

SECTION 42A REPORT OF GLENDA DIXON - TABLE OF SUBMISSIONS ON RESIDENTIAL HERITAGE AREAS WITH  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS (UPDATED FOLLOWING HEARING)

Submission points highlighted with a light orange background were not included in the s42A evidence in chief.

Recommendations highlighted with light orange background, and **bold dark orange underlined or bold dark orange strikethrough** indicate changes to the position in the s42A evidence in chief as a result of Glenda Dixon’s rebuttal evidence or summary statement to the Independent Hearings Panel.

Where the officer recommendation on a specific submission point is to “reject”, this recommendation may be based on planning merit or if the submission point is considered outside the scope of this plan change, it may be a matter not able to be considered through a change to the District Plan.

Council have provided documentation of both original and further submissions. This is available via the following link:

<https://makeasubmission.ccc.govt.nz/PublicSubmissionSearch.aspx>.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
<b>ISSUE 1 – CHESTER STREET EAST RHA</b>						
Peter Beck	<b>S22</b>	<b>S22.1, S22.2</b>	Amend	Extend the Chester Street East Residential Heritage Area to cover the entire street.		<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.55	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Reject</b>

Debbie Smith	<b>S57</b>	<b>S57.1, S57.4</b>	Amend	Seeks that the entirety of Chester Street East be included as a Residential Heritage Area.		<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.92	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
Mary Crowe	<b>S281</b>	<b>S281.2</b>	Amend	Chester Street East should receive heritage protection zoning for the whole length of the street.		<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
Fire and Emergency NZ	<b>S842</b>	<b>S842.48</b>	Amend	Request that the boundaries of RHA2 are reduced to exclude the Fire and Emergency City Station site at 91 Chester Street East.		<b>Accept in part,</b> with the extent of inclusion of the FENZ site at 91 Chester St East being reduced to 5m from the Chester Street road boundary of the site, with the remainder of the property area proposed as RHA, to instead be part of the Heritage Area Interface Overlay.
		<b>S842.75-.77, S842.79, S842.81, S842.82.</b>	Oppose	Ensure that 91 Chester Street East is not subject to these RHA rules.		<b>Accept in part,</b> As the FENZ site at 91 Chester Street East will only be included for 5m from the Chester street road boundary of the site, with the remainder of the property area proposed as RHA, to instead be part of the Heritage Area Interface Overlay.

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2084.3 (S842.81)	Christian Jordan	Oppose	<b>Accept in part</b>
Kirsten Rupp	<b>S1001</b>	<b>S1001.1, S1001.2</b>	Amend	All of Chester Street East be included in the Residential Heritage Area.	<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.	
Keith Patterson	<b>S1002</b>	<b>S1002.1, S1002.3</b>	Amend	The section of Kilmore St west of Dawson St to Barbadoes St to be included in the Chester St/ Dawson Lane Residential Heritage Area.	<b>Reject,</b> as the section of Kilmore Street proposed for inclusion no longer has sufficient authenticity and integrity to merit being included. However the cottages at 341, 345 and 347 Barbadoes Street do warrant inclusion as an extension to the RHA, but no submission sought this.	
Ian Shaw	<b>S1007</b>	<b>S1007.1</b>	Amend	Add the following areas to the Chester St heritage area:  1: The area East of Dorset [Dawson] Street to Fitzgerald Avenue.  2. The properties located on Kilmore Street that adjoin the heritage area of Chester Street East, eg. the North boundaries of 129, 131 and 133 Chester Street	1. <b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.  2. <b>Reject,</b> as the section of Kilmore Street proposed for inclusion no longer has sufficient authenticity and integrity to merit being included.	

Simon Adamson and Judith Hudson	<b>S1013</b>	<b>S1013.1, S1013.2</b>	Amend	That Chester St East be included in the Chester Street Residential Heritage Area.	<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
Susan Parle	<b>S1014</b>	<b>S1014.1, S1014.2, S1014.3</b>	<b>Amend</b>	That Chester St East be included in the Chester St Residential Heritage Area.	<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
Mary Crowe	<b>S1015</b>	<b>S1015.1, S1015.2</b>	Amend	The entirety of Chester Street East should be included in the Residential Heritage Area.	<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board	<b>S1016</b>	<b>S1016.1</b>	Amend	The entire area or whole street from Chester Street East to Fitzgerald Ave be included in the Residential Heritage Area.	<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
Bosco Peters	<b>S1022</b>	<b>S1022.1, S1022.2</b>	Amend	That Council recognises the whole of Chester Street East as having special heritage character, and Include it in Appendix 9.3.7.3	<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
Marius and Roanna Percaru	<b>S1024</b>	<b>S1024.1, S1024.2, S1024.3</b>	Amend	That the special heritage and character of Chester Street East include the whole of Chester Street East [that the whole of Chester Street East is included as a Residential Heritage Area]...	<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.
Oxford Terrace Baptist Church	<b>S1052</b>	<b>S1052.3, S1052.4</b>	Amend	Seek that the whole of Chester Street East be included in the Residential Heritage Area.	<b>Reject,</b> as the built environment that now exists in the eastern section of the street does not embody significant heritage values.

**ISSUE 2 MACMILLAN AVENUE RHA**

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Daniel Rutherford	<b>S1027</b>	<b>S1027.1, S1027.2</b>	Oppose	Remove 20 Macmillan Avenue from the proposed Macmillan Avenue Residential Heritage Area.	<b>Reject,</b> as the inclusion of 20 Macmillan Avenue maintains the integrity of the historic subdivision that underpins the heritage values of the area.
Dr Bruce Harding	<b>S1079</b>	<b>S1079.1</b>	Amend	Seek clarification on the RHA 8 (Macmillan Avenue) boundary, as it was all covered in the Special Amenity Area provisions in the 1990s City Plan. Why is the home of John Macmillan Brown (35 Macmillan Ave) excluded.	<b>Reject,</b> as 35 Macmillan Avenue is included in a Character Area under Plan Change 14.
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>
		FS2037.662	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Reject</b>
		<b>S1079.2</b>	Amend	Seek confirmation that homes/properties of iconic citizens (in all city RHAs) are clearly delineated in the revised City Plan— so for Cashmere, for example, “Rise Cottage” (Westenra Terrace), the Ngaio Marsh House (37 Valley Road).	<b>Partly accept,</b> as the properties cited are already included in 9.3.7.2 Schedule of Significant Historic Heritage.
		<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	

			FS2037.663	Christchurch Civic Trust	Partly accept	<b>Partly accept</b>
<b>ISSUE 3 – INNER CITY WEST RHA</b>						
Christ's College	<b>S699</b> [also covered under Issue 10]	<b>S699.1, S699.7</b> [RHA mapping only]	Oppose	Delete the RHA Qualifying Matter from the following properties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Armagh Street – Numbers 6, 14, 16, 20 and 22</li> <li>• Gloucester Street – Numbers 4, 6, 8, 13, 14 and 19</li> <li>• Rolleston Avenue – Numbers 54, 64 and 72 (excluding the Heritage Items and Setting 267 at 64 Rolleston Ave.</li> </ul>		<b>Reject,</b> As the properties in question make a significant contribution to the heritage values of the area. The Inner City West RHA is one of the few remaining pockets of larger inner city housing from the late 19th and early 20th centuries.
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.544	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support in part	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2084.9	Christian Jordan	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
Carter Group Limited	<b>S814</b>	<b>S814.9</b>	Oppose	Oppose the definition for Contributory Building. Seek that this is deleted.		<b>Reject,</b> as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.

	Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
	FS2051.6	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
	FS2082.839	Kainga Ora	Support in part	<b>Reject</b>
<b>S814.11</b>	Oppose	Oppose definition of Defining Building. Seek that it is deleted.		<b>Reject</b> , as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.
	Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
	FS2051.9	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
	FS2082.841	Kainga Ora	Support in part	<b>Reject</b>
<b>S814.25</b>	Oppose	Oppose definition of Intrusive building or site. Seek that it is deleted.		<b>Reject</b> , as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.
	Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
	FS2051.23	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>

	FS2082.855	Kainga Ora	Support in part	<b>Reject</b>
<b>S814.26</b>	Oppose	Oppose definition for Neutral building or site. Seek that it is deleted.		<b>Reject</b> , as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.
	<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
	FS2051.27	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
	FS2082.856	Kainga Ora	Support in part	<b>Reject</b>
<b>S814.241 (part)</b>	Oppose	Amend the planning maps to remove the following features identified on the planning maps at 32 Armagh Street (as indicated below):  a. The heritage setting and heritage item;  [.....]  c. The residential heritage area overlay applying to the land and surrounding area.		<b>Partly accept, as the</b> contributions ratings of the cottage and former Girls High tuckshop should be amended as described in paragraph 8.3.4 of this s42A report, and the currently vacant part of the property should be excluded from the RHA but instead be shown as part of the Heritage Area Interface Overlay.
	<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
	FS2082.1071	Kainga Ora	Support in part	<b>Reject</b>



Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	S823	S823.9	Oppose	Definition of 'Contributory Building'. Delete.		Reject, as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.1241	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	Accept
			FS2045.182	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject
			FS2051.7	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
			FS2082.1094	Kāinga Ora	Oppose in part	
	S823.11	Oppose	Definition 'Defining building'. Delete		Reject, as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.	
		<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>		
		FS2037.1243	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	Accept	

	FS2045.184	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	<b>Reject</b>
	FS2051.10	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
	FS2082.1096	Kāinga Ora	Oppose in part	
<b>S823.212</b>	Oppose	Delete the definition of 'Neutral building or site'.		<b>Reject</b> , as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.
	<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
	FS2037.1444	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose.	<b>Accept</b>
	FS2045.385	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	<b>Reject</b>
	FS2051.28	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose.	<b>Accept</b>
	FS2082.1222	Kāinga Ora	Oppose in part	
<b>S823.213</b>	Oppose	Delete the definition of 'Intrusive building or site'.		<b>Reject</b> , as the definitions and consequent contribution ratings are not considered vague or uncertain.

	Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
	FS2037.1445	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
	FS2045.386	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	<b>Reject</b>
	FS2051.24	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
	FS2082.1223	Kāinga Ora	Oppose in part	
<b>S823.228</b>	Oppose	Delete Heritage Item 390 and Heritage Setting 287 regarding 32 Armagh Street from Appendix 9.3.7.2.		<b>Reject,</b> As the submitter does not provide any substantive evidence to call into question the heritage value of this item.
	Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
	FS2037.1460	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
	FS2045.401	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	<b>Reject</b>

Elizabeth Harris and John Harris	<b>S1061</b>	<b>S1061.3, S1061.4</b>	Oppose	Seeks that the Inner City West Residential Heritage Area overlay is removed from 31 Cashel Street and other sites on [the north side of] Cashel Street.	<b>Reject,</b> As there are significant historic, architectural and contextual heritage values in this area.	
		<b>S1061.1</b>	Oppose	The submitter seeks that 31 Cashel Street and surrounding sites be rezoned to High Density Residential.	<b>Reject,</b> As all the proposed RHAs have been zoned Medium Density Residential to reflect the significant historic heritage values of these areas, which would be more likely to be compromised with High Density zoning.	
Diana Shand	<b>S1075</b>	<b>S1075.1</b>	Amend	Supports the Inner West Residential Heritage Area and seeks that Cranmer Square be included in the Inner City West Residential Heritage Area.	<b>Reject,</b> as Cranmer Square is not considered integral to the heritage values of the Inner City West RHA.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.668	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Accept</b>
			<b>S1075.5 [ heritage only]</b>	Oppose	Seek that the Commercial use be confined to Oxford Terrace and that the Medium Density Zone should extend south from 59 Gloucester Street in a direct line south to the River at 75 Cambridge Terrace, displacing the Mixed Use Zone. <b>[zoning question reported elsewhere]</b>	<b>Reject,</b> As the parts of blocks described in this submission do not embody collective heritage values.
<b>ISSUE 4 - HEATON STREET RHA</b>						
Susanne Trim	<b>S37 [also covered]</b>	<b>S37.5, S37.6, S37.7 [Heaton St RHA only]</b>	Amend	Support most of the Residential [Heritage] areas except Heaton Street	<b>Reject,</b> As the south side of the street retains sufficient integrity to qualify as an RHA.	

under Issue 11]			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2092.2	Simon Watts for Brighton Observatory of Environment and Economics	Amend – unclear if supports or opposes Heaton St RHA	
<b>ISSUE 5 – CHURCH PROPERTY TRUSTEES/NORTH ST ALBANS RHA</b>						
Melissa Macfarlane	S135	S135.2	Oppose	Delete any applicable residential heritage area qualifying matters for the St Albans Church Properties Subdivision area.	Reject,	As the area demonstrates significant historic heritage values and therefore merits scheduling as an RHA
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2015.8	Susan Wall	Support	Reject
			FS2035.1	Anne Talaska	Support	Reject
			FS2038.1	Nick Bristed	Support	Reject
Melissa Macfarlane	S1003	S1003.2	Amend	Amend 48 Malvern Street to a 'neutral building' rather than a 'defining building'	Reject,	As the house retains sufficient authenticity and integrity, at this time, to be rated as a 'Defining' building

		<b>S1003.7</b>	Oppose	Delete HA3 from Appendix 9.3.7.3 and retain the area as a residential character area instead.	<b>Reject,</b> As the area demonstrates significant historic heritage values and therefore merits scheduling as an RHA	
<b>ISSUE 6- SHELLEY/FORBES RHA</b>						
Kate Askew	<b>S1005</b>	<b>S1005.2</b>	Support	Supports the inclusion of Heritage Areas including HA11 Shelley/Forbes Street, and own property at 11 Shelley Street.	<b>Accept.</b>	
		<b>S1005.3</b>	Amend	Amend Appendix 9.3.7.3 to include 10 Shelley Street as a defining building	<b>Reject,</b> As it is considered that the building at 10 Shelley Street should continue to be rated as contributory.	
Neil McAnulty	<b>S1040</b>	<b>S1041.1, S1041.2</b>	Oppose	Oppose the RHA as it applies to Forbes Street, Sydenham	<b>Reject,</b> As the street does merit inclusion in the RHA.	
<b>ISSUE 7- PIKO/SHAND RHA</b>						
Kāinga Ora	<b>S834</b> [also covered under Issue 10]	<b>S834.333</b>	Oppose	Opposes the proposed Residential Heritage Areas ('RHAs') in their entirety [also specifically opposes Piko/Shand RHA in covering letter]	<b>Reject,</b> As the area is one of the most authentic, 'fastidiously planned and carefully integrated' of all the early state housing schemes in New Zealand.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2044.131	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	<b>Reject</b>

	FS2045.137	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject
	FS2051.114	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
<b>S834.334</b>	Oppose	Oppose Residential Heritage Area provisions contained in section 9.3.6.4		Reject
	<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
	FS2044.132	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject
	FS2045.138	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject
	FS2051.90	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Accept
<b>S834.335</b>	Oppose	Oppose Residential Heritage Areas as listed in Appendix 9.3.7.3		Reject
	<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
	FS2044.133	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject

			FS2045.139.	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	<b>Reject</b>
		<b>S834.337</b>	Oppose	Oppose the assessments supporting the identification of RHAs [and RHAIOs] as they predominantly focus on physical built form, and do not have sufficient consideration of historical values associated with the place.		<b>Reject,</b> as this assertion is not accepted.
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2044.135	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2045.141	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	<b>Reject</b>
Jono de Wit	<b>S1053</b>	<b>S1053.1, S1053.3, S351.6</b>	Oppose	Oppose the Piko Crescent Residential Heritage Area. Does not meet the threshold to be a protected area.		<b>Reject,</b> as the area is one of the most authentic, 'fastidiously planned and carefully integrated' of all the early state housing schemes in New Zealand.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
<b>ISSUE 8- LYTTELTON RHA</b>					



Cody Cooper	<b>S289</b>	<b>S289.3, S289.4</b>	Oppose	Remove Lyttelton as a heritage area and instead pick a specific street or smaller area to designate as heritage.	<b>Reject,</b> As the RHA is already a reduced version of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga registered “Lyttelton Historic Area”.	
Julie Villard	<b>S1078</b>	<b>S1078.1, S1078.2</b>	Amend	Oppose the extent of the Lyttelton Residential Heritage Area. Seek that this be reduced.	<b>Reject,</b> As the RHA is already a reduced version of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga registered “Lyttelton Historic Area”.	
Lyttelton Port Company	<b>S1083</b>	<b>S1083.1, S1083.2</b>	Support	Supports the extent of the Lyttelton Residential Heritage Area as notified.	<b>Accept</b>	
<b>ISSUE 9 – REQUESTED ADDITIONAL RHAS</b>						
Susanne Trim	<b>S37</b>	<b>[Body of submission]</b>	Amend	Mary Street and Rayburn Avenue in Papanui are more appropriate than Heaton St to be an RHA	<b>Reject,</b> As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
Emma Wheeler	<b>S206</b>	<b>S206.1</b>	Amend	[New Residential Heritage Area] Make both St James Avenue and Windermere Road category 1 Streets, protecting both the plaques, trees and the people that already enjoy and use these streets	<b>Reject,</b> As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.298	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Reject</b>

Dominic Mahoney	<b>S329</b>	<b>S329.3, S329.4</b>	Amend	Perry Street should not be zoned for high density residential development on the basis of its historical heritage nature	<b>Reject,</b> As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>Decision No.</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Recommendation and Reasons</b>	
P Tucker and C Winefield	<b>S709</b>	<b>S709.3</b>	Amend	Windermere Road should be an RHA	<b>Reject,</b> As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
Marie Byrne	<b>S734, S1063</b>	<b>S734.1, S734.2; S1063.1, S1063.2</b>	Amend	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential area in Phillipstown Cashel Street to Ferry Road, Bordesley Street to Nursery Road be considered for a heritage area and subsequently a qualifying matter.	<b>Reject,</b> As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA. However an adjoining area around Ryan Street may meet the criteria.	
Susan Bye for Lower Cashmere Residents Association	<b>S741</b>	<b>S741.3, S741.4</b>	Amend	Make Cashmere View Street a heritage street.	<b>Reject,</b> As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA. Cashmere View Street is recommended in Ms Rennie and Ms White's evidence to be a Character Area.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2082.493, FS2082.494	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	<b>Accept.</b>

Mark Winter	<b>S1008</b>	<b>S1008.1, S1008.2</b>	Amend	Retain a heritage [and character status] for Beverley Street	<b>Reject,</b> As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
Waipapa Papanui-Innes- Central Community Board	<b>S1016</b>	<b>S1016.4</b>	Amend	Include Dover Street (original workers' cottages of historical significance) in schedule.	<b>Reject,</b> As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
Ruth Morrison	<b>S1041</b>	<b>S1041.1- S1041.3</b>	Amend	Keep the area around Paparoa St, Dormer St, Rayburn Ave and Perry St as a heritage area	<b>Reject,</b> As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
Anton Casutt	<b>S1088</b>	<b>S1088.1- S1088.3</b>	Amend	Seeks that Scott Street, Sydenham is added to a Residential Heritage Area [or Character Area].	<b>Reject,</b> As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
Waipuna Halswell Hornby Riccarton Community Board	<b>S1090</b>	<b>S1090.1</b>	Amend	Supports the Residential Heritage Areas but seeks that additional areas of Hornby, South Hornby, Sockburn, Hei Hei, Islington, and Broomfield be considered	<b>Reject,</b> As no areas have been identified in these suburbs which would meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2063.191	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
			FS2064.184	Retirement Village Association of New Zealand Incorporated.	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>

		<b>S1090.6</b>	Amend	Seeks a much larger Riccarton Heritage setting from Mona Vale to the Britten stables and war memorial at Jane Deans Close.	<b>Reject,</b> As it is not best practice to connect disparate heritage items which are already mapped and scheduled by applying a 'heritage setting' overlay to a suburb.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.651	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Reject</b>
Rosie Linterman	<b>S1091</b>	<b>S1091.1, S1091.2</b>	Amend	Seek that Beverley Street be included as a Residential Heritage Area.	<b>Reject,</b> As the area does not meet the criteria for being an RHA.	
<b>ISSUE 10 - OPPOSITION TO THE CONCEPT OF RHAS, OR TO THE NUMBER OF RHAS</b>						
Logan Brunner	<b>S191</b>	<b>S191.1</b>	Oppose	That proposed Residential Heritage Areas are removed	<b>Reject,</b> As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS 2037.264	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>

	<b>S191.2</b>		Oppose	That proposed Residential Heritage Areas are removed	<b>Reject,</b> As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>
			FS2037.265	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose <b>Accept</b>
			FS2051.113	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose <b>Accept</b>
Property Council of NZ	<b>S242</b>	<b>S242.20, S242.21</b>	Amend	Given the scale of the proposal and introduction of 11 new residential heritage areas, we wish to highlight the importance of ensuring that Christchurch has sufficient development capacity.	<b>Partly accept,</b> As the importance of ensuring that Christchurch has sufficient development capacity is accepted. However the City has more than enough development capacity outside of RHAs.
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>
			FS2051.68.	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support (S242.21) <b>Partly accept</b>
Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke	<b>S695</b>	<b>S695.22</b>	Amend	Amend definition [of Māori Land] to enable definition to be applied in relation to chapter 14.8 Residential Banks Peninsula Zone.	<b>Reject,</b> As this is not considered appropriate.

	Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
	FS2037.1015	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Reject</b>
<b>S695.8, S695.11- S695.21</b>	Amend	Amend all relevant RHA provisions, in Ch 9.3 Historic heritage, Ch 8 subdivision and Ch 14.8.3 area specific provisions in the Banks Peninsula Residential zone, to enable Rapaki runanga to develop ancestral land for papākāinga housing. Within the Lyttelton RHA, request that papākāinga housing be exempt from RHA rules including built form and minimum site size standards.		<b>Partly accept,</b> To the extent that the words “or is to be used for Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga” be inserted into matter of discretion (e ) in Rule 9.3.6.4.
	Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
	FS2037.1001, FS2037.1004- FS2037.1014	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support.	<b>Partly accept</b>

			FS2082.459, FS2082.462-- FS2082.472	Kāinga Ora	Support	<b>Partly accept</b>
Christs College	<b>S699</b>	<b>S699.1, S699.4. S699.8- S699.10 [RHA provisions]</b>	Oppose	Delete Qualifying Matter - Residential Heritage Area from the following properties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Armagh Street – Numbers 6, 14, 16, 20 and 22</li> <li>• Gloucester Street – Numbers 4, 6, 8, 13, 14 and 19</li> <li>• Rolleston Avenue – Numbers 54, 64 and 72 (excluding the Heritage Items and Setting 267 at 64 Rolleston Ave).</li> </ul>		<b>Reject,</b> As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City’s residential history. The proposed provisions for RHAs are reasonable and justifiable. <b><u>NB partly accept S699.5 below in regard to a new second part of demolition Policy 9.3.2.2.8, and revisions to matters of discretion on demolition.</u></b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.544	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support in part (S699.1)	<b>Accept in part</b>

			FS2084.9.	Christian Jordan	Oppose (S699.1)	<b>Accept</b>
			FS2051.61	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support (S699.4)	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2093.1, FS2093.2, FS2093.3, FS2093.4	Christian Jordan	Oppose (S699.8 – S699.10)	<b>Accept</b>
Matthew Gibbons	<b>S743.4</b>		Oppose	No new heritage areas should be allowed as they restrict development in parts of Christchurch where people want to live. A good rule would be that for every house added to a heritage area another is removed.		<b>Reject,</b> As the proposed rule is impractical. Properties in RHAs are included and their values assessed on a site specific basis.
Carter Group Ltd	<b>S814</b>	<b>S814.90 (part), S814.94- S814.99, S814.102- S814.104, S814.108- S814.110, S814.151, S814.163- S814.168.</b>	Oppose	Oppose all policies, rules, schedules and maps relating to RHAs, both in Chapter 9.3 and elsewhere in the Plan, and seek their deletion.		<b>Reject,</b> As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history. The proposed provisions for RHAs are reasonable and justifiable. <b>However partly accept S814.97 in regard to a new second part of Policy 9.3.2.2.8 on demolition in Residential Heritage Areas, and revisions to matters of discretion on demolition.</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	



			FS2015.6	Susan Wall	Support (S814.94)	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2051- 8 points	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
			FS2065 – 9 points	Davie Lovell- Smith Limited for Hughes Developments Ltd	Support	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2068.39	Red Spur Limited	Support (S814.90)	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2082 - 20 points	Kāinga Ora	Support in part	<b>Reject</b>
Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	<b>S823</b>	<b>S823.83 (part), S823.131 – S823.135, S823.216 - S823.219, S823.221, S823.222, S823.225- S823.227, S823.231- S823.233</b>	Oppose	Oppose all policies, rules, schedules and maps relating to RHAs, both in Chapter 9.3 and elsewhere in the Plan such as Chapter 14.5, and seek their deletion.		<b>Reject,</b> As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City’s residential history. The proposed provisions for RHAs are reasonable and justifiable.
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS 2037 – 18 points	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>

			FS2045 – 18 points	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2051 – 9 points.	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
			FS2082 – 4 points	Kāinga Ora	Support in part	<b>Reject</b>
Kāinga Ora	<b>S834</b>	<b>S834.333</b>	Oppose	Opposes the proposed Residential Heritage Areas ('RHAs') in their entirety [also specifically opposes Piko/Shand RHA in covering letter] [also discussed under Issue 7 Piko/Shand]	<b>Reject,</b> As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history. The proposed provisions for RHAs are reasonable and justifiable. <u>However partly accept in regard to a new second part of Policy 9.3.2.2.8 on demolition in Residential Heritage Areas, and revisions to matters of discretion on demolition.</u> <u>Also partly accept in regard to extending the exceptions to Rule 9.3.4.1.3 RD6 to include all alterations to exteriors of neutral or intrusive buildings.</u>	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2044.131	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	<b>Reject</b>

	FS2045.137	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	<b>Reject</b>
	FS2051.114	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
<b>S834.334</b>	Oppose	Oppose Residential Heritage Area provisions contained in section 9.3.6.4		<b>Reject</b>
	<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
	FS2044.132	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	<b>Reject</b>
	FS2045.138	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support	<b>Reject</b>
	FS2051.90	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
<b>S834.335</b>	Oppose	Oppose Residential Heritage Areas as listed in Appendix 9.3.7.3		<b>Reject</b>
	<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
	FS2044.133	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	<b>Reject</b>

			FS2045.139	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Limited	Support)	<b>Reject</b>
Otautahi Community Housing Trust	<b>S877</b>	<b>S877.6, S877.7, S877.24</b>	Oppose	Delete the Residential Heritage Area qualifying matter and any proposed provisions, including in Ch 14 MRZ area specific rules and in 14.3.f.i – how to apply rules		<b>Reject,</b> As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City’s residential history. The proposed provisions for RHAs are reasonable and justifiable.
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2082.1234 , FS2082.1235 , FS2082.1252 , FS2082.1302 , FS2082.1303 , FS2082.1320	Kāinga Ora	Support in part	
			FS2051.105, FS2051.100	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S877.7, S877.24)	<b>Accept</b>

Richard Abbey-Nesbit	<b>S1009</b>	<b>S1009.1- S1009.3</b>	Oppose	The submitter supports limitation of heritage areas, including to promote better public transport options	<b>Reject,</b> As the City has more than enough development capacity outside of RHAs.	
Kristin Mokes	<b>S1025</b>	<b>S1025.1, S1025.2</b>	Oppose	Reconsider adding so many more heritage sites - especially [in the] suburbs	<b>Reject,</b> As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history.	
Paul Mollard	<b>S1030</b>	<b>S1030.1, S1030.2</b>	Oppose	Remove any reference to residential heritage areas and make those areas subject to the same development rules as the rest of the city.	<b>Reject,</b> As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history.	
Sam Spekreijse	<b>S1033</b>	<b>S1033.1- S1033.3</b>	Oppose	Oppose all heritage overlays for residential heritage areas.	<b>Reject,</b> As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2051.115	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose S1033.1	<b>Accept</b>
Peter Earl	<b>S1038</b>	<b>S1038.1</b>	Oppose	Oppose all heritage areas and requests Council stay in line with the government's policy direction for intensification.	<b>Reject,</b> As the City has more than enough development capacity outside of RHAs, and RHAs being a Qualifying Matter is justified.	

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose				
			FS2051.116	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>			
Cameron Matthews	<b>S1048</b>	<b>S1048.1- S1048.16, S1048.19- S1048.36</b>	Oppose	Strike out all rules or parts of rules as they relate to Residential Heritage Areas, particularly Lyttelton, Inner City West and Piko/Shand RHAs.		<b>Reject,</b> As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history. The City has more than enough development capacity outside of RHAs.			
			Further Submission No.				Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051				Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose - 23 submission points	<b>Accept</b>
			FS2015.1, FS2015.10				Susan Wall	Support (S1048.3, S1048.22)	<b>Reject</b>
Jono de Wit	<b>S1053</b>	<b>S1053.1, S1053.3</b>	Oppose	Oppose the Piko Street Residential Heritage Area [because it is close to the Riccarton Road public transport corridor/future MRT line] [also discussed under Issue 7 Piko/Shand]		<b>Reject,</b> The City has more than enough development capacity outside of RHAs. Retention of RHAs will contribute to Objective 1 of the NPS-UD, being well-functioning urban environments that provide for the well-being of communities.			

Keri Whaitiri	S1069	S1069.1, S1069.2	Amend	Seek that the 'defining' and 'contributory' categories in Residential Heritage Areas are removed completely from the proposed new Policy Changes.	<b>Reject,</b> As removal of these categories would disable the RHA system.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2015.2	Susan Wall	Support (S1069.1)	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2051.54	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1069.2)	<b>Accept</b>
			S1069.3	Amend	Seeks that the full implications of the new 'Residential Heritage Areas' are disclosed and that these do not exceed the current provisions of the 'Residential Character Areas'	<b>Reject,</b> As the implications of RHAs have been disclosed. RHA provisions are similar to those for Residential Character Areas.
Danny Whiting [with regard to RHAs]	S1070	S1070.2	Oppose	Delete/reject proposed amendments to definitions, policies, rules and assessment matters in PC13 and retain the status quo in respect of these provisions	<b>Reject,</b> As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history, and the proposed provisions for RHAs are reasonable and justifiable.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2015.9	Susan Wall	Support	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2051.47	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>

Peebles Group Limited, Richard and Suzanne Peebles and 181 High Limited	<b>S1071-S1073</b>	<b>S1071.1, S1072.3, 1073.2</b>	Oppose	Delete/reject proposed amendments to definitions, policies, rules and assessment matters as they relate to heritage and retain the status quo in respect of these provisions.	<b>Reject,</b> As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history, and the proposed provisions for RHAs are reasonable and justifiable.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2015.12	Susan Wall	Support (S1071.1)	
			FS2051.39	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1071.1)	
			FS2051.48, FS2051.49	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1072.3, S1973.2)	
Duncans Lane Limited	<b>S1085</b>	<b>S1085.3</b>	Oppose	Delete/reject proposed amendments to definitions, policies, rules and assessment matters as they relate to heritage and retain the status quo in respect of these provisions.	<b>Reject,</b> As the few remaining areas which meet the criteria to be RHAs are significant examples of the City's residential history, and the proposed provisions for RHAs are reasonable and justifiable.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2015.5	Susan Wall	Support	<b>Reject</b>



			FS2051.50	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
<b>ISSUE 11 – SUPPORT RHAS/ SEEK MORE RHAS</b>						
Susanne Trim	<b>S37</b>	<b>S37.5, S37.6, S37.7 [points added - supporting RHAs only]</b>	Support	Retain the proposed [Residential Heritage Areas] except Heaton St. [Heaton St RHA discussed under Issue 4 above].		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2092.2	Simon Watts for Brighton Observatory of Environment and Economics	Seek Amendment – oppose RHAs?	
Te Mana Ora/Community and Public Health	<b>S145</b>	<b>S145.18</b>	Support	Te Mana Ora supports the protection of Residential Heritage Areas and recognises the need to balance housing development with protecting areas of cultural heritage and identity.		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	

			FS2037.209	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Accept</b>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)	<b>S193</b>	<b>S193.2, S192.3, S193.6-S193.8, S193.10, S193.15-S193.19, S193.24-S193.28</b>	Support	Retain definitions of defining, contributory, neutral and intrusive buildings as proposed. [also see Issue 3 on these definitions]. Retain RHA policies, rules and matters of discretion as proposed.		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.272, FS2037.274	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Accept</b>
Michael Dore	<b>S225</b>	<b>S225.5</b>	Support	The history, character and heritage of our city of Christchurch should be protected at all costs		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.316	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Accept</b>
			FS2051.118	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	<b>Accept</b>
Lawrence Kiesanowsk	<b>S404</b>	<b>S404.1</b>	Support	Support plan change provisions to protect historic heritage areas.		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	

			FS2051.40	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	<b>Accept</b>
Sarah Wylie	<b>S428</b>	<b>S428.3</b>	Support	Support the protection of heritage areas		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2051.41	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	<b>Accept</b>
Hilary Talbot	<b>S700</b>	<b>S700.1- S700.3, S700.6</b>	Support	[Re: Englefield Heritage Area] support the creation of the Heritage Area [and the continuation of the character area] with more stringent controls		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support (all four points)	<b>Accept</b>
			FS2051.42	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support (S700.1)	
		Support	Support the retention of heritage listed Englefield House [in the context of the RHA]. [This is also covered in the evidence of Mrs Richmond]		<b>Accept,</b> Although there is no submission seeking its deletion.	
		<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>		
		FS2037.549, FS2037.550,	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Accept</b>	
		<b>S700.4, S700.5</b>				

			FS2037.990, FS2037.991			
Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
Margaret Stewart	S755	S755.4	Support	Retain Heritage areas		Accept
Historic Places Canterbury	S835	S835.20	Support	The submitter welcomes the addition of 11 Residential Heritage areas and their inclusion as Qualifying Matters.		Accept
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.607 and FS2037.705	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept
			FS2051.120	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	Accept
Peter Dyrberg	S885	S885.3, S885.4, S885.6, S885.7	Support	Retain the proposed Residential Heritage Areas and rules relating to them		Accept
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.119	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support (S885.3)	Accept

			FS2062.23	Riccarton Bush Kilmarnock Residents Association	Support (S885.6)	
Julie Florkowski	<b>S1019</b>	<b>S1019.1, S1019.2</b>	Support	Supports the Residential Heritage Areas of Otautahi, Christchurch (specifically, Alpha Avenue).		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2051.121	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support (S1019.2)	<b>Accept</b>
Chris Florkowski	<b>S1020</b>	<b>S1020.2, S1020.3</b>	Support	Support Residential Heritage Areas of Otautahi, Christchurch, which deserve special protection		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2051.45, FS2051.122	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	<b>Accept</b>
Maxine Webb	<b>S1026</b>	<b>S1026.1</b>	Support	The submitter supports the heritage areas as a qualifying matter and is of the view that they should have a wider extent to protect the character of Christchurch.		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	

			FS2051.123	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	<b>Accept</b>
Waihoru Spredon- Cashmere- Heathcote Community Board	<b>S1077</b>	<b>S1077.1</b>	Support	Supports the addition of the MacMillan Avenue and Shelley/Forbes Street Residential Heritage Areas.		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.664	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Accept</b>
Christian Jordan	<b>S1086 and S737 [statement s on RHAs not coded in S737]</b>	<b>S1086.5, S1086.6 and S1086.7 [points added]</b>	Amend	Further heritage areas need to be assessed and created across the city to protect Christchurch's remaining built history.		<b>Accept,</b> although no specific areas were requested.
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2099.9, FS2099.10. FS2099.11	Kāinga Ora	Oppose (S1086.7)	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2095.5	Chapman Tripp for Ryman Healthcare Ltd	Oppose (S1086.7)	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2096.5	Chapman Tripp for Retirement Village Assn of NZ Incorporated	Oppose (S1086.7)	<b>Reject</b>

Christchurch Civic Trust	S1089	S1089.2	Support	Support the scheduled Highly Significant Englefield Lodge [in the context of the RHA]. [This is also covered in the evidence of Mrs Richmond]	<b>Accept,</b> Although there is no submission seeking its deletion.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.653	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Accept</b>
<b>ISSUE 12 - AMEND RHA RULES SO THEY ARE LESS RESTRICTIVE</b>						
James Carr	S519	S519.6, S519.7, S519.22- S519.24, S519.26	Amend	Adopt MDRS height rules and recession plane rules in RHAs, to provide for taller villas and two storey Victorian villas and Arts and Crafts houses to be altered, but apply stricter limits on site coverage and setbacks to work with the existing streetscape.	<b>Reject,</b> As the question of higher height limits in the RHAs requires more work, and needs to be considered as part of the RHA and Character Area built form rules packages.	
Christ's College	S699	S699.5	Amend	Reject all notified changes to Policy 9.3.2.2.8– Demolition of scheduled historic heritage. It is inappropriate that buildings located within a heritage area are subject to the same policy test as listed heritage items.	<b>Partly Accept,</b> <u>with a new second part of Policy 9.3.2.2.8 directed specifically at demolition in Residential Heritage Areas, and revisions to matters of discretion on demolition.</u>	
Hilary Talbot	S700	S700.7	Amend	The drafting of these rules should be reviewed to see if a more nuanced approach to buildings in heritage areas is appropriate.	<b>Partly accept,</b> As this report recommends an exception to the RHA rules for sustainability and energy conservation measures.	

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.552, FS2037.993	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	
Melissa Macfarlane	S1003	S1003.1, S1003.6	Amend	Delete Rule 9.3.4.1.3 RD6 entirely or if Residential Heritage Areas remain included in the proposed plan, include a more appropriate and targeted rule, e.g. only apply it to new buildings greater than 30m <sup>2</sup> or the alteration of defining or contributory external building fabric by more than 35%. Delete 9.3.6.4 or amend 9.3.6.4 to remove matters that focus on the dwelling itself (which is not individually listed) and target the assessment to impacts on the wider residential heritage area.		<b>Partly accept,</b> As the report recommends some amendments to the matters of discretion for new buildings and alterations within RHAs, for example to make it clearer that there is intended to be a primary focus on the collective values of the heritage area, with only a secondary focus on individual buildings.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
		FS2051.79	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1003.6)	<b>Partly accept</b>	
		S1003.4	Amend	Amend the definition of 'Heritage fabric' to exclude 'heritage area' or exclude heritage area buildings that are not defining or contributory.		<b>Reject,</b> As removal of neutral and intrusive sites from RHAs or effectively from the need for an RD consent for rebuilding would negate the possibility of heritage enhancement of an area for at least this chunk of buildings, and could even



				result in buildings which detract from the heritage values of the area.
		<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>
		FS2051.16	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose
				<b>Accept</b>
	<b>S1003.8</b>	Amend	Amend rule 14.5.3.2.8 (b)(i) to apply a minimum 6m setback for all buildings.	<b>Partly accept,</b> As it is recommended that this rule be reworded to cover buildings remaining in situ, but with a default 8m setback.
	<b>S1003.9</b>	Amend	Amend Rule 14.5.3.2.3(b)(v)(b) to enable 2 storey buildings.	<b>Reject,</b> As the question of higher height limits in the RHAs requires more work, and needs to be considered as part of the RHA built form rules package.
	<b>S1003.10</b>	Amend	Amend Rule 14.5.3.2.8(c)(ii) so that it only applies to residential dwellings and not accessory buildings. Accessory buildings will need to comply with the standard zone provisions for boundary setbacks.	<b>Reject,</b> As the intent of wider internal boundary setbacks in RHAs applying to all buildings is to keep accessory buildings out of the street view as much as possible, and maintain the streetscape pattern.
	<b>S1003.11- S1003.13</b>	Amend	Delete references to RHAs in Policies 9.3.2.2.3, 9.3.2.2.5 and 9.3.2.2.8. Instead include a new fit for purpose targeted	<b>Partly accept,</b> As the report recommends some amendments to the matters of

				policy for residential heritage areas that focuses on impacts on the recognised values of the area, i.e. interwar Californian bungalows.	discretion for new buildings and alterations within RHAs, for example to make it clearer that there is intended to be a primary focus on the collective values of the heritage area, with only a secondary focus on individual buildings.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2051.60	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1003.12).	<b>Partly accept</b>
			FS2051.67	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1003.13)	<b>Partly accept</b>
Melissa Macfarlane	<b>S1003</b>	<b>S1003.16</b>	Amend	Amend Rule 14.5.3.1.3 RD14 so that it only applies to the demolition or removal or relocation or erection of a building greater than 30m2.	<b>Reject,</b> As larger scale accessory buildings can still make a significant contribution to the values of RHAs.	
Jayne Smith	<b>S1017</b>	<b>S1017.2, S1017.4</b>	Amend	Supports Residential Heritage Areas but has some concerns regarding the ability to make alterations to the exterior of their property for sustainability and other reasons.	<b>Partly Accept,</b> As this report recommends an exception to the RHA rules for sustainability and energy conservation measures.	

Emily Arthur	S1036	S1036.1	Amend	Amend RD7 so that consent is not required to demolish a contributory building in a Residential Heritage Area.	<b>Reject,</b> As it is not appropriate to remove the need for demolition consents for the more significant buildings, as that would provide free rein for people to remove the buildings which contribute most to the heritage values of the area. <b>However, add non-notification rule for demolition of contributory buildings.</b>	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2051.80	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
		S1036.2	Amend	Remove the mandatory 1m from one boundary and 3m from the other on new builds. Allow houses to be built closer than 1m or 3m from property boundaries if that was the way the one being removed was constructed.	<b>Reject,</b> As existing use rights may apply. Otherwise, the purpose of these setbacks is to maintain the streetscape pattern, and the scale of buildings and their settings.	
		S1036.3	Amend	Allow up to 70% site coverage on a site by site basis rather [than] having a blanket rule of 40%.	<b>Reject,</b> As 70% is much too high a proportion of coverage for RHAs generally. Sites need to function with adequate outdoor living space and some degree of landscaping/tree cover.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	

	FS2082.830	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
--	------------	------------	--------	---------------

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
Cameron Matthews	<b>S1048</b>	<b>S1048.17, S1048.18</b>	Oppose	Strike out all rules or parts of rules as they relate to RHA's and Heritage Areas,[see Issue 10] including definitions of Contributory and Defining Buildings		<b>Reject,</b> As all of the RHAs have a strong heritage story and are significant examples of the City's residential history. Removal of these categories would disable the RHA system.
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2051.8, FS2051.11	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
Keri Whaitiri	<b>S1069</b>	<b>S1069.1, S1069.2</b>	Oppose	Seek that the 'defining' and 'contributory' categories in Residential Heritage Areas are removed completely from the proposed new Policy Changes.		<b>Reject</b> Removal of these categories would disable the RHA system
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2015.2	Susan Wall	Support (S1069.1)	<b>Reject</b>

			FS2051.54	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S1069.2)	<b>Accept</b>
Julie Villard	<b>S1078</b>	<b>S1078 [points not coded]</b>	Amend	[Points not coded]. Limit RHA in Lyttelton to defining and contributory sites. Neutral sites do not have any architectural significance or historical values		<b>Reject,</b> As removal of neutral sites from RHAs or effectively from the need for an RD consent for rebuilding, would negate the possibility of heritage enhancement of an area for at least this chunk of buildings, and could even result in buildings which detract from the heritage values of the area.
Ian Cumberpatch Architects	<b>S2076</b>	<b>S2076.56</b>	Amend	Amend subclause 14.8.3.2.2.(a) to be 250m <sup>2</sup> [Residential Banks Peninsula zone area specific built form standards – site density for Residential Heritage Area in Lyttelton]		<b>Reject</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2099.68	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	
		<b>S2076.57</b>	Amend	Amend subclause 14.8.3.2.4(a) to be 60% [Residential Banks Peninsula zone area specific built form standards – coverage in Residential Heritage Area in Lyttelton]		<b>Partly accept,</b> In that the part of the RHA which is also within the Lyttelton Character Area is recommended to have a maximum coverage of 60%, with the remainder of the

					Lyttelton RHA continuing to have a coverage limit of 50%.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2099.69	Kainga Ora	Oppose	
					<b>Partly accept</b>	
<b>ISSUE 13 -- CLARIFY HOW RHA RULES WILL WORK/MAKE MINOR AMENDMENTS SO THEY WORK BETTER</b>						
Fire and Emergency NZ	<b>S842</b>	<b>S842.73</b>	Oppose	Regarding Rule 9.3.4.1.1 P2, Fire and Emergency seek clarity as to whether an intrusive building within a residential heritage area would be subject to the activity specific standards set out in permitted activity rule 9.3.4.1.1.- repairs to a building in a heritage area.	<b>Accept.</b> See wording amendment to P2.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2084.2	Christian Jordan	Oppose	<b>Reject</b>
Fire and Emergency NZ	<b>S842</b>	<b>S842.74</b>	Oppose	Assume 91 Chester St East is not subject to 9.3.4.1.1 P3 (a)(iv) temporary activities in a heritage area – clarify.	<b>Reject,</b> As temporary buildings are likely to be visible beyond the site, the rule is not considered to be unreasonable.	

Melissa Macfarlane	<b>S1003</b>	<b>S1003.5</b>	Amend	Exclude heritage areas from the definition of heritage fabric or amend RD1 so it does not apply to activities covered by Rule 9.3.4.1.3 RD6.	<b>Accept.</b> See wording addition to RD1
Waipapa Papanui-Innes- Central Community Board	<b>S1016</b>	<b>S1016.3</b>	Amend	Continue to consider any additional suggestions of historical significance that are received through this process. Provision should be made for interim protection of areas (and sites) with potential heritage values to allow time for necessary in depth investigation to be undertaken	<b>Reject,</b> As there is no need to insert a provision to this effect as this could be done at any time by plan change. It is not possible under the RMA to provide interim protection for potential RHAs.
Rob Seddon-Smith	<b>S1028</b>	<b>S1028.2</b>	Amend	Seeks a clear definition of what constitutes the particular 'heritage' character of each area, so that it is easy to determine how any proposed development might meet such character standards.	<b>Reject,</b> As it would be too difficult to draft standards which captured the variable and often contextual heritage features of all the different RHAs. These include streetscapes and public realm features.
		<b>S1028.4</b>	Amend	Seeks that a date not more than 30 years hence whereby the heritage status of an area and the rules governing it should be reviewed or otherwise automatically removed.	<b>Reject,</b> As RHAs would be reviewed in the normal course of every District Plan review (nominally every 10 years), or could be reviewed more often by plan change.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
-----------	----------------	--------------	---------	-----------------	----------------------------

Oxford Baptist Church	<b>S1052</b>	<b>S1052.5</b>	Amend	Seeks that any development of 94-96 Chester Street East be publicly notified.	<b>Reject,</b> As public notification of consents for vacant sites cannot be assured, because decisions on public notification have to be based on a judgement at the time of application, on whether an activity will have or is likely to have adverse effects on the environment that are more than minor.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2084.4	Christian Jordan	Support	<b>Reject</b>
Hughes Developments Limited	<b>S1062</b>	<b>S1062.1</b>	Amend	Seek that the activity status for development in Residential Heritage Areas is made clearer.	<b>Reject,</b> Because contributions ratings could only be changed via a plan change or at a District Plan review, whereas the heritage reports behind them are non-statutory and could be updated at any time.	
		<b>S1062.2</b>	Amend	Amend Residential Heritage Area - Heritage Report and Site Record Forms - HA6 Inner City West to remove references to 31 Worcester containing buildings on site.	<b>Accept</b>	
<b>ISSUE 14 - OPPOSE OR SUPPORT RHA INTERFACE AREAS</b>						
Hamish Ritchie	<b>S687</b>	<b>S687.2</b>	Oppose	Remove sites at 75 and 77 Rattray Street from the Interface Overlay Area to the east of the Piko/Shand RHA. [Points S687.1 and S687.3 dealt with elsewhere].	<b>Reject,</b> As a full intensification scenario on these sites would be detrimental to the heritage values of the adjoining RHA.	



Hilary Talbot	<b>S700</b>	<b>S700</b>	Support	[point not coded] Support a protective buffer zone for the Englefield RHA although it is not clear how it will work.	<b>Accept</b>	
Carters Group Ltd	<b>S814</b>	<b>S814.99 (part), S814.104, 814.217</b>	Oppose	Seek that the advice note at the end of 15.12.1.3 be deleted [refers to RD8 in Ch 9.3 and RHA interface areas]. Also delete 9.3.4.1.3 RD8 and matters of discretion for interface areas	<b>Reject,</b> Because a full intensification scenario on adjoining sites zoned HRZ would be detrimental to the heritage values of these RHAs, particularly in terms of visual dominance. The interface rule is targeted and matters of discretion are very limited.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2051.69	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S814.99)	<b>Accept</b>
			FS2065.5	Davie Lovell -Smith for Hughes Developments Ltd	Support (S814.99)	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2082.929, FS2082.934 FS2082.1047	Kāinga Ora	Support in part (S814.99, S814.104, and S814.217)	
<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Submission No.</b>	<b>Decision No.</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Recommendation and Reasons</b>	

Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	S823	S823.183, S823.222 (part), S823.227	Oppose	Seek that the advice note at the end of 15.12.1.3 be deleted [refers to RD8 in Ch 9.3 and RHA interface areas]. Also delete 9.3.4.1.3 RD8 and matters of discretion for interface areas	<b>Reject,</b> Because a full intensification scenario on adjoining sites zoned HRZ would be detrimental to the heritage values of these RHAs, particularly in terms of visual dominance. The interface rule is targeted and matters of discretion are very limited.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.1415, FS2037.1454, FS2037.1459	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
			FS2045.356, FS2045.395, FS2045.400	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group Ltd	Support	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2082.1228	Kainga Ora	Oppose in part (S823.227)	
			FS2051.70	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose (S823.222)	<b>Accept</b>

Kāinga Ora	<b>S834</b>	<b>S834.336</b>	Oppose	Oppose the proposed provisions controlling new buildings on sites sharing a boundary with a Residential Heritage Area (Residential Heritage Area Interface).	<b>Reject,</b> Because a full intensification scenario on adjoining sites zoned HRZ would be detrimental to the heritage values of these RHAs, particularly in terms of visual dominance. The interface rule is targeted and matters of discretion are very limited.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2044.134	Chapman Tripp for Catholic Diocese	Support	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2045.140	Chapman Tripp for Carter Group	Support	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2063.157	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2064.151	Retirement Village Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<b>Reject</b>
Historic Places Canterbury	<b>S835</b>	<b>S835.23</b>	Amend	Clarify these rules, eg whether it is a site sharing a boundary or a zone sharing a boundary. Possibly apply more widely eg to sites separated from RHA by a road.	<b>Reject,</b> As there is no uncertainty that this rule, Rule 9.3.4.1.1 RD8 is about sites sharing a boundary with an RHA.	

			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.610, FS2037.708	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Reject</b>
Fire and Emergency NZ	<b>S842</b>	<b>S842.78, S842.80</b>	Support	Retain RD8 re sites sharing a boundary with RHAs, and associated matters of discretion at 9.3.6.6.		<b>Accept</b>
Otautahi Community Housing Trust	<b>S877</b>	<b>S877.24</b>	Oppose	Regarding 14.3.i, Remove the last part of the sentence: "Residential Heritage Area, Residential Heritage Area Interface"		<b>Reject,</b> Because a full intensification scenario on adjoining sites zoned HRZ would be detrimental to the heritage values of these RHAs, particularly in terms of visual dominance. The interface rule is targeted and matters of discretion are very limited.
			Further Submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2051.100	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
			FS2082.1252, FS2082.1320	Kāinga Ora	Support	<b>Reject</b>

Peter Dyhrberg	<b>S885</b>	<b>S885.5, S885.6</b>	Support	[Retain] the proposed Interface rules for the adjacent sites which share a boundary with that proposed Residential Heritage Area	<b>Accept</b>	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2062.23	Riccarton Bush Kilmarnock Residents Association .	Support (S885.6)	<b>Accept</b>
Keith Patterson	<b>S1002</b>	<b>S1002.2</b>	Amend	Amend the matters of discretion for 9.3.6.6 (sites sharing a boundary with RHA) to require consultation with neighbouring properties.	<b>Reject,</b> <i>As the</i> matters of discretion were deliberately kept narrow to make such consents less onerous. Also the NPS-UD at Policy 6.b states that significant changes to the amenity values of an area are not of themselves an adverse effect, meaning that a consultation requirement would probably not be sustainable.	
Sam Spekreijse	<b>S1003</b>	<b>S1033.1</b>	Oppose	These whole areas are not significant enough to be given effective indefinite exemption to intensification, especially with the buffer zone requirements as planned	<b>Reject</b> As these areas are significant examples of the City's residential history, which the interface areas will assist in protecting from inappropriate development, either in the RHA or on adjoining sites.	
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	

			FS2051.115	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<b>Accept</b>
Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board	<b>S1090</b>	<b>S1090.3 (part)</b>	Support	Supports the proposed buffer between RHAs, bordering high density areas [.....]		<b>Accept</b>
			<b>Further Submission No.</b>	<b>Further Submitter</b>	<b>Support / Oppose</b>	
			FS2037.648	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	<b>Accept</b>
			FS2063.192	Ryman Healthcare Ltd	Oppose	<b>Reject</b>
			FS2064.186	Retirement Village Association	Oppose	<b>Reject</b>
Oxford Terrace Baptist Church	<b>S1052</b>	<b>S1052.6</b>	Amend	Seeks that the wording for buffers for Residential Heritage Areas is made clearer.		<b>Reject,</b> As the consultation booklet was not part of the notified plan change, and has no legal weight.
<b>ISSUE 15- QUESTION/OPOSE ZONING IN AND AROUND RHAS</b>						
Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board	<b>S1016</b>	<b>S1016.2</b>	Oppose	Address the impact of the HRZ area between Chester St East and Englefield RHAs.[Rezone high density zone between Chester Street East and Fitzgerald Ave to Residential Heritage Area]		<b>Reject,</b> As the eastern end of the street would not qualify as an RHA, which means there is no Qualifying Matter under the NPS-UD which could be a reason for downzoning the eastern end of the street.

**ISSUE 16 – OTHER MISCELLANEOUS RHA SUBMISSIONS**

Jayne Smith	<b>S1017</b>	<b>S1017.3</b>	Support	Support [Policy 9.3.2.2.10 on] incentives and assistance for historic heritage	<b>Partly accept,</b> As although this is a Council policy, the Council budget for heritage protection is limited at this time.
R.Seddon-Smith	<b>S1028</b>	<b>S1028.3</b>	Amend	Seeks an effective means of compensating owners of property deemed to be of heritage value for the additional expenses incurred in maintenance and any loss of value as a result of the designation.	<b>Reject,</b> As there is no possibility that Council could compensate owners to the extent sought in this submission.