset Group Holdings Limited</a> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Port Influences overlay – Ms Oliver</li> <li>• Landscaping, tree canopy and financial contributions – Ms Hansbury</li> <li>• Electricity Transmission – Ms Oliver</li> </ul>
<b>Building height and accessory buildings</b> 4 submission points	Most submitters seek for 8m building heights to be retained. Submitter #205 also requests that accessory buildings cannot be built on a boundary.	205 ( <a href="#">Addington Neighbourhood Association</a> ), 253 ( <a href="#">John Simpson</a> ), 471, 471 ( <a href="#">Kem Wah Tan</a> )	<p><b>Building height and accessory buildings: Accept in-part</b></p> <p><del>I accept, that as a result of the LPTAA, a lesser height of 8m should be enabled. However, I reject that accessory buildings should not be able to be built along the property boundary.</del></p> <p><u>The zone was held as a response to the Tsunami Management Area, as per the evidence of Ms Oliver. However, a zone response is no longer considered appropriate by Ms Oliver and is proposed to be removed in its entirety.</u></p>
<b>Increase site density</b> 1 submission point	Rohan A Collett (#147) requested that permitted site density is increased to encourage more smaller units instead of larger single units.	147 ( <a href="#">Rohan A Collett</a> )	<p><b>Increase site density: <del>Accept in-part</del> Reject</b></p> <p><del>The LPTAA QM has applied a restriction to permitted activities to ensure a suburban outcome is achieved in order to reduce any prospective increase in private vehicle use in poorly accessible or serviceable areas.</del></p>

Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
			<p><u>The zone was held as a response to the Tsunami Management Area, as per the evidence of Ms Oliver. However, a zone response is no longer considered appropriate by Ms Oliver and is proposed to be removed in its entirety.</u></p>
<p><b>Climate change &amp; stormwater</b> 4 submission points</p>	<p>These submitters seeks that additional controls are added to better respond to the current and future effects of climate change, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carbon footprint calculation;</li> <li>• Roof reflectivity</li> <li>• Rainwater storage</li> <li>• Greywater</li> <li>• Alternative energy</li> <li>• Green roofs</li> <li>• Impervious surface controls</li> </ul>	<p>685 (<u>Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ</u>), 314 (<u>Graham Townsend</u>), 627 (<u>Plain and Simple Ltd</u>), 112 (<u>Nikki Smetham</u>)</p>	<p><b>Climate change &amp; stormwater - Reject</b></p> <p>I consider that controls to lessen climate change are beyond the scope of the Act. Renewable energy is permitted through the Plan. Council has opted to use Bylaws to manage three waters. Reference is made to the evidence of Mr Norton. <u>The zone was held as a response to the Tsunami Management Area, as per the evidence of Ms Oliver. However, a zone response is no longer considered appropriate by Ms Oliver and is proposed to be removed in its entirety.</u></p>
<p><b>Density overlays</b> 6 submission points</p>	<p>Submitter #879 (Rutherford Family Trust) requests that the Moncks Spur/Mt Pleasant Overlay in 14.7.2.1(ii) is removed.</p> <p>Submitter #881 (Red Spur Ltd) requests that the Residential Mixed Density Precinct – Redmund Spur and Residential Hills zoning are both removed, applying MDRS and NPS-UD, as applicable.</p>	<p>879 (<u>Rutherford Family Trust</u>), 881 (<u>Red Spur Ltd</u>)</p>	<p><b>Density overlays:</b></p> <p><b>Accept – #879</b></p> <p>I accept that this is required as a consequence of applying MDRS, as supported by the Council submission.</p> <p><b>Reject – #881</b></p> <p>I do not accept that the site is able to considered further as part of the IPI as the effect of the zoning and density overlays are not considered to represent a relevant residential zone, or are within a Policy 3 catchment of the NPS-UD. The proposal has simply been to apply the appropriate National Planning Standards response to the site without any change to the application of rules. I recommend that changes are only made to ensure that</p>

Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
			operative controls and their effects are best addressed in the proposed RLL framework.
<b>Fire fighting</b> 1 submission point	Fire and emergency (#842) notes that an error in the numbering in 14.7.1.3 RD18 and request this be amended as per the relief sought.	842 ( <a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a> )	
<b>Greater restrictions</b> 12 submission points	<p>Submitters requests more restrictive controls through the likes of increased setbacks or requiring consent for developments greater than two storeys. Some stated that status quo Residential Hill Zone standards should simply remain.</p> <p>Submitter #13 also request that all residential streets are notified for any development that breaches standards [‘out of the norm’].</p>	469, 469 ( <a href="#">Beverley Nelson</a> ), 297, 297 ( <a href="#">Kate Z</a> ), 13 ( <a href="#">Andrew Tulloch</a> ), 680 ( <a href="#">Bernard and Janette Johnston and Dovey</a> ), 70 ( <a href="#">Paul Wing</a> ), 205 ( <a href="#">Addington Neighbourhood Association</a> ), 276 ( <a href="#">Steve Burns</a> ), 305 ( <a href="#">Vickie Hearnshaw</a> ), 1047 ( <a href="#">Anna McKenzie</a> ), 36 ( <a href="#">Alana Harper</a> )	<p><b>Greater restrictions:</b> <del>Accept in part</del> <b>Reject</b></p> <p>The proposal seeks to apply a qualifying matter over this area (LPTAA), reducing the potential for medium density development. A recommendation has been made to provide controls to ensure a suburban density is permitted.</p> <p><u>The zone was held as a response to the Tsunami Management Area, as per the evidence of Ms Oliver. However, a zone response is no longer considered appropriate by Ms Oliver and is proposed to be removed in its entirety.</u></p> <p><b>Reject - #13</b></p> <p>I do not consider that the notification threshold request is appropriate and is ultra varies.</p>
<b>Housing choice</b> 1 submission point	Ara Poutama Aotearoa (Corrections NZ - #259) requested that greater housing choice was provided through permitting housing for that supports requirements under the Sentencing Act, Parole Act and Corrections Act.	259 ( <a href="#">Ara Poutama Aotearoa</a> )	<p><b>Housing choice - Reject – out of scope</b></p> <p>I consider that the scope of the IPI is restricted, insofar as it cannot consider non-residential activities where MDRS solely applies and is limited through s77G to only implementing a response to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. I therefore recommend that the submission point is considered out of scope.</p>

Theme	Points	Submitter(s)	Response
<b>Rural expansion</b> 4 submission points	Harvey Armstrong (#244) requests that 75 Alderson Ave is re-zoned to either 'Living Hills Zone' [Residential Hills Zone] or Large Lot Residential Zone.	244 ( <a href="#">Harvey Armstrong</a> )	<b>Rural expansion: Reject – out of scope</b>  The scope of the IPI is restricted in its ability to consider these requests, noting the ability to only consider intensification within relevant residential zones and within Policy 3 catchments contained within the urban environment. For these reasons, I have recommended that these submissions are considered out of scope and rejected.
<b>LPTAA</b> 3 submission points	Submitters request the removal of the LPTAA QM and to apply MRZ accordingly.	834 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 419 ( <a href="#">James Thomas</a> )	<b>Opposition to QM approach: Reject in-part</b>  The qualifying matter is proposed to be retained, but is recommended to be modified to better respond to the nature of the QM <a href="#">through zoning affected areas MRZ and applying a Precinct approach accordingly</a> . Reference is made to section 7.4 of this report for further consideration.
<b>General opposition to intensification</b> 5 submission points	A few submitters expressed their opposition to the overall intensification. As Council is required to respond to the direction under s77G to implement MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, these submissions are considered out of scope and not considered here further.	447 ( <a href="#">Alex Lowings</a> ), 454 ( <a href="#">Steve Hanson</a> ), 205 ( <a href="#">Addington Neighbourhood Association</a> ), 224 ( <a href="#">Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)</a> ), 155 ( <a href="#">Trudi Bishop</a> )	<b>General opposition to intensification: Reject</b>  Council is required to respond to the direction under s77G to implement MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD

## 14.8 – RESIDENTIAL BANKS PENINSULA

Please refer to reasoning detailed in s42A report.

A total of 62 submission points were made against the Residential Banks Peninsula Zone. For clarity, the following 19 submission points are not considered here as they are outside the scope of this evidence:

762.27, 685.78, 834.50, 685.77, 834.44, 834.45, 834.46, 834.49, 834.47, 720.43, 720.44, 834.48, 834.51, 834.60, 834.68, 834.67, 829.6, 829.7, 1004.2.

Reference should instead be made to the following s42 reports:

- Residential Character Areas – Ms White
- Residential Heritage Areas – Ms Dixon
- Port influences & railway setback – Ms Oliver
- Heritage Streets – Ms Richmond

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
627	Simon Bartholomew for Plain and Simple Ltd	Plain and Simple Ltd	627.9	Seek Amendment	[New standards for] accessibility and environmentally responsible design, [such as]:  Rain and grey water harvesting / recycling Composting / incinerating toilets Alternative energy sources Green roofs Porous hardscaping	Reject
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	685.8	Seek Amendment	[New built form standard] to require buildings to calculate their lifetime carbon footprint and be required to not exceed a sinking lid maximum.	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
314	Graham Townsend		314.8	Seek Amendment	[New built form standards to require roofing colours with low reflectivity and] roof-runoff rainwater storage.	Reject
842	Lydia Shirley for Fire and Emergency	Fire and Emergency	842.40	Support	[14.8.1.3 Restricted discretionary RD9] Amend as follows:  Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matter: a. Water supply for fire fighting – Rule 14.15.78	Accept
447	Alex Lowings		447.7	Oppose	No increase in the maximum building height in residential zones.	Out of scope
155	Trudi Bishop		155.2	Oppose	There should be no more development allowed on the Port Hills, adjacent to Bowenvale Reserve and in Banks Peninsula	Out of scope
469	Beverley Nelson		469.10	Seek Amendment	Amend the Sunlight Access rule to [ensure more sunlight is available] to homes.	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
469	Beverley Nelson		469.18	Seek Amendment	Amend the Sunlight Access rule to [ensure more sunlight is available] to homes.	Reject
276	Steve Burns		276.6	Support	[Retain sunlight access provisions]	Reject
13	Andrew Tulloch		13.5	Seek Amendment	[That] all residents of a street [are notified] regarding any new house development that is outside the norm.	Reject
205	Graham Robinson for Addington Neighbourhood Association	Addington Neighbourhood Association	205.15	Oppose	Accessory buildings should not be allowed to be built on or near property boundary line, if maintenance of such buildings would necessitate the owner going on to next door property to facilitate such repairs.	Reject
471	Kem Wah Tan		471.9	Seek Amendment	Allow only a maximum of 2 stories buildings and less density per suburb.	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
471	Kem Wah Tan		471.10	Seek Amendment	Allow only a maximum of 2 stories buildings and less density per suburb.	Reject
469	Beverley Nelson		469.9	Seek Amendment	Amend rule to increase 1m setback from boundary to increase sunlight access and privacy.	Reject
205	Graham Robinson for Addington Neighbourhood Association	Addington Neighbourhood Association	205.32	Support	Encourage intensification while considering the potential loss of amenity for existing house owners.	Accept in-part
454	Steve Hanson		454.7	Oppose	Opposes [height and height in relation to boundary rules] and [effects on] sunlight access.	Reject
205	Graham Robinson for Addington Neighbourhood Association	Addington Neighbourhood Association	205.22	Seek Amendment	Qualifying matters are needed to protect existing residents from losing their sunlight and warmth. Putting 2 & 3 story buildings next to some existing properties with solar panels could negate the usefulness of said panels through shading.	Reject



No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
70	Paul Wing		70.7	Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to ensure recession planes protect existing residential properties from negative impact of new multi-storey builds.	Reject
297	Kate Z		297.9	Seek Amendment	That resource consent to be required for buildings greater than two stories and all subdivisions.	Reject
297	Kate Z		297.10	Seek Amendment	That resource consent to be required for buildings greater than two stories and all subdivisions.	Reject
224	Richard Ball for Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)	Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)	224.5	Oppose	That the permitted height limits within the existing District Plan (prior to PC14) are retained to the maximum extent possible.	Reject
259	Andrea Millar for Ara Poutama Aotearoa	Ara Poutama Aotearoa	259.14	Seek Amendment	Seeks to amend the residential definitions in the CDP to ensure housing which provides for diverse needs of the community is provided for.	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.84	Oppose	1.. Delete the Low Public Transport Accessibility Qualifying Matter and all associated provisions.  2. Rezone all areas subject to this QM to MRZ	Reject
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.6	Seek Amendment	[A]mend the provisions to enable Rāpaki Rūnanga to develop ancestral land within its takiwā to give effect to section 6 (e) of the RMA; and to enable provision for papakainga housing in accordance with s.80E (1) (b) (ii) of the RMA.	Reject in-part
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.29	Seek Amendment	Add an advice note [to RD10 Multi-unit residential complexes] confirming that this rule does not include papakainga housing.	Reject in-part
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.28	Seek Amendment	Amend rule [P1, or add a new rule] to enable papakainga housing within the residential zone as a permitted activity	Reject in-part
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.7	Not Stated	In terms of the proposed qualifying matters that relate to historic heritage [and character] in the Lyttelton township, amend the provisions to enable Rāpaki Rūnanga to develop ancestral land and give effect to section 6 (e) of the RMA and to enable provision for papakainga housing in accordance with s.80E (1) (b) (ii) of the RMA.	Reject in-part

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.9	Oppose	[Remove all proposed amendments and] retain existing activity rules (e.g., as set out under rules 14.8.1, 14.8.2, 14.8.3, 14.8.1.4 and 14.8.1.5) as well as built form standards (e.g., as prescribed in rule 14.8.2 of the District Plan),	Reject in-part
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.15	Seek Amendment	Provide an additional exclusion clause for whereby land which is held as Māori Land is also excluded from complying with this rule.	Reject in-part
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.16	Seek Amendment	Provide an additional exclusion clause, whereby land which is held as Māori Land and that is in the Lyttelton Residential Heritage Area (RHA) and/or the Lyttelton Character Area Overlay is exempt from complying with these area specific built form standards.	Reject in-part
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.17	Seek Amendment	Provide an additional exclusion clause, whereby land which is held as Māori Land and that is in the Lyttelton Residential Heritage Area (RHA) and/or the Lyttelton Character Area Overlay is exempt from complying with these area specific built form standards.	Reject in-part
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.18	Seek Amendment	Provide an additional exclusion clause, whereby land which is held as Māori Land and that is in the Lyttelton Residential Heritage Area (RHA) and/or the Lyttelton Character Area Overlay is exempt from complying with	Reject in-part

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
					these area specific built form standards.	
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.19	Seek Amendment	Provide an additional exclusion clause, whereby land which is held as Māori Land and that is in the Lyttelton Residential Heritage Area (RHA) and/or the Lyttelton Character Area Overlay is exempt from complying with these area specific built form standards.	Reject in-part
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.20	Seek Amendment	Provide an additional exclusion clause, whereby land which is held as Māori Land and that is in the Lyttelton Residential Heritage Area (RHA) and/or the Lyttelton Character Area Overlay is exempt from complying with these area specific built form standards.	Reject in-part
695	Amy Beran for Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke (Rapaki) Runanga	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	695.21	Seek Amendment	Provide an additional exclusion clause, whereby land which is held as Māori Land and that is in the Lyttelton Residential Heritage Area (RHA) and/or the Lyttelton Character Area Overlay is exempt from complying with these area specific built form standards.	Reject in-part

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
305	Vickie Hearnshaw		305.6	Seek Amendment	[S]upport[s] the idea of developing a new town plan. [Seeks more appropriate design outcomes for higher density housing]	Reject in-part
853	Jo Appleyard for Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Lyttelton Port Company Limited	853.9	Support	Retain area-specific activities for Residential Banks Peninsula Zone as notified in 14.8.3.1.1 – 14.8.3.1.5	Acknowledge

## 14.10 – RESIDENTIAL LARGE LOT ZONE

Please refer to reasoning detailed in s42A report.

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
881	Fiona Aston for Red Spur Ltd	Red Spur Ltd	881.17	Seek Amendment	Seeks wholesale change to rules to enabled Redmund Spur.	Approach to Redmund	Reject
881	Fiona Aston for Red Spur Ltd	Red Spur Ltd	881.19	Seek Amendment	Seeks wholesale change to rules to enabled Redmund Spur.	Approach to Redmund	Reject
881	Fiona Aston for Red Spur Ltd	Red Spur Ltd	881.18	Seek Amendment	Seeks wholesale change to rules to enabled Redmund Spur.	Approach to Redmund	Reject
881	Fiona Aston for Red Spur Ltd	Red Spur Ltd	881.20	Seek Amendment	Seeks wholesale change to rules to enabled Redmund Spur.	Approach to Redmund	Reject
881	Fiona Aston for Red Spur Ltd	Red Spur Ltd	881.15	Seek Amendment	[Seeks to amend this rule as follows]	Approach to Redmund	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
881	Fiona Aston for Red Spur Ltd	Red Spur Ltd	881.16	Seek Amendment	Seeks wholesale change to rules to enabled Redmund Spur.	Approach to Redmund	Reject
881	Fiona Aston for Red Spur Ltd	Red Spur Ltd	881.21	Seek Amendment	<p>[Seeks to amend this rule as follows]</p> <p>14.9.2.12 Street scene amenity and safety – fences</p> <p>a. Within the Residential Mixed Density Precinct – 86 Bridle Path Road, Residential Mixed Density Precinct – Redmund Spur , and Rural Hamlet Precinct, for multi-unit residential complexes and social housing complexes:</p> <p>i. The maximum height of any fence in the required building setback from a road boundary shall be 1.8 metres.</p> <p>ii. This rule shall not apply to fences or other screening structures located on an internal boundary between two properties zoned residential, or residential and commercial or industrial.</p> <p>iii. For the purposes of this rule, a fence or other screening structure is not the exterior wall of a building or accessory building.</p>	Bridal path approach	Reject
842	Lydia Shirley for Fire and Emergency	Fire and Emergency	842.41	Seek Amendment	<p>[14.9.1.3. Restricted discretionary activities RD15]</p> <p>Amend as follows: Council’s discretion shall be limited to the following matter:</p>	Framework	Accept

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
					a. Water supply for fire fighting – Rule 14.15.78		
842	Lydia Shirley for Fire and Emergency	Fire and Emergency	842.42	Seek Amendment	Amend Rule 14.9.2.5 - Minimum building setbacks from internal boundaries as follows:  Advice note:  Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.	Framework	Accept
13	Andrew Tulloch		13.6	Seek Amendment	[That] all residents of a street [are notified] regarding any new house development that is outside the norm.	Out of scope	Reject
297	Kate Z		297.11	Seek Amendment	That resource consent to be required for buildings greater than two stories and all subdivisions.	Out of scope	Reject



No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
259	Andrea Millar for Ara Poutama Aotearoa	Ara Poutama Aotearoa	259.15	Seek Amendment	Seeks to amend the residential definitions in the CDP to ensure housing which provides for diverse needs of the community is provided for.	Out of scope	Reject
305	Vickie Hearnshaw		305.7	Seek Amendment	[S]upport[s] the idea of developing a new town plan. [Seeks more appropriate design outcomes for higher density housing]	Out of scope	Reject
314	Graham Townsend		314.9	Seek Amendment	[New built form standards to require roofing colours with low reflectivity and] roof-runoff rainwater storage.	Out of scope	Reject
627	Simon Bartholomew for Plain and Simple Ltd	Plain and Simple Ltd	627.10	Seek Amendment	[New standards for] accessibility and environmentally responsible design, [such as]:  Rain and grey water harvesting / recycling Composting / incinerating toilets Alternative energy sources Green roofs Porous hardscaping	Out of scope	Reject
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	685.9	Seek Amendment	[New built form standard] to require buildings to calculate their lifetime carbon footprint and be required to not exceed a sinking lid maximum.	Out of scope	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
224	Richard Ball for Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)	Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)	224.6	Oppose	That the permitted height limits within the existing District Plan (prior to PC14) are retained to the maximum extent possible.	Out of scope	Reject
297	Kate Z		297.12	Seek Amendment	That resource consent to be required for buildings greater than two stories and all subdivisions.	Out of scope	Reject
447	Alex Lowings		447.8	Oppose	No increase in the maximum building height in residential zones.	Out of scope	Reject
471	Kem Wah Tan		471.12	Seek Amendment	Allow only a maximum of 2 stories buildings and less density per suburb.	Out of scope	Reject
205	Graham Robinson for Addington Neighbourhood Association	Addington Neighbourhood Association	205.21	Seek Amendment	Qualifying matters are needed to protect existing residents from losing their sunlight and warmth. Putting 2 & 3 story buildings next to some existing properties with solar panels could negate the usefulness of said panels through shading.	Out of scope	Reject
205	Graham Robinson for Addington Neighbourhood Association	Addington Neighbourhood Association	205.33	Support	Encourage intensification while considering the potential loss of amenity for existing house owners.	Out of scope	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
276	Steve Burns		276.7	Support	[Retain sunlight access provisions]	Out of scope	Reject
454	Steve Hanson		454.8	Oppose	Opposes [height and height in relation to boundary rules] and [effects on] sunlight access.	Out of scope	Reject
469	Beverley Nelson		469.11	Seek Amendment	Amend the Sunlight Access rule to [ensure more sunlight is available] to homes.	Out of scope	Reject
70	Paul Wing		70.8	Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to ensure recession planes protect existing residential properties from negative impact of new multi-storey builds.	Out of scope	Reject
205	Graham Robinson for Addington Neighbourhood Association	Addington Neighbourhood Association	205.16	Oppose	Accessory buildings should not be allowed to be built on or near property boundary line, if maintenance of such buildings would necessitate the owner going on to next door property to facilitate such repairs.	Out of scope	Reject
469	Beverley Nelson		469.12	Support	Amend rule to increase 1m setback from boundary to increase sunlight access and privacy.	Out of scope	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
471	Kem Wah Tan		471.11	Seek Amendment	Allow only a maximum of 2 stories buildings and less density per suburb.	Out of scope	Reject
443	Christine Hetherington for Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	443.6	Seek Amendment	<p>amend 14.9.2.13 as follows:</p> <p>a. Within the Rural Hamlet Precinct, for multi-unit residential complexes and social housing complexes only and excluding retirement villages , development sites shall include the following minimum tree and garden planting:.....</p> <p>b. For single and/or multi residential unit developments, other than multi-unit residential complexes and social housing complexes, and excluding retirement villages a minimum tree canopy cover of 20% of the development site area must be provided in accordance with the Chapter 6.10A rules. The tree canopy cover planting area may be combined with the landscaping area in whole or in part, may be located on any part of the development site, and does not have to be associated with each residential unit.</p>	Out of scope	Reject
13	Andrew Tulloch		13.7	Seek Amendment	[That] all residents of a street [are notified] regarding any new house development that is outside the norm.	Out of scope	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
852	Jo Appleyard for Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	852.16	Support	[Retain as notified] Residential activities are permitted within the zone (PI). Rule 14.9.2.1.ix specifies a minimum net site area of 2000m2. RDA consent (RD2) required for residential units on sites which do not meet the density standard of rule 14.9.2.1by up to 10%. Such consents shall not be limited or publicly notified. Where the 10% margin is breached a fully discretionary consent is required (D4).	Rural Hamlet area	Accept

## 14.10 – RESIDENTIAL SMALL SETTLEMENT

Please refer to reasoning detailed in s42A report.

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
70	Paul Wing		70.10	Seek Amendment	Recession planes need to be protected for all residential development.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
297	Kate Z		297.13	Seek Amendment	That resource consent to be required for buildings greater than two stories and all subdivisions.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
70	Paul Wing		70.9	Seek Amendment	Recession planes need to be protected for all residential development.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
305	Vickie Hearnshaw		305.8	Seek Amendment	[S]upport[s] the idea of developing a new town plan. [Seeks more appropriate design outcomes for higher density housing]	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
627	Simon Bartholomew for Plain and Simple Ltd	Plain and Simple Ltd	627.11	Seek Amendment	[New standards for] accessibility and environmentally responsible design, [such as]:  Rain and grey water harvesting / recycling Composting / incinerating toilets Alternative energy sources Green roofs Porous hardscaping	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	685.10	Seek Amendment	[New built form standard] to require buildings to calculate their lifetime carbon footprint and be required to not exceed a sinking lid maximum.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
224	Richard Ball for Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)	Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)	224.7	Oppose	That the permitted height limits within the existing District Plan (prior to PC14) are retained to the maximum extent possible.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
447	Alex Lowings		447.9	Oppose	No increase in the maximum building height in residential zones.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
471	Kem Wah Tan		471.14	Seek Amendment	Allow only a maximum of 2 stories buildings and less density per suburb.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
205	Graham Robinson for Addington Neighbourhood Association	Addington Neighbourhood Association	205.20	Seek Amendment	Qualifying matters are needed to protect existing residents from losing their sunlight and warmth. Putting 2 & 3 story buildings next to some existing properties with solar panels could negate the usefulness of said panels through shading.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
205	Graham Robinson for Addington Neighbourhood Association	Addington Neighbourhood Association	205.34	Support	Encourage intensification while considering the potential loss of amenity for existing house owners.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
276	Steve Burns		276.8	Support	[Retain sunlight access provisions]	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
454	Steve Hanson		454.9	Oppose	Opposes [height and height in relation to boundary rules] and [effects on] sunlight access.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
469	Beverley Nelson		469.13	Support	Amend the Sunlight Access rule to [ensure more sunlight is available] to homes.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
70	Paul Wing		70.11	Seek Amendment	Recession planes need to be protected for all residential development.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
205	Graham Robinson for Addington Neighbourhood Association	Addington Neighbourhood Association	205.17	Oppose	Accessory buildings should not be allowed to be built on or near property boundary line, if maintenance of such buildings would necessitate the owner going on to next door property to facilitate such repairs.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope



No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Recommendation
469	Beverley Nelson		469.14	Support	Amend rule to increase 1m setback from boundary to increase sunlight access and privacy.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope
471	Kem Wah Tan		471.13	Seek Amendment	Allow only a maximum of 2 stories buildings and less density per suburb.	Out of scope	Reject - Out of Scope

## 14.11 – RESIDENTIAL VISITOR / GUEST ACCOMMODATION ZONE

Please refer to reasoning detailed in s42A report.

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Theme	Recommendation
314	Graham Townsend		314.11	Seek Amendment	[New built form standards to require roofing colours with low reflectivity and] roof-runoff rainwater storage.	Climate provisions	Reject
627	Simon Bartholomew for Plain and Simple Ltd	Plain and Simple Ltd	627.12	Seek Amendment	[New standards for] accessibility and environmentally responsible design, [such as]:  Rain and grey water harvesting / recycling Composting / incinerating toilets Alternative energy sources Green roofs Porous hardscaping	Climate provisions	Reject
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	685.11	Seek Amendment	[Newbuilt form standard] to require buildings to calculate their lifetime carbon footprint and be required to not exceed a sinking lid maximum.	Climate provisions	Reject
471	Kem Wah Tan		471.15	Seek Amendment	Allow only a maximum of 2 stories buildings and less density per suburb.	Height limit	Reject
16	Andrea Heath		16.5	Oppose	Remove the ability to construct buildings of up to 14m without resource consent.	Height limit	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Theme	Recommendation
224	Richard Ball for Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)	Atlas Quarter Residents Group (22 owners)	224.8	Oppose	That the permitted height limits within the existing District Plan (prior to PC14) are retained to the maximum extent possible	Height limit	Reject
297	Kate Z		297.14	Seek Amendment	That resource consent to be required for buildings greater than two stories and all subdivisions.	Height limit	Reject
344	Luke Baker-Garters		344.11	Oppose	Removal of all central city maximum building height overlays.	Height limit	Reject in-part
447	Alex Lowings		447.10	Oppose	No increase in the maximum building height in residential zones.	Height limit	Reject
471	Kem Wah Tan		471.16	Seek Amendment	Allow only a maximum of 2 stories buildings and less density per suburb.	Height limit	Reject
305	Vickie Hearnshaw		305.9	Seek Amendment	[S]upport[s] the idea of developing a new town plan. [Seeks more appropriate design outcomes for higher density housing]	Increased density	Support in-part
205	Graham Robinson for Addington Neighbourhood Association	Addington Neighbourhood Association	205.35	Support	Encourage intensification while considering the potential loss of amenity for existing house owners.	Increased density	Support in-part
454	Steve Hanson		454.10	Oppose	Opposes [height and height in relation to boundary rules] and [effects on] sunlight access.	Increased density	Reject
13	Andrew Tulloch		13.8	Seek Amendment	[That] all residents of a street [are notified] regarding any new house development that is outside the norm.	Increased density	Reject
469	Beverley Nelson		469.15	Support	Amend rule to increase 1m setback from boundary to increase sunlight access and privacy.	Sunlight access	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Theme	Recommendation
469	Beverley Nelson		469.17	Support	Amend rule to increase 1m setback from boundary to increase sunlight access and privacy.	Sunlight access	Reject
63	Kathleen Crisley		63.42	Support	Retain provisions in relation to recession planes in final plan decision.	Sunlight access	Acknowledge
21	Grant McGirr		21.6	Support	That no changes to rules lessen the amount of sunlight that any property (house and land) currently receives.	Sunlight access	Reject
63	Kathleen Crisley		63.43	Support	Retain provisions in relation to recession planes in final plan decision.	Sunlight access	Acknowledge
70	Paul Wing		70.12	Seek Amendment	Recession planes need to be protected for all residential development.	Sunlight access	Reject
469	Beverley Nelson		469.16	Support	Amend the Sunlight Access rule to [ensure more sunlight is available] to homes.	Sunlight access	Reject

### 14.13 – ENHANCED DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM

Please refer to the s42A report for reasoning. **NOTE: The EDM is part of 14.4, which is a QM response by Ms Oliver. Reference should be made to the s42A of Ms Oliver.**

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Accept / Reject
107	Heather Woods		107.24	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.13 to enable Qualifying Sites to be located in ANY Residential Suburban zone, (not just the Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone).	Extend to RS	Reject <b>in-part</b>
792	Carmel Woods		792.6	Seek Amendment	Seek that the location of Qualifying Sites for EDMs should be permitted in any Residential Suburban zone, not just the Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone.	Extend to RS	Reject <b>in-part</b>

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Accept / Reject
627	Simon Bartholomew for Plain and Simple Ltd	Plain and Simple Ltd	627.14	Seek Amendment	[New standards for] accessibility and environmentally responsible design, [such as]:  Rain and grey water harvesting / recycling Composting / incinerating toilets Alternative energy sources Green roofs Porous hardscaping	Climate	Reject
107	Heather Woods		107.15	Seek Amendment	Support 14.13.3.10 on the basis CCC is to provide for Transportable Homes Hubs	Transportable homes	Reject
276	Steve Burns		276.10	Support	[Retain sunlight access provisions]	Sunlight access	Accept
70	Paul Wing		70.14	Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to ensure recession planes protect existing residential properties from negative impact of new multi-storey builds.	Sunlight access	Accept in-part
97	Geoff Tune		97.1	Seek Amendment	That the proposed provision 14.13.3.2 to be amended to 'buildings shall not project beyond a building envelope constructed by recession planes from points 3 meters (2.3 metres) above boundaries with other sites as shown in Appendix 14.16.2, with replaced MDRS angles i.e 55° (diagram C) except that: i. where an internal boundary of a site abuts an access lot, access strip, or access to a rear lot, the recession plane may be constructed from points 2.3 metres above the furthest boundary of the access lot, access strip, or access to a rear lot or any combination of these areas; ii. where buildings on adjoining sites have a common wall along an internal boundary the recession planes shall not apply along that part	Sunlight access	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Accept / Reject
					of the boundary covered by such a wall. iii. Where the building is located in a Flood Management Area, the exemptions in Rule 5.4.1.3 apply (for activities P1-P4 in Table 5.4.1.1b).' [The proposed amendments in relation to height at boundary are the same as currently proposed in PC14].		
107	Heather Woods		107.16	Seek Amendment	Support 14.13.3.12 on the basis CCC is to provide for Transportable Homes Hubs within this criteria.	Transportable homes	Reject
797	Zsuzsanna Hajnal		797.7	Seek Amendment	[D]ecrease the net floor area requirements of these EDM homes (e.g. by 33%).	Net floor area	Reject
802	Anita Moir		802.7	Seek Amendment	[D]ecrease the net floor area requirements of these homes (e.g. by 33%).	Net floor area	Reject
796	Justin Woods		796.6	Seek Amendment	[E]liminate or drastically reduce the net floor area requirements of Enhanced Development Mechanism homes.	Net floor area	Reject
803	Tamsin Woods		803.7	Seek Amendment	[E]liminate or drastically reduce the net floor area requirements of Enhanced Development Mechanism homes.	Net floor area	Reject
795	Andrew Stevenson		795.7	Oppose	[E]liminate the net floor area requirements of EDM homes.	Net floor area	Reject
801	Jean Turner		801.7	Seek Amendment	[E]liminate the net floor area requirements of these homes, or at least decrease them by at least 33%.	Net floor area	Reject
107	Heather Woods		107.25	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.13.4.5 to decrease the net floor area requirements of these homes (e.g. by 33%). The current net floor area requirements are not aligned with the MDRS which has no such restrictions.	Net floor area	Reject
789	Eric Woods		789.8	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.13.4.5. and decrease the net floor area requirements of tiny homes (e.g. by 33%).	Net floor area	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Accept / Reject
800	Ramon Gelonch Roca		800.6	Seek Amendment	Eliminate the net floor area requirements of EDM homes in order to align with the MDRS, which has no such restrictions.	Net floor area	Reject
792	Carmel Woods		792.7	Seek Amendment	Seek that the net floor area requirements of Enhanced Development Mechanism homes are reduced by 33%.	Net floor area	Reject
107	Heather Woods		107.11	Support	Support 14.13.3.5 - provided CCC include provision for transportable homes	Transportable homes	Reject
800	Ramon Gelonch Roca		800.7	Seek Amendment	Allow for outdoor living spaces to be shared or partially shared with neighboring dwellings.	OLS	<del>Accept in part</del> <b>Reject</b>  <u>The EDM is part of 14.4, which is a QM response by Ms Oliver. Reference should be made to the s42A of Ms Oliver.</u>
795	Andrew Stevenson		795.8	Seek Amendment	[A]llow for outdoor living spaces to be shared or partially shared with neighboring dwellings.	OLS	<del>Accept in part</del> <b>Reject</b>  <u>The EDM is part of 14.4, which is a QM response by Ms Oliver. Reference should be made to the s42A of Ms Oliver.</u>
797	Zsuzsanna Hajnal		797.8	Seek Amendment	[A]llow outdoor living space requirement to allow for greenspaces to be shared or partially shared with neighbouring dwellings. Alternatively, a portion of outdoor living space requirements should be permitted to be fulfilled by shared greenspaces.	OLS	<del>Accept in part</del> <b>Reject</b>  <u>The EDM is part of 14.4, which is a QM response by Ms Oliver. Reference should be made to the s42A of Ms Oliver.</u>
801	Jean Turner		801.8	Seek Amendment	[Allow] for outdoor living spaces to be shared or partially shared with adjacent homes, or allow for a portion of outdoor living areas to be fulfilled by shared greenspaces.	OLS	<del>Accept in part</del> <b>Reject</b>  <u>The EDM is part of 14.4, which is a QM response by Ms Oliver. Reference</u>

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Accept / Reject
							<u>should be made to the s42A of Ms Oliver.</u>
802	Anita Moir		802.8	Seek Amendment	[E]nable the option for outdoor living spaces to be shared or partially shared with neighbouring dwellings. Or at least a portion of outdoor living spaces should be able to be satisfied by shared greenspaces.	OLS	<u>Accept-in-part Reject</u>  <u>The EDM is part of 14.4, which is a QM response by Ms Oliver. Reference should be made to the s42A of Ms Oliver.</u>
803	Tamsin Woods		803.8	Seek Amendment	[That] r individual outdoor living spaces [are allowed] to be smaller [where there are] outdoor living spaces shared or partially shared with neighbouring dwellings.	OLS	<u>Accept-in-part Reject</u>  <u>The EDM is part of 14.4, which is a QM response by Ms Oliver. Reference should be made to the s42A of Ms Oliver.</u>
107	Heather Woods		107.26	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.13.4.7 To enable the option for outdoor living spaces to be shared or partially shared with neighbouring dwellings. Or at least a portion of outdoor living spaces should be able to be satisfied by shared greenspaces.	OLS	<u>Accept-in-part Reject</u>  <u>The EDM is part of 14.4, which is a QM response by Ms Oliver. Reference should be made to the s42A of Ms Oliver.</u>
792	Carmel Woods		792.8	Seek Amendment	Seek that the standards make it possible for outdoor living spaces to be shared or partially shared with adjacent homes, or allow for a portion of outdoor living areas to be fulfilled by shared greenspaces.	OLS	<u>Accept-in-part Reject</u>  <u>The EDM is part of 14.4, which is a QM response by Ms Oliver. Reference should be made to the s42A of Ms Oliver.</u>



No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Accept / Reject
789	Eric Woods		789.9	Seek Amendment	To enable the option for outdoor living spaces to be shared or partially shared with neighbouring dwellings. Or at least a portion of outdoor living spaces should be able to be satisfied by shared greenspaces.	OLS	<b>Accept in-part Reject</b>  <b>The EDM is part of 14.4, which is a QM response by Ms Oliver. Reference should be made to the s42A of Ms Oliver.</b>
107	Heather Woods		107.12	Support	Support 14.13.3.7 provided Transportable homes are provided for	Transportable homes	Reject
107	Heather Woods		107.13	Seek Amendment	Support 14.13.4.7 provided transportable homes are provided for	Transportable homes	Reject
107	Heather Woods		107.14	Seek Amendment	Support 14.13.4.8. provided CCC is to provide for Transportable Homes Hubs within this criteria.	Transportable homes	Reject
789	Eric Woods		789.7	Seek Amendment	permit Qualifying Sites to be located in ANY Residential Suburban zone, (not just the Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone).	Extend to RS	Reject in-part
571	James Harwood		571.29	Support	Seeks that higher density housing near the city and commercial centres be supported.	Central city	Accept
571	James Harwood		571.28	Support	Seeks that rules relating to Higher-density housing near the city and commercial centres be supported.	Central city	Accept
107	Heather Woods		107.33	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.13.1.4 to apply the following A. 800 metres EDM walking distance of: I. A Commercial Business City Centre Zone , or Commercial Mixed use Zone. II. A supermarket of not less than 1000m <sup>2</sup> gross floor area - except that B does not apply to EDM in the Residential Banks Peninsula Zone; B. 800 metres EDM walking distance of either a primary or intermediate school; C. 400 metres EDM walking distance of an Open	Remove qualifying controls	<b>Accept in-part Reject</b>  <b>The EDM is part of 14.4, which is a QM response by Ms Oliver. Reference should be made to the s42A of Ms Oliver.</b>

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	THEME	Accept / Reject
					Space 2 Zone or an Open Space 1 Zone that has an area greater than 4000m <sup>2</sup> ;		
795	Andrew Stevenson		795.6	Seek Amendment	[A]llow Qualifying Sites not only in Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone, but also in any Residential Suburban Zone.	Extend to RS	Reject
797	Zsuzsanna Hajnal		797.6	Seek Amendment	[P]ermit EDM sites in any Residential Suburban zone, not just the Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone.	Extend to RS	Reject in-part
803	Tamsin Woods		803.6	Seek Amendment	[P]ermit Qualifying Sites [in] ANY Residential Suburban zone, not just the Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone	Extend to RS	Reject in-part
801	Jean Turner		801.6	Seek Amendment	[P]ermit Qualifying Sites to be located in ANY Residential Suburban zone, (not just the Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone)	Extend to RS	Reject in-part
802	Anita Moir		802.6	Seek Amendment	[P]ermit Qualifying Sites to be located in ANY Residential Suburban zone, (not just the Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone).	Extend to RS	Reject in-part
796	Justin Woods		796.5	Seek Amendment	[P]ermit Qualifying Sites to not just the Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone, but also be ANY Residential Suburban zone.	Extend to RS	Reject in-part
800	Ramon Gelonch Roca		800.5	Seek Amendment	Allow Qualifying Sites to include any Residential Suburban Zone, not only in Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone.	Extend to RS	Reject in-part
107	Heather Woods		107.34	Seek Amendment	Delete Rule 14.13.1.1	Remove qualifying controls	Reject in-part

## 14.14 – COMMUNITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT MECHANISIM

*Please refer to the s42A report for reasoning.*

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Accept / Reject
107	Heather Woods		107.17	Seek Amendment	Reinstate sub-chapter 14.14 - Community Housing Development Mechanism	Reject
625	Pamela-Jayne Cooper		625.4	Oppose	Oppose [proposed deletion of 14.14]	Reject
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.237	Support	[That the Community Housing Redevelopment Mechanism remains deleted and is not re-instated].	Accept

## 14.15 – MATTERS OF CONTROL AND DISCRETION

### 14.15 – Generally

Nature of feedback	Submitter points	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter #834 requested that the LPTAA is removed and areas rezoned as MRZ.</li> <li>Submitter #145 requested that greater controls were in place to deliver healthy streets.</li> <li>Submitter #780 supported all matters of discretion as notified.</li> </ul>	834.85 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ) 145.10 ( <a href="#">Te Mana Ora/Community and Public Health</a> ) 780.18 ( <a href="#">Josie Schroder</a> )	<b>Accept in part</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of the LPTAA is covered in the specific issue relating to the QM. I accept that zoning beneath the QM should be changed to MRZ, but should also include two new Precincts to address the nature of the QM.</li> <li>I accept the importance of an attractive street environment. Matters and standards have been included in the plan change to address street engagement, however standards relating to the Transport Zone itself are considered out of scope of PC14.</li> </ul>

### 14.15.1 – Residential Design Principles

Nature of feedback	Submitter points	Recommendations
<b>Support as notified:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter #145 supports design principles as notified and is especially supportive of controls to strengthen CPTED and matters to address site layout and context.</li> </ul> <b>Simplification:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitters #834 and #877 requested that all matters and sub-matters in 14.15.1 are streamlined and distilled down to five key matters in order to ease consenting and avoid duplication</li> </ul>	877.35* ( <a href="#">Otautahi Community Housing Trust</a> ), 842.26, 842.45 ( <a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a> ), <del>805.9 (Waka Kotahi (NZ Transport Agency) – WITHDRAWN)</del> , 212.12 ( <a href="#">BP Oil New Zealand Ltd, Z Energy Limited and Mobil Oil New Zealand Ltd (referred to as The Fuel Companies)</a> ), 834.203 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> ), 145.23, 145.9 ( <a href="#">Te Mana Ora/Community and Public Health</a> ), 305.1 ( <a href="#">Vickie Hearnshaw</a> )	<b>Simplification:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I recommend that these submissions are rejected as their application is an over-simplification of potential adverse effects associated with density and increased ambiguity of how the rule is applied to Plan users. <b>I therefore recommend that these specific requests are rejected.</b></li> <li>However, I accept that changes can be made to ease interpretation and general application. I adopt recommendations made by Ms Blair <a href="#">and the proposal to simplify the Principles</a>.</li> </ul> <b>Greater urban design control:</b>

<p>and redundancies across matters of discretion.</p> <p><b>Greater urban design control:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #305 expressed support for design principles and requests these are further strengthened to provide for more appropriate design outcomes for high density housing.</li> <li>• Submitter #842 (Fire and Emergency) supports the matter and seeks that emergency service access is also included.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reverse sensitivity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #212 (The Fuel Companies) request that reverse sensitivity is considered within principles.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> this report does not address submissions on the City Spine QM (i.e. submission 805.9 <a href="#">[withdrawn]</a>). Reference should be made to the s42A by Ms Oliver.</p>	<p>* This subpoint was coded to 14.15 (generally) but relates to 14.15.1 and has thus been included here.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I support changes recommended by Ms Blair to address high density housing.</li> <li>• While I accept that changes requested by Fire and Emergency are valid, I do not believe that this is not where this matter of discretion should be applied as the associated rule is located in Chapter 7. Changes should therefore be made to 7.4.4 as required. Reference should be made to evidence by Ms Piper.</li> <li>• <b>I recommend that the request by Fire and Emergency here is therefore rejected.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Reverse sensitivity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While I accept that changes requested by The Fuel Companies are valid, I do not believe that Residential Urban Design Principles are an appropriate matter to contain these changes as they seek to reflect effects internal to the site.</li> <li>• <b>I therefore recommend that <del>a new</del> <a href="#">this is reflected in</a> matter of discretion <a href="#">14.15.3 and 14.15.4</a> is applied to <del>14.15</del> to address these concerns.</b></li> </ul>
--	---	---

#### 14.15.2 - Site density and site coverage

Nature of feedback	Submitter points	Recommendations
<p><b>Simplification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #834 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) requests that the matter is more simplified to avoid any duplication and overlap with 14.15.1 – Residential Design Principles.</li> </ul>	<p>471.19 (<a href="#">Kem Wah Tan</a>), 834.78, 834.206 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 557.7 (<a href="#">Peter Beswick</a>), 212.13 (<a href="#">BP Oil New Zealand Ltd, Z Energy Limited and Mobil Oil New Zealand Ltd (referred to as The Fuel Companies)</a>), 467.7 (<a href="#">Jillian Schofield</a>),</p>	<p><b>Simplification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I support improvements to the matter to ease its application and avoid duplication. I make reference to the evidence of Ms Blair.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reverse sensitivity:</b></p>

<p><b>Reverse sensitivity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #212 (The Fuel Companies) requests that an addition is made to clause (a) to address reverse sensitivity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sunlight:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #467 (Jillian Schofield) states general opposition to enabled height, such as that in Hornby and Hei Hei.</li> <li>• Submitter #61 (VNA) requests that the operative recession plane dial (Appendix 14.16.2 Diagram C) is used.</li> <li>• Submitters #557 and #834 request that references to MDRS-modified recession planes (as a result of the Sunlight Access QM) are removed as a consequence of removing the QM.</li> </ul> <p><b>More restrictive density:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #471 (Kem Wah Tan) requests that a maximum of two storeys is set in suburban areas and less density.</li> </ul>	<p>61.39 (<a href="#">Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA)</a>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While I accept that changes requested by The Fuel Companies are valid, I do not believe that <del>Residential Urban Design Principles</del> <a href="#">Site density and site coverage matters of discretion</a> are an appropriate matter to contain these changes as they seek to reflect effects internal to the site.</li> <li>• <b>I therefore recommend that <del>a new this is reflected in</del> matter of discretion <a href="#">14.15.3 and 14.15.4</a> <del>is applied to 14.15</del> to address these concerns.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Sunlight:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>I recommend that all submissions on this matter are rejected.</b></li> <li>• Council must apply MDRS and Policy 3 unless a qualifying matter applies. This can only reduce intensification otherwise directed to the extent necessary. I support the qualifying matter approach as proposed.</li> </ul> <p><b>More restrictive density:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>I recommend that all submissions on this matter are rejected.</b></li> <li>• Council must apply MDRS and Policy 3 unless a qualifying matter applies</li> </ul>
--	---	---

### 14.15.3 - Impacts on neighbouring property

Nature of feedback	Submitter points	Recommendations
<p><b>Boundary treatments &amp; amenity scope:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #834 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) considers that considering amenity is appropriate for</li> </ul>	<p>834.204 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 786.3 (<a href="#">Marta Scott</a>), 842.46 (<a href="#">Fire and Emergency</a>), 425.7 (<a href="#">Tom King</a>), 212.14 (<a href="#">BP Oil New Zealand Ltd, Z Energy Limited and Mobil Oil New Zealand Ltd (referred</a></p>	<p><b>Boundary treatments &amp; amenity scope:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>I recommend that the request by #834 are accepted</b> and refer to evidence by Ms Blair for modifications.</li> <li>• <b>I recommend that the request by #786 is accepted in-part:</b> wider structural effects may not be captured by the Building Act</li> </ul>

<p>this rule and height should relate to Policy 1 accessibility matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #786 (Marta Scott) requests that the rule better reflect effects on adjoining retaining walls and vegetation planting at the boundary.</li> <li>• Submitter #842 (Fire and Emergency) requests that matters are inserted to address fire spread and adequate water supply and pressure for fire fighting.</li> <li>• Submitter #425 (Tom King) request for greater consideration of loss of privacy, sunlight and road congestion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reverse sensitivity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #212 (The Fuel Companies) requests that an addition is made to clause (a) to address reverse sensitivity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Simplification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitters #823 and #814 request that all of the sub-points are removed and that discretion is focused on planned urban character.</li> <li>• Submitter #556 (Winton Land Limited) requests that the rule is simplified, largely removing section (c) that specifically relates to MRZ and HRZ development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sunlight:</b></p>	<p><b>to as The Fuel Companies)), 823.145 (The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch), 814.179 (Carter Group Limited), 556.16 (Winton Land Limited), 454.3 (Steve Hanson), 63.48 (Kathleen Crisley), 70.16 (Paul Wing)</b></p>	<p>and are important to consider on slopes; however controls on vegetation I consider to be too prescriptive and best address through other parts of property law, outside of the Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I support amendments requested by Fire and Emergency to address fire spread, however water supply is addressed in 14.15.8 – Water supply for fire fighting. <b>I therefore recommend that the request is accepted in-part.</b></li> <li>• <b>I recommend that the request by Tom King is rejected.</b> Sunlight and privacy are already addressed and Chapter 7 addresses traffic effects.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reverse sensitivity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>I recommend that the request by The Fuel Companies is accepted.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Simplification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>I recommend that these requests are rejected or rejected in part.</b></li> <li>• Requests submitters #823 and #814 remove all specificity and increase ambiguity for Plan users. I also do not support the request by Winton Land Limited to remove matters specifically relating to MRZ and HRZ development.</li> <li>• However, recommendations included in reporting have highlighted the modification of height control to be more permissive, easing the application of matters of discretion. <b>I therefore recommend that consequential changes are made and refer to evidence by Ms Blair.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Sunlight:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>I recommend that requests made to protect existing sun access are rejected</b> as this would fail to achieve the intensification requirements of MDRS and Policy 3.</li> </ul>
--	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitters #454, #63, and #70 request that greater controls are made to protect existing sunlight access.</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

#### 14.15.4 - Height in relation to boundary breaches

Nature of feedback	Submitter points	Recommendations
<p><b>Scope of discretion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter #834 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) considers that discretion should only be limited to neighbouring properties (i.e. those affected by the breach).</li> </ul> <p><b>Reverse sensitivity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter #212 (The Fuel Companies) requests that an addition is made to clause (a) to address reverse sensitivity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Support sunlight protection:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter #63 (Kathleen Crisley) seeks that provisions in relation to recession planes are retained in final plan decision.</li> </ul>	<p>834.205 (<a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a>), 212.15 (<a href="#">BP Oil New Zealand Ltd, Z Energy Limited and Mobil Oil New Zealand Ltd (referred to as The Fuel Companies)</a>), 63.50* (<a href="#">Kathleen Crisley</a>)</p> <p>*Note: this submission point was recorded under 14.15.7 (Traffic generation and access safety) but does not address that subpoint and is best considered here.</p>	<p>I recommend that both submissions are accepted.</p> <p>Submission #63 is acknowledged.</p>

#### 14.15.6 – Scale and nature of activity

- Submitter #237 (Marjorie Manthei) supports the matter, as notified.

#### 14.15.8 – Water supply for fire fighting



- Submitter #842 (Fire and Emergency) support the matter, as notified.

#### 14.15.10 – Retirement villages

- RVA (811.66, 811.67) seeks that this matter of discretion is entirely replaced.
- The matter of discretion regarding retirement villages was specifically added to address the urban design effects and other wider effects associated with Retirement Villages. I consider that that the matters remain relevant. The proposed RVA change would also remove reference to development in Akaroa, which is outside the scope of this Plan Change. However, I do consider that a minor change is required to c. to note its application **due to the effect of the MDRS**.
- **Further, as per the rebuttal evidence of Ike Kleynbos dated 16 October 2023 I support the removal of sub-clauses a.i.D and a.i.iv.**
- **I therefore recommend that the submission is rejected in-part.**

#### 14.15.14 – Residential fencing

Nature of feedback	Submitter points	Recommendations
<b>Simplification:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #834 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) seek that the rule is limited to the adequate provision of amenity for occupants and the delivery of a functional and attractive streetscape.</li> </ul>	834.207 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<b>I recommend that the submission is accepted in-part.</b> The sub-points address these matters, whilst also considering fencing along internal boundaries, rather than just streetscape.

#### 14.15.20 – Service, storage and waste management spaces

Nature of feedback	Submitter points	Recommendations
<b>Simplification:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter #834 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) requests that the matters for assessment are sought to be limited to the adequate provision of</li> </ul>	834.208 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<b>Reject in-part</b> There is not considered to be an overlap with other matters, but these have been reviewed as part of the alternative proposal.

amenity for occupants and the delivery of a functional and attractive streetscape. Changes should be seen to avoid duplication and overlapping with 14.15.1.		
--	--	--

#### 14.15.21 – Outdoor living space

- University of Canterbury #184 supports the standard, as notified.

#### 14.15.23 – Street-facing glazing

Nature of feedback	Submitter points	Recommendations
<b>Simplification:</b> Submitter #834 (Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities) requests that the matters for assessment are sought to be limited to the adequate provision of amenity for occupants and the delivery of a functional and attractive streetscape. Changes should be seen to avoid duplication and overlapping with 14.15.1.	834.210 ( <a href="#">Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities</a> )	<b>Reject in-part</b> There is not considered to be an overlap with other matters, but these have been reviewed as part of the alternative proposal.

#### 14.15.30 – Building height in the High Density Residential Zone within the Central City

Nature of feedback	Submitter points	Recommendations
<b>Marjorie Manthei (#237):</b> Requests that greater consideration is given to ways to provide further protection from tall buildings in a residential neighbourhood, by rewriting and expanding the current list.  <b>Linda Blake (#78):</b>	237.47 78.6	<b>Out of scope - reject</b>  This matter of discretion relates to non-compliances that relate to cultural activities in accordance with 14.6.1.3.RD1. This has not been considered as part of the plan change and only the title has proposed to

Supports means to improve sunlight access.		change to ensure reference remain accurate as the zone name is proposed to change.
--	--	--

**14.15.31 – Daylight recession planes in the High Density Residential Zone within the Central City**

Nature of feedback	Submitter points	Recommendations
All submissions related to the greater protection of sunlight access.	237.48 ( <a href="#">Marjorie Manthei</a> ), 63.49 ( <a href="#">Kathleen Crisley</a> ), 70.15 ( <a href="#">Paul Wing</a> ), 78.7 ( <a href="#">Linda Blake</a> )	<p><b>Out of scope - reject</b></p> <p>This matter of discretion relates to non-compliances that relate to cultural activities in accordance with 14.6.1.3.RD1. This has not been considered as part of the plan change and only the title has proposed to change to ensure reference remain accurate as the zone name is proposed to change.</p>

**14.15.36 – Urban design in the High Density Residential Zone within the Central City**

- Marjorie Manthei (#237) support the matter, as notified.

## 14.16 – RESIDENTIAL APPENDICIES

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
258	Stephen Bryant		258.5	Seek Amendment	Amend recession planes for Christchurch to ensure they meet the Australian standard.	Alternative metric	Reject
385	Claire Williams		385.4	Seek Amendment	[Seeks that] the recession planes for Christchurch should meet the Australian Standard.	Alternative metric	Reject
119	Tracey Strack		119.7	Seek Amendment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That sunlight access be better protected by further amending the medium/high density southern boundary recession plane to 45° from 3m at the boundary; and,</li> <li>• That neighbours along the southern boundaries of any proposed developments that involve non-compliances with height or access to sunlight rules can be notified of the required resource consents and to make submissions.</li> </ul>	Greater sunlight	Reject
165	Catherine & Peter Baddeley		165.4	Seek Amendment	That sunlight access be better protected by further amending the medium/high density southern boundary recession plane to 45° from 3m at the boundary	Greater sunlight	Reject
188	Tony Simons for Riccarton Bush - Kilmarnock Residents' Association	Riccarton Bush - Kilmarnock Residents' Association	188.6	Seek Amendment	[T]he Sunlight Qualifying Matter should be more conservative than proposed, to preserve sunlight to the same degree as is enjoyed under current density rules.	Greater sunlight	Reject
197	Steve Smith		197.5	Oppose	[Maintain existing recession planes]	Greater sunlight	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
200	Robert J Manthei		200.6	Oppose	Recession planes should be the same as the current ones	Greater sunlight	Reject
215	Graham Thomas Blackett		215.2	Seek Amendment	Amend recession planes on new buildings to allow sunlight to directly reach the ground floors of existing adjoining dwellings for at least some portion of every day of the year.	Greater sunlight	Reject
220	Martin Snelson		220.6	Seek Amendment	Amend the recession plane angles to maximise sunlight	Greater sunlight	Reject
221	Cynthia Snelson		221.6	Seek Amendment	Amend the recession plane angles to maximise sunlight	Greater sunlight	Reject
237	Marjorie Manthei		237.7	Oppose	[Retain] current residential recession planes	Greater sunlight	Reject
245	Victoria Berryman		245.1	Seek Amendment	Amend the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter to allow for ground floors to have more sun during the winter.	Greater sunlight	Reject
246	Robert Black		246.5	Seek Amendment	Amend the recession planes to 40 degrees or less. Exclude Rule 5.4.1.3 from applying to recession planes under the MDRS.	Greater sunlight	Reject
272	Caitriona Cameron		272.7	Seek Amendment	The proposal should increase protection of sunlight access to maximise liveability features in new developments. - The recession plane angles should be reduced to provide more sunshine access than in Auckland, not the same, to take account of the colder temperatures in Christchurch. - Recession planes and setbacks should be set to	Greater sunlight	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
					guarantee minimum sunshine access to adjoining properties, regardless of site width of those neighbouring properties. Recession plane angles should be reduced for those sites bordering sites narrower than the suggested standard of 15m.		
294	Chessa Crow		294.3	Seek Amendment	Seeks to have recession planes made LOWER than currently proposed (way, way lower)...for any builds happening next to any single-story residences.	Greater sunlight	Reject
332	Neil Hodgson		332.1	Seek Amendment	Amend the sunlight access qualifying matter to ensure new buildings will not reduce the amount of sun a property receives by more than 20% at any time of the year. The submitter seeks to add this amendment to any changes to resource management laws.	Greater sunlight	Reject
360	Rebecca West		360.4	Support	[Require] greater attention to the mitigation of the loss of sunlight to neighboring properties	Greater sunlight	Reject
367	John Bennett		367.1	Seek Amendment	That the recession plane angles be lowered to allow adequate sunlight into ground floor housing units on adjacent sites during mid winter.	Greater sunlight	Reject
376	Colin Gregg		376.4	Seek Amendment	That sunlight access be better protected by further amending the medium/high density southern boundary recession plane to 45° from 3m at the boundary	Greater sunlight	Reject
383	Colin Dunn		383.5	Seek Amendment	Seeks more restrictive recession planes.	Greater sunlight	Reject
390	Mike Singleton		390.2	Support	[Retain recession planes]	Greater sunlight	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
425	Tom King		425.6	Seek Amendment	Consideration needs to be given and requirements increased for developers, as to the impact that high density housing and increased height will have on existing houses/ neighbours to minimise loss of privacy, sunlight and road congestion.	Greater sunlight	Reject
435	Madeleine Thompson		435.5	Oppose	[Oppose Height in Relation to Boundary Provisions]	Greater sunlight	Reject
454	Steve Hanson		454.12	Oppose	Opposes [height and height in relation to boundary rules] and [effects on] sunlight access.	Greater sunlight	Reject
485	John Buckler		485.5	Oppose	Change 45 St. Albans Street to a Medium Density Residential zone or preserve current sunlight.	Greater sunlight	Reject
491	Juliet Kim		491.2	Oppose	[S]upport[s] the application of Christchurch-specific sunlight access rules, but wants Christchurch to also have a maximum of 3 months/year of no sunlight to ground floor.	Greater sunlight	Reject
518	Sarah Meikle		518.10	Seek Amendment	[That the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter only applies to developments within the 4 Avenues].	Greater sunlight	Reject
580	Darin Cusack		580.5	Seek Amendment	That the Sunlight Qualifying Matter be more conservative than proposed.	Greater sunlight	Reject
584	Claudia M Staudt		584.7	Seek Amendment	Diagram D - That sunlight access be better protected by further amending the medium/high density southern boundary recession plane to 45° from 3m at the boundary	Greater sunlight	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
62	Thomas Calder		62.3	Not Stated	That sunlight access be better protected by amending the medium/high density southern boundary recession plane to 45 degrees from 3m at the boundary	Greater sunlight	Reject
638	Garth Wilson for Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc	Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc	638.3	Seek Amendment	[Amend recession planes to provide more sunlight]	Greater sunlight	Reject
685	Glenn Murdoch for Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	685.36	Seek Amendment	[M]ore restrictive recession planes should apply along the shared boundary [between MRZ and Residential Suburban, Residential Suburban Density Transition or Residential Hills zoned sites]	Greater sunlight	Reject
701	Ian McChesney		701.5	Seek Amendment	Reduce recession plane angles to provide more sunshine access than in Auckland.	Greater sunlight	Reject
701	Ian McChesney		701.6	Seek Amendment	Recession plane angles should be reduced for those sites bordering single storey existing properties.	Greater sunlight	Reject
701	Ian McChesney		701.7	Seek Amendment	[That] recession planes and setbacks [are] set to guarantee minimum sunshine access to adjoining properties, regardless of site width of those neighbouring properties.	Greater sunlight	Reject
708	Lauren Gibson		708.3	Seek Amendment	[Increase sunlight access]	Greater sunlight	Reject
786	Marta Scott		786.1	Seek Amendment	[That] recession planes ...consider the slope of the land (on the Port Hills).	Greater sunlight	Reject



No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
791	Marie Dysart		791.5	Support	Supports that the current proposal of the CCC sets lower recession planes on the south side of sites throughout the whole city, in order to reduce shading on properties to the south.	Greater sunlight	Reject
851	Robert Leonard Broughton		851.2	Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to the qualifying matter [make them more restrictive].	Greater sunlight	Reject
86	Melissa and Scott Alman		86.3	Seek Amendment	That sunlight access be better protected by further amending the medium/high density southern boundary recession plane from 50° to 45° from 3m at the boundary	Greater sunlight	Reject
876	Alan Ogle		876.6	Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to the Sunlight Qualifying Matter to be more conservative than proposed.	Greater sunlight	Reject
897	Evelyn Lalahi		897.2	Seek Amendment	[Modify recession planes to ensure sufficient sunlight and passive heating for neighbouring properties when 2-3 storeys developed next door]  Many of those affected are senior citizens and young families.	Greater sunlight	Reject
902	Helen Broughton for Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board	Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board	902.13	Seek Amendment	[T]hat there is provision for all ground floor dwellings to have access to sunlight all year round.	Greater sunlight	Reject
30	Doug Latham		30.12	Seek Amendment	Amend Appendix 14.16.2 'Recession planes' to increase recession planes in high density zone and reinstate previous exclusions.	More lenient	Reject
654	Wendy Fergusson		654.5	Seek Amendment	[H]ave a steeper pyramid shape of reducing heights out to the edges of the walkable catchment.	More lenient	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
676	Jack Gibbons		676.8	Seek Amendment	Add an option that reduces recession planes in the front 20m of the plot, in return for meeting larger shared yard and tree planting requirements.	More lenient	Reject
762	Daniel Crooks for New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	762.28	Seek Amendment	[That the] permitted intrusion [of gables] is revisited and revised as suitable to be included in PC14.	More lenient	Reject
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834.86	Oppose	1. Delete the Low Public Transport Accessibility Qualifying Matter and all associated provisions. 2. Rezone all areas subject to this QM to MRZ.	Oppose LPTAA	Reject
589	Krystal Boland		589.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
1049	Dylan Lange		1049.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
187	Tom Logan		187.4	Oppose	[Drop the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter]	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
191	Logan Brunner		191.16	Oppose	[Remove proposed QM Sunlight Access]	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
233	Paul Clark		233.10	Oppose	Oppose [Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter]	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
<del>261</del> (WITHDRAWN)	Maia Gerard		261.10	Seek Amendment	Opposes the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
262	Alfred Lang		262.8	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
263	Harley Peddie		263.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
264	Aaron Tily		264.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
265	John Bryant		265.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
266	Alex Hobson		266.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
267	Justin Muirhead		267.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] The council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
268	Clare Marshall		268.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
269	Yvonne Gilmore		269.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
270	Rob Harris		270.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
271	Pippa Marshall		271.10	Oppose	[S]eek[s] that the council drop [the Sunlight Access] qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
273	Ian Chesterman		273.10	Oppose	[S]eek[s] that the council drop [the Sunlight Access] qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
274	Robert Fleming		274.10	Oppose	[S]eek[s] that the council drop [the Sunlight Access] qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
331	clare mackie		331.1	Oppose	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter as part of CCC's PC14.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
342	Adrien Taylor		342.8	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
344	Luke Baker-Garters		344.4	Oppose	Removal of the city-wide sunlight access qualifying matter in its entirety	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
345	Monique Knaggs		345.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
346	George Laxton		346.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
347	Elena Sharkova		347.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
350	Felix Harper		350.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
361	James Gardner		361.6	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
362	Cynthia Roberts		362.8	Oppose	Opposes the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
363	Peter Galbraith		363.8	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
364	John Reily		364.8	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
365	Andrew Douglas-Clifford		365.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
366	Olivia Doyle		366.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
370	Simon Fitchett		370.10	Oppose	[O]ppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter...seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
372	Julia Tokumaru		372.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
373	Mark Stringer		373.10	Oppose	[O]ppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter...seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
374	Michael Redepenning		374.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
375	Aidan Ponsonby		375.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
379	Indiana De Boo		379.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
384	Christopher Seay		384.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
387	Christopher Henderson		387.10	Support	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
389	Emma Coumbe		389.8	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
391	Ezra Holder		391.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
392	Ella McFarlane		392.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
393	Sarah Laxton		393.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
394	Lesley Kettle		394.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
395	Emily Lane		395.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
415	Blake Thomas		415.9	Oppose	[O]ppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter...seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
416	Anake Goodall		416.6	Oppose	[O]ppose[s] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter.. seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
417	Jason Bi for Viso NZ Limited	Viso NZ Limited	417.1	Oppose	Seek amendment to 4m 60° recession plane.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
503	Jamie Lang		503.1	Oppose	Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter seeks that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
505	Jarred Bowden		505.6	Oppose	[O]ppose[s] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter...seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
507	Paul Young		507.4	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
510	Ewan McLennan		510.1	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
512	Harrison McEvoy		512.3	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
514	Ann Vanschevensteen		514.4	Oppose	The council drop the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
515	Zachary Freiberg		515.10	Oppose	Seek that the council to drop Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
516	Jessica Nimmo		516.8	Oppose	Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter seeks that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
517	Alex McNeill		517.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
519	James Carr		519.16	Oppose	[O]ppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter... seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
520	Amelie Harris		520.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject



No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
521	Thomas Garner		521.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
522	Lisa Smailes		522.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] I seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
523	Adam Currie		523.6	Oppose	[O]ppose[s] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter.. seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
524	Daniel Tredinnick		524.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
525	Gideon Hodge		525.10	Oppose	That Council drops [the Sunlight Access] qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
527	Kaden Adlington		527.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
528	Kelsey Clousgon		528.4	Oppose	[O]ppose[s] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter...seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
529	Daniel Carter		529.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
531	Claire Cox		531.6	Oppose	[O]ppose[s] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter...seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
532	Albert Nisbet		532.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
533	Frederick Markwell		533.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
537	Matt Johnston		537.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
546	Benjamin Maher		546.3	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] [S]eek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
551	Henry Seed		551.10	Oppose	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
552	David Moore		552.9	Oppose	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
553	Josh Flores		553.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
554	Fraser Beckwith		554.10	Oppose	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
555	James Cunniffe		555.10	Support	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
556	Clare Dale for Winton Land Limited	Winton Land Limited	556.14	Seek Amendment	<p>Delete 14.16.2 Appendix recession planes, insert the following:  Appendix 14.16.2  No part of any building below a height of 12m shall project beyond a 60o recession planes measured from points 34m vertically above ground level along all boundaries. Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way.</p> <p>b. For any part of a building above 12m in height, the recession plane under a. shall apply, unless that part of the building above 12m in height is set back from the relevant boundary of</p> <p>a development site as set out below:</p> <p>i. northern boundary: 6 metres;  ii. southern boundary: 8 metres; and  iii. eastern and western boundaries: 7 metres where the boundary orientation is as identified in Appendix 14.16.2 Diagram D, in which case there shall be no recession plane requirement for that part of the building above 12m in height.</p> <p>c. This standard does not apply to—</p> <p>i. a boundary with a road:  ii. existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site:  iii. site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed.  iv. the construction of three or more residential units of a maximum of 14 23 metres in height from ground level, to any part of a building:  A. along the first 20 metres of a side boundary measured from the road boundary; or  B. within 60% of the site depth, measured from the</p>	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
					road boundary, whichever is lesser. For corner sites, depth is measured from the internal boundaries, that are perpendicular to the road boundary. See Figure 1, below  insert new figure 1 as per submission		
557	Peter Beswick		557.12	Oppose	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
559	Mitchell Tobin		559.10	Support	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
560	Reece Pomeroy		560.10	Support	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
562	Rob McNeur		562.10	Support	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
563	Peter Cross		563.6	Oppose	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
565	Angela Nathan		565.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
566	Bruce Chen		566.6	Oppose	Seek that the council to drop Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
567	Mark Mayo		567.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
568	Hazel Shanks		568.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
570	Christine Albertson		570.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
571	James Harwood		571.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
572	Yu Kai Lim		572.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
573	Jeff Louttit		573.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
574	Henry Bersani		574.7	Oppose	Seek[s] that the council to drop Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
575	Jeremy Ditzel		575.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
576	Juliette Sargeant		576.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
577	James Robinson		577.8	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
578	Jamie Dawson		578.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
587	Ciaran Mee		587.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
588	David Lee		588.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
590	Todd Hartshorn		590.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
591	Helen Jacka		591.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
599	David Townshend		599.3	Oppose	[Delete Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter]	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
611	Ailbhe Redmile		611.9	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
612	Hamish McLeod		612.7	Support	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
613	Noah Simmonds		613.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
615	Analija Thomas		615.23	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
624	Daniel Scott		624.9	Support	[Opposes] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter. Seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
628	Tom Crawford		628.5	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
633	James Dunne		633.5	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
634	Georgia Palmer		634.5	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
639	Rory Evans Fee		639.6	Oppose	[O]ppose[s] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter...seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
643	Keegan Phipps		643.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
646	Archie Manur		646.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
652	Declan Cruickshank		652.11	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
655	Daymian Johnson		655.10	Oppose	Seek[s] that the council to drop Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
656	Francesca Teague-Wytenburg		656.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council [remove] this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
658	Ben Thorpe		658.6	Oppose	[O]ppose[s] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter...seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
660	Bray Cooke		660.5	Oppose	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
661	Edward Parkes		661.6	Oppose	[O]ppose[s] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter...seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
662	Bryce Harwood		662.6	Oppose	[O]ppose[s] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter... seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
670	Mary-Louise Hoskins		670.3	Oppose	Oppose the sunlight access qualifying matter [and seeks greater sunlight for Christchurch].	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject



No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
713	Girish Ramlugun		713.7	Oppose	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
715	Sara Campbell		715.8	Oppose	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and that the council remove this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
717	Jonty Coulson		717.7	Oppose	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
718	Gareth Holler		718.10	Oppose	I oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
719	Andrew Cockburn		719.10	Oppose	Oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
721	Ethan Pasco		721.8	Oppose	[O]ppose[s] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter...seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
724	Alan Murphy		724.6	Seek Amendment	[O]ppose[s] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter.. seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
727	Birdie Young		727.5	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
733	Michael Hall		733.11	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
752	Amanda Smithies		752.9	Oppose	oppose the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
753	Piripi Baker		753.8	Oppose	[Opposes] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
754	Alex Shaw		754.8	Oppose	[Opposes] the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter and seek that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
810	Anita Collie for Regulus Property Investments Limited	Regulus Property Investments Limited	810.4	Seek Amendment	[Reject QM Sunlight Access] - Reject, refuse, or otherwise decline the Qualifying Matters that do not align with that directed by the Central Government through the Amendment Act	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
811	Luke Hinchey for Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	811.59	Seek Amendment	[Amend MRZ & HRZ recession plane to] 60 [degrees] measured from a point 4 m above ground level along all boundaries,	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
812	James Barbour		812.2	Oppose	[Reject QM Sunlight Access] - seeks that the Council reject, refuse, or otherwise decline the Qualifying Matters that do not align with that directed by the Central Government through the Amendment Act.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
814	Jo Appleyard for Carter Group Limited	Carter Group Limited	814.174	Seek Amendment	Amend Appendix 14.16.2, to align with Schedule 3A, Part 2, Density Standards (12) Height in Relation to Boundary of the Amendment Act.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
823	Jo Appleyard for The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	823.140	Seek Amendment	Amend Rule 14.6.2.2 and Appendix 14.16.2, to align with Schedule 3A, Part 2, Density Standards (12) Height in Relation to Boundary of the Amendment Act.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
832	Finn Jackson		832.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
837	Sylvia Maclaren		837.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
839	Jacinta O'Reilly		839.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
840	Rosa Shaw		840.8	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
841	Jess Gaisford		841.8	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
843	Allan Taunt		843.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
844	Hayden Smythe		844.10	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
846	Lauren Bonner		846.1	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
847	Will Struthers		847.7	Oppose	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council drop this qualifying matter.	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	MAIN THEME	Recommendation
859	Fiona McCarthy for Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	859.4	Oppose	That the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter is deleted	Oppose sunlight QM	Reject
112	Nikki Smetham		112.9	Support	[Retain Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter]	Support sunlight QM	Acknowledge
184	Kelly Bombay for University of Canterbury	University of Canterbury	184.8	Support	Retain rule as proposed (Diagram D)	Support sunlight QM	Acknowledge
196	Brian Gillman		196.5	Support	[Retain Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter as proposed]	Support sunlight QM	Acknowledge
222	Claire Mulcock for Deans Avenue Precinct Society Inc.	Deans Avenue Precinct Society Inc.	222.8	Seek Amendment	Support the proposal to add a Qualifying Matter that would better allow sunshine to reach neighbouring properties, especially in the winter. This must apply to both Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone.	Support sunlight QM	Acknowledge
918	Geoff Banks		918.10	Support	[Regarding the Sunlight Access Qualifying Matter] seek[s] that the council maintain this qualifying matter.	Support sunlight QM	Acknowledge

## QUALIFYING MATTER – LOW PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESSIBILITY AREA (LPTAA)

Main theme	Matters raised	Submission points	Response
<p><b>Support approach, as notified</b></p> <p>3 submission points</p>	<p>Submitters support the qualifying matter approach as notified. Submitter #900 noting how particularly inaccessible and constrained the Port Hills are.</p>	<p>900.3 (<a href="#">Summit Road Society</a>), 112.3 (<a href="#">Nikki Smetham</a>), 312.5 (<a href="#">Joyce Fraser</a>)</p>	<p><b>Support approach, as notified – Accept in-part</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree, although foothill areas should be seen as accessible when within walking catchments to identified routes. <b><u>I consider an appropriate response to be MRZ zoning with a Precinct approach to specially manage development in accordance with the purpose of the LPTAA.</u></b></li> <li>Re-configuration of the bus route network on the hills is highly restricted due to topographical and roading infrastructure constraints and the increased cost of development on hill sites.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Other bus routes to be considered</b></p> <p>17 submission points</p>	<p>The following other bus routes were requested to be considered as high frequency by submitters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bus #60 [Keyes Road];</li> <li>Bus #80 [Wainoni Road];</li> <li>Bus #3 [to Sumner].</li> </ul>	<p>801.9, 801.15 (<a href="#">Jean Turner</a>), 802.9, 802.15 (<a href="#">Anita Moir</a>), 107.27, 107.31 (<a href="#">Heather Woods</a>), 792.9, 792.15 (<a href="#">Carmel Woods</a>), 789.10, 789.12 (<a href="#">Eric Woods</a>), 795.9 (<a href="#">Andrew Stevenson</a>), 796.7 (<a href="#">Justin Woods</a>), 797.9 (<a href="#">Zsuzsanna Hajnal</a>), 803.9 (<a href="#">Tamsin Woods</a>), 689.78 (<a href="#">Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council</a>), 703.2 (<a href="#">Graeme Boddy</a>), 800.8 (<a href="#">Ramon Gelonch Roca</a>)</p>	<p><b>Other bus routes to be considered – Accept-in part</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approach taken with the qualifying matter is that only those areas outside of walking catchments from more bus routes and the Orbiter (single digit bus numbers) – as well as employment connectors – are restricted. Double digit bus services are of a lesser frequency, with #80 has lower frequency (generally half-hourly) than #5 (generally 15-minutes).</li> <li><b><u>I accept that the #8 bus route should be considered, subject to specific restriction over Lyttelton Township due to infrastructure constraints.</u></b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Modify catchment extent</b></p>	<p>Submitters requested that the catchment used to define the qualifying matter be modified to better consider:</p>	<p>728.2 (<a href="#">Sutherlands Estates Limited</a>), 244.1 (<a href="#">Harvey Armstrong</a>), 322.2, 322.1 (<a href="#">Michael Campbell</a>), 879.7</p>	<p><b>Reject in-part</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above, sites within catchments from route #3 are proposed to be included.</li> </ul>

Main theme	Matters raised	Submission points	Response
18 submission points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally, higher frequency bus routes / should only be applied to completely un-serviced areas;</li> <li>• Areas of future investment;</li> <li>• Areas serviced by other transport options (like Uber);</li> <li>• Catchments from Orbiter route;</li> <li>• Operative RNN areas proposed to be MRZ outside of accessible catchments (Storr Close, Glendore Drive, James Mackenzie Drive and Sutherlands Road) (#728.2);</li> <li>• Remove from 75 Alderson Avenue (#244.1);</li> <li>• Crest Lane (#879.7);</li> <li>• Gwynfa Ave (#726.2);</li> <li>• Low frequency area of Hackthorne Road (#421.1);</li> <li>• Zone areas not considered relevant residential zones – Redmund Spur (#881.4, #881.5);</li> <li>• As per Council submission;</li> <li>• Better considers impacts on intensification.</li> </ul>	<p>(<a href="#">Rutherford Family Trust</a>), 726.2 (<a href="#">Michele McKnight</a>), 421.1 (<a href="#">Kane Lacey</a>), 663.3 (<a href="#">Williams Corporation Limited</a>), 300.3 (<a href="#">Sam Holdaway</a>), 881.4, 881.5 (<a href="#">Red Spur Ltd</a>), 814.243 (<a href="#">Carter Group Limited</a>), 242.15 (<a href="#">Property Council New Zealand</a>), 107.29 (<a href="#">Heather Woods</a>), 792.13 (<a href="#">Carmel Woods</a>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only higher frequency routes and employment connector routes are considered, therefore the Mt Peasant and Hackthorne Road service do not meet the criteria and would have the QM applied.</li> <li>• The qualifying matter approach is to focus on the highest frequency as this is the best indicator of propensity. The objective is to lessen private vehicle use by enabling greater densities in highly accessible and serviceable areas. Focusing of other ride-share options would not support this objective. In addition, the qualifying matter has not been placed over operative RNN areas that <u>have</u> been developed as their propensity to re-develop would be very low. This means that areas described by submitter #728 would remain MRZ, without the LPTAA qualifying matter.</li> <li>• Considering other specific addresses/areas requested by submitters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 75 Alderson Avenue is not within a walkable catchment to an identified bus route; the LPTAA should remain.</li> <li>○ Crest Lane is not within a walkable catchment to an identified bus route; the LPTAA should remain.</li> <li>○ Upper parts of Hackthorne Road are within a low-frequency part of #1 route and should have the LPTAA applied.</li> <li>○ Gwynfa Avenue is within a walkable catchment to the Orbiter Route and should remain MRZ, without the LPTAA qualifying matter.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Council submission and other submitters have highlighted that the catchment from the Orbiter must be better reflected in the catchment. I agree and recommend it's full inclusion for consideration, where areas within the 800m catchment are removed from the LPTAA.</li> </ul>

Main theme	Matters raised	Submission points	Response
<p><b>Oppose, qualifying matter should be removed</b></p> <p>202 submission points [~172 proforma]</p>	<p>Submitters request that the qualifying matter is removed for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Represents a static picture of current public transport accessibility / unable to adapt;</li> <li>• Restricts future growth and intensification;</li> <li>• Does not consider prospective future rail access;</li> <li>• Fails to meet statutory test / contrary to NPS-UD and/or MDRS / lacks evidence;</li> <li>• Does not consider active transport connections, like Major Cycle Routes;</li> <li>• Potential to exacerbate social inequities in eastern Christchurch;</li> <li>• Lack of relationship between PT access and density;</li> <li>• A financial contribution could instead be payable, financing future PT growth;</li> <li>• Approach has been used to reduce both high density and MDRS areas;</li> <li>• Methodology is arbitrary / should include down to 15 minute frequencies;</li> <li>• Specific buses mentioned for inclusion: 28, 107, 130, 140;</li> </ul>	<p><b>805.18-(Waka Kotahi (NZ Transport Agency) – WITHDRAWN)</b>, 880.1  <b>(Cathedral City Development Ltd)</b>, 444.6 <b>(Joseph Corbett-Davies)</b>, 723.3 <b>(Brooksfield Limited)</b>, 877.3, 877.12  <b>(Otautahi Community Housing Trust)</b>, 114.6 <b>(Connor McIver)</b>, 884.4 <b>(Troy Lange)</b>, 887.6 <b>(Jane Harrow)</b>, 676.9  <b>(Jack Gibbons)</b>, 55.12 <b>(Tobias Meyer)</b>, 121.19 <b>(Cameron Matthews)</b>, 344.5 <b>(Luke Baker-Garters)</b>, 681.2  <b>(Andrew McCarthy)</b>, 104.5 <b>(Ann Clay)</b>, 103.5 <b>(Damian Blogg)</b>, 100.5 <b>(Mary Clay)</b>, 783.2 <b>(Roman Shmakov)</b>, 187.8 <b>(Tom Logan)</b>, 189.9  <b>(Matt Edwards)</b>, 191.18 <b>(Logan Brunner)</b>, 199.4  <b>(Joshua Wight)</b>, 798.3 <b>(Wolfbrook)</b>, 859.1 <b>(Ministry of Housing and Urban Development)</b>, 277.3 <b>(Eriki Tamihana)</b>, 233.5 <b>(Paul Clark)</b>, 61.24 <b>(Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA))</b>, 362.12 <b>(Cynthia Roberts)</b>, 506.3 <b>(Alex McMahan)</b>, 517.5 <b>(Alex McNeill)</b>, 507.1 <b>(Paul Young)</b>, 512.2 <b>(Harrison McEvoy)</b>,</p>	<p><b>Reject:</b></p> <p><b>Oppose, qualifying matter should be removed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference should be made to 7.4 in this <a href="#">[the s42A report of Ike Kleynbos]</a> report for further discussion and evaluation under the Act.</li> <li>• The qualifying matter is largely based on core routes who are unlikely to fundamentally change due to the requirements of roading infrastructure needed to deliver routes at this frequency and the cost prohibitive nature of delivering this elsewhere.</li> <li>• The additional 4 routes may alter in time, however Council is required to review sufficiency every 3 years (HBA), which provides an opportunity to evaluate whether qualifying matter settings are appropriate. Requirements under the NPS-UD also require council to enable ‘at least six storeys’ within walkable catchments of rapid transport stops. Intensifying around current rail connections is presumptuous about future public transport delivery and does not reflect the requirements of the NPS-UD or the Mass Rapid Transit Indicative Business Case<sup>1</sup>.</li> <li>• The Council Submission has considered additional changes to reflect the Orbiter Bus route, which was not fully considered in error.</li> <li>• Proposed routes have been re-evaluated and the following changes (in addition to the Council Submission) are recommended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Applying the LPTAA over the low-frequency component of #1 route (Hackthorne Road)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> See Mass Rapid Transit information on the Greater Christchurch Partnership webpage: <https://www.greaterchristchurch.org.nz/governance/>

Main theme	Matters raised	Submission points	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The QM should not apply to retirement villages.</li> </ul>	<p>370.6 (<a href="#">Simon Fitchett</a>), 373.6 (<a href="#">Mark Stringer</a>), 753.5 (<a href="#">Piripi Baker</a>), 624.2 (<a href="#">Daniel Scott</a>), 595.2 (<a href="#">Logan Sanko</a>), 542.2 (<a href="#">Ben Helliwell</a>), 608.2 (<a href="#">Denisa Dumitrescu</a>), 614.2 (<a href="#">Matthew Coulthurst</a>), 596.2 (<a href="#">Hayley Woods</a>), 603.2 (<a href="#">Evan Ross</a>), 550.2 (<a href="#">Sam Mills</a>), 534.2 (<a href="#">Donna Barber</a>), 365.12 (<a href="#">Andrew Douglas-Clifford</a>), 366.6 (<a href="#">Olivia Doyle</a>), 375.5 (<a href="#">Aidan Ponsonby</a>), 538.2 (<a href="#">Barnaba Auia</a>), 539.2 (<a href="#">Lucy Hayes</a>), 540.2 (<a href="#">Ben Close</a>), 553.2 (<a href="#">Josh Flores</a>), 727.1 (<a href="#">Birdie Young</a>), 733.6 (<a href="#">Michael Hall</a>), 738.5 (<a href="#">Pim Van Duin</a>), 918.5 (<a href="#">Geoff Banks</a>), 371.5 (<a href="#">Nkau Ferguson-spence</a>), 379.5 (<a href="#">Indiana De Boo</a>), 387.5 (<a href="#">Christopher Henderson</a>), 391.5 (<a href="#">Ezra Holder</a>), 393.5 (<a href="#">Sarah Laxton</a>), 510.12 (<a href="#">Ewan McLennan</a>), 527.5 (<a href="#">Kaden Adlington</a>), 529.5 (<a href="#">Daniel Carter</a>), 532.5 (<a href="#">Albert Nisbet</a>), 589.5 (<a href="#">Krystal Boland</a>), 832.5 (<a href="#">Finn Jackson</a>), 1049.5 (<a href="#">Dylan Lange</a>), 843.5 (<a href="#">Allan Taunt</a>), 342.5 (<a href="#">Adrien Taylor</a>), 350.4 (<a href="#">Felix Harper</a>), 363.5 (<a href="#">Peter Galbraith</a>), 264.5 (<a href="#">John Reily</a>), 265.5 (<a href="#">Andrew Douglas-Clifford</a>), 266.5 (<a href="#">Olivia Doyle</a>), 269.5 (<a href="#">Winstone Wallboards</a>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the LPTAA over the higher frequency part of #7 (Travis area)</li> <li>Further adjust the catchment to rationalise smaller 'islands' and extremities at the edge of catchment(s).</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is evidence that supports investing in areas within 10 minutes from routes with the highest frequency. This, along with future investment into reliability and quality of the service, are the best means to increase patronage and reduce private vehicle use.</li> <li>I agree that proposed controls are more restrictive than necessary. Modified provisions have been proposed, although the intention is still to prevent medium density housing from being achieved.</li> <li>In the order of 100,000 commercially feasible residential units are still provided for, and about eight-fold Plan-enabled units.</li> <li>Routes have been selected on the basis of the highest frequency, continuous investment, and where routes connect to employment centres. Over 70% of residential areas have MDRS or higher density enabled over sites.</li> <li>There are no Policy 3 catchments that are restricted where another QM does not already do this (such as Coastal Hazard QMs).</li> </ul> <p>Regarding <b>active transport</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has made a strong commitment to investing in it's cycle network, with 13 routes identified through it's Major Cycle Routes network. Only very few areas where the QM applies are also intended or have an MCR (Hoon Hay, Woolston, Linwood, Ferrymead, Avondale).</li> </ul>



Main theme	Matters raised	Submission points	Response
		<p><a href="#">Limited (WWB)</a>, 374.5  <a href="#">(Michael Redepenning)</a>, 518.5  <a href="#">(Sarah Meikle)</a>, 520.5  <a href="#">(Amelie Harris)</a>, 533.5  <a href="#">(Frederick Markwell)</a>, 567.5  <a href="#">(Mark Mayo)</a>, 572.5  <a href="#">(Yu Kai Lim)</a>, 590.5  <a href="#">(Todd Hartshorn)</a>, 840.5  <a href="#">(Rosa Shaw)</a>, 844.5  <a href="#">(Hayden Smythe)</a>, <del>261.5</del>  <a href="#">(Withdrawn)</a>, 268.5  <a href="#">(Clare Marshall)</a>, 372.5  <a href="#">(Julia Tokumaru)</a>, 389.3  <a href="#">(Emma Coumbe)</a>, 394.6  <a href="#">(Lesley Kettle)</a>, 395.5  <a href="#">(Emily Lane)</a>, 565.5  <a href="#">(Angela Nathan)</a>, 568.5  <a href="#">(Hazel Shanks)</a>, 569.5  <a href="#">(Marcus Devine)</a>, 570.5  <a href="#">(Christine Albertson)</a>, 571.5  <a href="#">(James Harwood)</a>, 573.5  <a href="#">(Jeff Louttit)</a>, 575.5  <a href="#">(Jeremy Ditzel)</a>, 576.5  <a href="#">(Juliette Sargeant)</a>, 577.6  <a href="#">(James Robinson)</a>, 578.5  <a href="#">(Jamie Dawson)</a>, 587.5  <a href="#">(Ciaran Mee)</a>, 588.1  <a href="#">(David Lee)</a>, 591.5  <a href="#">(Helen Jacka)</a>, 643.6  <a href="#">(Keegan Phipps)</a>, 646.6  <a href="#">(Archie Manur)</a>, 837.5  <a href="#">(Sylvia Maclaren)</a>, 839.5  <a href="#">(Jacinta O'Reilly)</a>, 841.5  <a href="#">(Jess Gaisford)</a>, 846.2  <a href="#">(Lauren Bonner)</a>, 847.5  <a href="#">(Will Struthers)</a>, 267.5  <a href="#">(Justin Muirhead)</a>, 346.5  <a href="#">(George Laxton)</a>, 347.5  <a href="#">(Elena Sharkova)</a>, 521.5  <a href="#">(Thomas Garner)</a>, 522.5  <a href="#">(Lisa Smailes)</a>,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In many cases other QMs have been proposed in these areas whereby intensification is not possible. In other cases, I have proposed a reduction in the application of the QM due to lying within a walking catchment from one of the identified bus routes.</li> <li>• Evidence presented by Mr Morahan details how active transport should not be considered a straight substitute for public transport; they often complement each other and people who don't own a car will usually rely on a combination of both.</li> <li>• Overall, I believe the areas where MRZ or HRZ are proposed without restriction are strongly aligned with the location of public and active transport routes.</li> <li>• Regarding effects on eastern Christchurch: it is recommended that the Parklands/Travis area within the #7 bus catchment are removed from the LPTAA and enabled to MRZ. Recommendations to Policy 3 catchments detail the extension of HRZ walking catchment around the Linwood Town Centre Zone to 600m. The majority of the remaining eastern Christchurch is heavily influenced by other qualifying matters, such as Coastal Hazards, Tsunami, High Flood Hazard, and Vacuum Sewer constraints. It is not considered that the LPTAA in isolation would result in inequitable social outcomes.</li> <li>• Some submitters have potentially misunderstood the interrelationship between the LPTAA and other qualifying matters, like the Airport Noise Contour.</li> <li>• The approach relates to bus routes and centres, not specific activities. Older persons have free use of off-peak public transport through the Gold Card.</li> </ul>

Main theme	Matters raised	Submission points	Response
		<p>345.5 (<a href="#">Monique Knaggs</a>),  541.2 (<a href="#">Amelia Hamlin</a>), 544.2  (<a href="#">David Davidson</a>), 546.2  (<a href="#">Benjamin Maher</a>), 634.2  (<a href="#">Georgia Palmer</a>), 609.2  (<a href="#">Morgan Patterson</a>), 652.2  (<a href="#">Declan Cruickshank</a>), 607.2  (<a href="#">Mathew Cairns</a>), 610.2  (<a href="#">Alexia Katisipis</a>), 611.2  (<a href="#">Ailbhe Redmile</a>), 612.2  (<a href="#">Hamish McLeod</a>), 613.2  (<a href="#">Noah Simmonds</a>), 615.2  (<a href="#">Analijia Thomas</a>), 616.2  (<a href="#">Elizabeth Oquist</a>), 617.2  (<a href="#">Tegan Mays</a>), 619.2 (<a href="#">Oscar  Templeton</a>), 620.2 (<a href="#">Izak  Dobbs</a>), 628.2 (<a href="#">Tom  Crawford</a>), 631.2 (<a href="#">Matt Pont</a>),  632.2 (<a href="#">Aimee Harper</a>), 633.2  (<a href="#">James Dunne</a>), 640.2 (<a href="#">Steven  Watson</a>), 642.2 (<a href="#">Sophie  Harre</a>), 645.2 (<a href="#">Laura McGill</a>),  648.2 (<a href="#">Brennan Hawkins</a>),  649.3 (<a href="#">Peter Stanger</a>), 650.2  (<a href="#">Charlie Lane</a>), 651.2 (<a href="#">Jess  Green</a>), 722.2 (<a href="#">Nick Leslie</a>),  808.2 (<a href="#">Josh Garmonsway</a>),  618.2 (<a href="#">Lance Woods</a>), 547.2  (<a href="#">Amanda Ng</a>), 597.2 (<a href="#">Karl  Moffatt-Vallance</a>), 598.2  (<a href="#">Caleb Sixtus</a>), 601.2 (<a href="#">Jack  Hobern</a>), 602.2 (<a href="#">Devanh  Patel</a>), 604.2 (<a href="#">Daniel Morris</a>),  606.2 (<a href="#">Alanna Reid</a>), 526.2  (<a href="#">Philippa Wadsworth</a>), 549.2  (<a href="#">Tineek Corin</a>), 548.2 (<a href="#">Ethan  Gullery</a>), 270.5 (<a href="#">Rob Harris</a>),</p>	

Main theme	Matters raised	Submission points	Response
		<p>384.5 (<a href="#">Christopher Seay</a>),  392.5 (<a href="#">Ella McFarlane</a>), 254.1  (<a href="#">Emma Besley</a>), 273.5 (<a href="#">Ian  Chesterman</a>), 274.5 (<a href="#">Robert  Fleming</a>), 271.6 (<a href="#">Pippa  Marshall</a>), 718.5 (<a href="#">Gareth  Holler</a>), 635.2 (<a href="#">Suzi  Chisholm</a>), 551.2 (<a href="#">Henry  Seed</a>), 552.2 (<a href="#">David Moore</a>),  554.2 (<a href="#">Fraser Beckwith</a>),  555.2 (<a href="#">James Cunniffe</a>), 558.2  (<a href="#">Jan-Yves Ruzicka</a>), 559.2  (<a href="#">Mitchell Tobin</a>), 560.2  (<a href="#">Reece Pomeroy</a>), 562.2 (<a href="#">Rob  McNeur</a>), 563.4 (<a href="#">Peter Cross</a>),  713.5 (<a href="#">Girish Ramlugun</a>),  717.5 (<a href="#">Jonty Coulson</a>), 719.5  (<a href="#">Andrew Cockburn</a>), 752.5  (<a href="#">Amanda Smithies</a>), 621.5  (<a href="#">Loren Kennedy</a>), 622.5 (<a href="#">Ella  Herriot</a>), 714.5 (<a href="#">Russell  Stewart</a>), 715.5 (<a href="#">Sara  Campbell</a>), 623.2 (<a href="#">Peter  Dobbs</a>), 754.5 (<a href="#">Alex Shaw</a>),  516.5 (<a href="#">Jessica Nimmo</a>), 503.8  (<a href="#">Jamie Lang</a>), 536.2 (<a href="#">Hannah  Blair</a>), 524.5 (<a href="#">Daniel  Tredinnick</a>), 574.5 (<a href="#">Henry  Bersani</a>), 515.5 (<a href="#">Zachary  Freiberg</a>), 566.11 (<a href="#">Bruce  Chen</a>), 641.2 (<a href="#">Andrew  Treadwell</a>), 655.5 (<a href="#">Daymian  Johnson</a>), 594.4 (<a href="#">Hao Ning  Tan</a>), 557.2 (<a href="#">Peter Beswick</a>),  440.4 (<a href="#">Sandi Singh</a>), 768.3  (<a href="#">Mark Darbyshire</a>), 525.5  (<a href="#">Gideon Hodge</a>), 514.3 (<a href="#">Ann</a></p>	

Main theme	Matters raised	Submission points	Response
		<p><a href="#">Vanschevensteen</a>), 737.6  <a href="#">(Christian Jordan)</a>, 883.3  <a href="#">(Miles Premises Ltd)</a>, 656.5  <a href="#">(Francesca Teague-Wytenburg)</a>, 811.48  <a href="#">(Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc)</a></p>	
<p><b>General opposition to qualifying matter approaches</b></p> <p>1 submission point</p>	<p>Submitter is generally concerned with the degree of qualifying matters included in PC14 following the September 2022 proposal.</p>	<p>307.4 <a href="#">(Robert Fletcher)</a></p>	<p><b>Reject</b></p> <p><b>General opposition to qualifying matter approaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New qualifying matters added since September 2022 include: Sunlight access; City Spine; Open Space / Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor; Residential-industrial interface; Greenfield development features (ODPs); extension to Riccarton Bush Interface; modification of heritage items and settings; and the LPTAA. Reference should be made to each applicable s32 report and s42A report for further discussion and justification.</li> <li>• The sum effect of all qualifying matters still ensure that in excess of 50-years of commercially feasible residential development is enabled.</li> </ul>

## QUALIFYING MATTER – RICcarton BUSH INTERFACE AREA

Please refer to the s42A report for reasoning and the evidence of Dr Wendy Hoddinott.

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
110	Marie Mullins			General Rules and Procedures > Noise > 6.1A - Qualifying Matters > 6.1A.1 Application of qualifying matters	110.4	Oppose	Oppose Riccarton Bush Interface Area qualifying matter.	Reject
187	Tom Logan			General Rules and Procedures > Noise > 6.1A - Qualifying Matters > 6.1A.1 Application of qualifying matters	187.7	Seek Amendment	[Regarding Riccarton Bush Interface Qualifying Matter] reduce proposed area to [the adjoining sites] being 40 houses.	Reject
351	Jono de Wit			General Rules and Procedures > Noise > 6.1A - Qualifying Matters > 6.1A.1 Application of qualifying matters	351.1	Seek Amendment	Seek to remove or significantly reduce the size of Riccarton Bush Interface Qualifying Matter is removed completely or reduced in size significantly so it is only on the north side of Riccarton bush - furthest away from the public transport corridor and town centre of Riccarton Road.	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
44	Shona Willis for The Riccarton Bush Trust	The Riccarton Bush Trust		General Rules and Procedures > Noise > 6.1A - Qualifying Matters > 6.1A.1 Application of qualifying matters	44.1	Support	Support[s] the inclusion of the Riccarton Bush Interface Area.	Acknowledge
50	Oliver Comyn			General Rules and Procedures > Noise > 6.1A - Qualifying Matters > 6.1A.1 Application of qualifying matters	50.1	Seek Amendment	Amend to include the whole of Ngahere Street in the Riccarton Bush Interface Qualifying Matter.	Reject
886	Helen Broughton			General Rules and Procedures > Noise > 6.1A - Qualifying Matters > 6.1A.1 Application of qualifying matters	886.1	Seek Amendment	Supports the Riccarton Bush Interface Area as a qualifying matter, but considers a greater area should be included.	Reject
110	Marie Mullins			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	110.5	Oppose	Oppose Riccarton Bush Interface qualifying matter.	Reject
121	Cameron Matthews			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	121.15	Oppose	Request removal of the Riccarton Bush Interface Qualifying Matter.	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
187	Tom Logan			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	187.6	Seek Amendment	[Regarding Riccarton Bush Interface Qualifying Matter] reduce proposed area to [the adjoining sites] being 40 houses.	Reject
188	Tony Simons for Riccarton Bush - Kilmarnock Residents' Association	Riccarton Bush - Kilmarnock Residents' Association		Planning Maps > Any other QMs	188.7	Seek Amendment	[That the Riccarton Bush Interface QM Overlay is extended to include] the small residential area directly north of Riccarton House and Bush, bounded by Ngahere St, Totara St and Kahu Rd	Accept in-part
189	Matt Edwards			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	189.6	Seek Amendment	Reduce the area of the Ric Bush interface back to the current level of 40 sites.	Reject
191	Logan Brunner			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	191.17	Seek Amendment	[Reduce extent of Riccarton Bush Interface to sites immediately adjacent]	Reject
199	Joshua Wight			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	199.3	Seek Amendment	Amend Riccarton bush interface that limits buildings in this area to 8m.	Reject
225	Michael Dore			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	225.2	Support	Support protections for Riccarton House and Bush.	Acknowledge

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
351	Jono de Wit			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	351.2	Seek Amendment	Seek to remove or significantly reduce the size of Riccarton Bush Interface Qualifying Matter is removed completely or reduced in size significantly so it is only on the north side of Riccarton bush - furthest away from the public transport corridor and town centre of Riccarton Road.	Reject
50	Oliver Comyn			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	50.3	Seek Amendment	Amend to include the whole of Ngahere Street in the Riccarton Bush Interface Qualifying Matter.	Reject
55	Tobias Meyer			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	55.13	Seek Amendment	QM: Riccarton Bush Interface Area: Reduce area and support medium density to be high density.	Reject
679	Tony Dale			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	679.5	Seek Amendment	It recommended limiting heights to 2-storeys in some proposed RMDs enabled zones, to preserve those views, but in some of this RBIA area the city council proposes retain the underlying RMDS zoning, which would still mean higher density, and more liberal recession planes and setbacks. Plainly, this is not what was intended and this zoning should not be applied. I support the position of the Riccarton Bush Kilmarnock Residents' Association (RBK) on this issue.	Accept in-part



No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
679	Tony Dale			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	679.7	Seek Amendment	I s[S]upport the position of the Riccarton Bush Kilmarnock Residents' Association (RBK) on this issue.	Acknowledge
69	John Campbell			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	69.3	Support	Amend the planning maps to remove the Riccarton Bush Interface Area.	Reject
835	Lynne Lochhead for Historic Places Canterbury	Historic Places Canterbury		Planning Maps > Any other QMs	835.6	Support	The submitter supports this qualifying matter.	Acknowledge
851	Robert Leonard Broughton			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	851.13	Seek Amendment	Establish a planned Putaingamotu-Riccarton Precinct as a new qualifying matter.	Reject
851	Robert Leonard Broughton			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	851.6	Seek Amendment	[Seeks] A new qualifying matter: Riccarton Commercial/Residential Transition Zone.	Reject
859	Fiona McCarthy for Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	Ministry of Housing and Urban Development		Planning Maps > Any other QMs	859.8	Support	[Retain Riccarton Bush Interface Qualifying Matter and consider further reductions]. HUD broadly supports the retention and protection of Riccarton Bush on environmental and cultural grounds.	Accept in-part

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
876	Alan Ogle			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	876.29	Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to add a new qualifying matter for the commercial area north of Riccarton Rd in the Riccarton centre. This area should be height restricted to a height that is appropriate given the proximity of low-rise residential dwellings immediately to the north.	Reject
902	Helen Broughton for Waipuna Halswell-Hornby- Riccartern Community Board	Waipuna Halswell-Hornby- Riccartern Community Board		Planning Maps > Any other QMs	902.29	Seek Amendment	[That] the Riccarton Bush Interface [Area is extended to include:]  The southern side of Rata Street to Rimu Street and Kauri Street. Kahu Road opposite the entrance to Riccarton House. The Kauri Cluster, the precinct beside Riccarton House and Bush on the southern side. all [both sides of] Ngahere Street [and] Girvan Street. Houses adjoining the Avon e.g. 36a Kahu Road and adjoining houses. the larger area as indicated by the Riccartern Bush /Kilmarnock Residents' Association.	Reject in-part
905	Declan Bransfield			Planning Maps > Any other QMs	905.1	Oppose	[Remove Riccarton Bush Interface Area]	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
145	Hebe Gibson for Te Mana Ora/Community and Public Health	Te Mana Ora/Community and Public Health		Planning Maps > Any other QMs	145.16	Support	Te Mana Ora supports the different proposals to support tree cover in the Housing and Business Choice Plan Change Consultation Document, including to update tree setbacks to better protect individual trees and to incentivise more tree planting, Financial Contributions, and the Schedule of Significant and Other Trees becoming a Qualifying matter.	Acknowledge
121	Cameron Matthews			Residential > Rules - Medium Density Residential Zone > Built form standards > Building height and maximum number of storeys	121.16	Oppose	Request removal of the Riccarton Bush Interface Qualifying Matter.	Reject
189	Matt Edwards			Residential > Rules - Medium Density Residential Zone > Built form standards > Building height and maximum number of storeys	189.7	Seek Amendment	14.5.2.3.v - Reduce the area of the Ric Bush interface back to the current level of 40 sites.	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
225	Michael Dore			Residential > Rules - Medium Density Residential Zone > Built form standards > Building height and maximum number of storeys	225.3	Support	Support protections for Riccarton House and Bush.	Acknowledge
44	Shona Willis for The Riccarton Bush Trust	The Riccarton Bush Trust		Residential > Rules - Medium Density Residential Zone > Built form standards > Building height and maximum number of storeys	44.3	Support	Support[s] the proposed 8m height limit within the Riccarton Bush Interface Area.	Acknowledge
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities		Residential > Rules - Medium Density Residential Zone > Built form standards > Building height and maximum number of storeys	834.184	Oppose	14.5.2.3(iv) Industrial interface and (v) Riccarton Bush. Delete 14.5.2.3(iv) and 14.5.2.3(v).	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities		Residential > Rules - Medium Density Residential Zone > Built form standards > Building height and maximum number of storeys	834.92	Oppose	1. Delete the Riccarton Bush Interface Qualifying Matter and all associated provisions.  2. The existing tree setbacks in Chapter 9.4 are retained.	Reject
876	Alan Ogle			Residential > Rules - Medium Density Residential Zone > Built form standards > Building height and maximum number of storeys	876.7	Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to ensure that the Kauri Cluster should not be disaggregated or dismantled, and all areas referred to in WSP's Putaringamotu Riccarton Bush Heritage Landscape Review (recommended for inclusion in the RBIA) should be limited to 2-storeys and remain Residential Suburban density. Also include sites on the north side of Ngahere St and in the area between the Avon River and Kahu Rd	Reject
189	Matt Edwards			Residential > Rules - Residential Suburban Zone and Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone > Built form standards > Building height	189.8	Seek Amendment	14.4.2.3.iv - Reduce the area of the Ric Bush interface back to the current level of 40 sites.	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
225	Michael Dore			Residential > Rules - Residential Suburban Zone and Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone > Built form standards > Building height	225.4	Support	Support protections for Riccarton House and Bush.	Acknowledge
44	Shona Willis for The Riccarton Bush Trust	The Riccarton Bush Trust		Residential > Rules - Residential Suburban Zone and Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone > Built form standards > Building height	44.2	Support	Support[s] the proposed 8m height limit within the Riccarton Bush Interface Area.	Acknowledge
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities		Residential > Rules - Residential Suburban Zone and Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone > Built form standards > Building height	834.171	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delete 8m Riccarton Bush height limit.</li> <li>2. Delete 7m height rule in the Industrial Interface Qualifying matter area and apply relevant MRZ or HRZ heights.</li> </ol>	Reject

No.	Name	Organisation	On Behalf Of	Category	Point No.	Support Oppose	Decision Sought Only	Recommendation
834	Brendon Liggett for Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities		Residential > Rules - Residential Suburban Zone and Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone > Built form standards > Building height	834.93	Oppose	1. Delete the Riccarton Bush Interface Qualifying Matter and all associated provisions. 2. The existing tree setbacks in Chapter 9.4 are retained.	Reject
876	Alan Ogle			Residential > Rules - Residential Suburban Zone and Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone > Built form standards > Building height	876.8	Seek Amendment	Seek amendment to ensure that the Kauri Cluster should not be disaggregated or dismantled, and all areas referred to in WSP's Putaringamotu Riccarton Bush Heritage Landscape Review (recommended for inclusion in the RBIA) should be limited to 2-storeys and remain Residential Suburban density. Also include the sites on the north side of Ngahere St and in the area between the Avon River and Kahu Rd in the RBIA.	Reject