

PC 14 COUNCIL REPLY - SECTION 42A REPORT OF LIZ WHITE - TABLE OF SUBMISSIONS ON RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER AREAS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS AND REASONS (UPDATED FOLLOWING HEARING)

The following provides an updated account of response to submissions relevant to the s42A report of Liz White.

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**~~.

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

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
Polly Grainger	S1	S1.1	Support	Seek that Bewdley Street and Evesham Crescent (Barrington) be added to the Residential Character Areas list.	Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Bewdley is retained.
Cheryl Horrell	S11	S11.1	Support	Retain qualifying matters.	Accept in part I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.
Martin Jones	S15	S15.1	Seek Amendment	Introduce either Residential Heritage Area or Residential Character Area over Cashmere View	Accept Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				Street. Resource consent should be required for any residential development.		that Cashmere View and Fairview Streets meets the criteria to be a RCA. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards. The changes I have recommended to the provisions do not generally alter the circumstances in which consent is required. However some development is permitted, and I consider permitting such activities remains appropriate.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.51 FS2037.52	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above.
		15.2	Seek Amendment	Do not zone Cashmere View Street or surrounds as High Density Residential Zone.		Accept It is recommended that a new RCA be applied to this area. MRZ has been applied with appropriate area specific controls to manage development in accordance with the values of the RCA. No RCA has been zoned HRZ.
		15.3				
		S15.6	Seek Amendment	Introduce a new Residential Character Area over Cashmere View Street.		Accept Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that Cashmere View and Fairview Streets meets the criteria to be a RCA. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.
Rex Drummond	S18	S18.1	Seek Amendment	Resource consent should be required for any development within a Residential Character Area.		Accept in part The changes I have recommended to the provisions do not generally alter the circumstances in which consent is required. However some development is permitted, and I consider permitting such activities remains appropriate.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
		FS2037.53	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above.	
		S18.2	Seek Amendment	Fairview Street (Cashmere) should be within a Residential Character Area.		Reject Accept <u>Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA. In her primary evidence, Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that only Cashmere View Street meets the criteria to be a RCA. However, in her supplementary evidence in response to Panel request #80, Ms Rennie recommended a change to include Fairview Street as well. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.</u>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.54	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject <u>Accept</u> Reasons as above.
Patricia Dench	S19	S19.2 S19.3	Seek Amendment	Fairview Street should be within a Residential Character Area.		Reject <u>Accept</u> Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA. In her primary evidence, Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that only Cashmere View Street meets the criteria to be a RCA. However, in her supplementary evidence in response to Panel request #80, Ms Rennie recommended a change to include Fairview Street as well. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.
Les Drury	S20	S20.3	Seek Amendment	1/19 Fairview Street should be within a Residential Character Area.		Reject <u>Accept</u> Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA. In her primary evidence, Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that only Cashmere View Street meets the criteria to be a

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					<u>RCA. However, in her supplementary evidence in response to Panel request #80, Ms Rennie recommended a change to include Fairview Street as well. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.</u>
Christine Parkes	S25	S25.1	Seek Amendment	That the area of Cashmere View St, Fairview St and nearby Ashgrove Tce be made a suburban character area. That resource consent be required before ANY development can proceed.	Accept in part <u>In her primary evidence</u> , Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that only Cashmere View Street meets the criteria to be a RCA. <u>However, in her supplementary evidence in response to Panel request #80, Ms Rennie recommended a change to include Fairview Street as well.</u> As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards. As <u>not all of</u> the remaining areas do not meet the criteria, I do not recommend an RCA is applied to them. The changes I have recommended to the provisions do not generally alter the circumstances in which consent is required. However some development is permitted, and I consider permitting such activities remains appropriate.
		S25.2	Seek Amendment	That the area of Cashmere View St, Fairview St and nearby Ashgrove Tce be [included in] a [residential] character area.	
Steve Parkes	S27	S27.2	Seek Amendment	That the area of Cashmere View St be identified as a suburban [residential] character area.	Accept

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that Cashmere View and Fairview Streets meets the criteria to be a RCA. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.
Joanne Knudsen	S33	S33.3	Support	Support the identification of Bewdley Street and Evesham Crescent within the Residential Evesham/Bewdley Character Area.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Bewdley is retained.
		S33.4	Support	Support the identification of Roker Street as in the Residential Roker Character Area.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Roker is retained.
		S33.5	Support	Support the identification of Ryan Street as within the Residential Ryan Character Area.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.
Keith Shaw	S35	S35.1	Support	Retain 23 Birdwood Avenue in a Residential Character Area.		Accept No changes are recommended to the Beckenham RCA.
Sharina Van Landuyt	S41	S41.1	Support	Support[s] the proposal to include Ryan Street within a Residential Character Area.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.
		S41.4		Further submission No.	Further Submitter	
			FS2037.167	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept Reasons as above.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
		S41.2	Oppose	Oppose[s] Ryan Street being designated as a medium density residential zone.		Reject The proposed RCA for Ryan is recommended to be retained. MRZ has been applied with appropriate area specific controls to manage development in accordance with the values of the RCA.
Michael Down	S42	S42.1	Support	Support inclusion of Evesham Crescent and Bewdley Street in a Residential Character Area.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Bewdley is retained.
Thomas Calder	S62	S62.1	Seek Amendment	Include Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) as a Residential Character Overlay Area.		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
Melissa and Scott Alman	S86	S86.1	Seek Amendment	Identify Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) as a Residential Character Area.		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.158	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
Andrew Laurie	S92	S92.1	Seek Amendment	The area near and including Ashgrove Tce, Fairview St and Cashmere View St should be a Heritage Value Residential Character zone, and		Accept in part In her primary evidence , Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that only Cashmere View Street

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				a resource consent should be required before any development can proceed.		meets the criteria to be a RCA. However, in her supplementary evidence in response to Panel request #80, Ms Rennie recommended a change to include Fairview Street as well. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards. As not all of the remaining areas do not meet the criteria, I do not recommend an RCA is applied to them.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.165	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above.
Hilton Smith	S98	S98.1 S98.2 S98.3	Seek Amendment	[Re: Character Areas] Proposes to introduce a resource consent requirement as a restricted discretionary activity.		Accept in part PC14 already includes a restricted discretionary consent pathway within RCAs in specified circumstances. The changes I have recommended to the provisions do not generally alter the circumstances in which consent is required. However some development is permitted, and I consider permitting such activities remains appropriate.
Ezzie Smith	S99	S99.1 S99.2 S99.3	Not stated	[Re: Character Areas] Proposes to introduce a resource consent requirement as a restricted discretionary activity.		Accept in part PC14 already includes a restricted discretionary consent pathway within RCAs in specified circumstances. The changes I have recommended to the provisions do not generally

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					alter the circumstances in which consent is required. However some development is permitted, and I consider permitting such activities remains appropriate.
Ros Pheloung	S101	S101.1	Oppose	Oppose Medium Density Residential Zone on Cashmere View Street, and surrounding streets.	Reject An RCA has been recommended for Cashmere View and Fairview Streets. MRZ has been applied with appropriate area specific controls to manage development in accordance with the values of the RCA.
		S101.2	Oppose	Cashmere View Street and surrounding streets should be within a Character Area.	Accept In her primary evidence , Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that only Cashmere View Street meets the criteria to be a RCA. However, in her supplementary evidence in response to Panel request #80, Ms Rennie recommended a change to include Fairview Street as well. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards. As not all the surrounding streets do-not meet the criteria, I do not recommend an RCA is applied to them.
Tracey Stack	S119	S119.3	Seek Amendment	That Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) be identified in the Christchurch District Pan as a Medium Density Residential zone and a Residential Character Overlay Area and be made subject to	Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				the rules that apply to Residential Character areas.	
		S119.8	Support	<p>Any further or other decisions that achieve the outcomes sought by this submission, or are required as a consequence of the relief we seek:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) be identified in the Christchurch District Pan as a Medium Density Residential zone and a Residential Character Overlay Area and be made subject to the rules that apply to Residential Character areas: or, • If Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) are not included as a Residential Character Area, that the Area be zoned Medium Density Residential: and, • 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, • 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. 	<p>Reject</p> <p>Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.</p> <p><i>Note – this report does not address the alternate relief sought as it does not relate to RCAs</i></p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons	
Cameron Matthews	S121	S121.6	Oppose	Request removal of the [Character Areas]: (Hackthorn Road), Beckenham Loop, Roker and Penrith [streets].		Reject For the reasons set out in this report, I recommend that the RCAs for Beckenham, Cashmere and Roker are retained.	
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose		
			FS2052.196	Christchurch International Airport	Oppose	Accept Reasons as above.	
			FS2082.52	Kāinga Ora	Support	Reject Reasons as above.	
	S121.7	Oppose	Request removal of the [Character Areas]: (Hackthorn Road), Beckenham Loop, Roker and Penrith [streets].			Reject For the reasons set out in this report, I recommend that the RCAs for Beckenham, Cashmere and Roker are retained.	
				Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
				FS2052.196	Christchurch International Airport	Oppose	Accept Reasons as above.
				FS2082.52	Kāinga Ora	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
Murray Walsh	S123	S123.1 S123.2	Seek Amendment	Introduce a resource consent requirement as a restricted discretionary activity to help us better protect Character Areas. The following rules are proposed:... [Lists summary of Character Area rule rules included in PC14]		Accept in part PC14 already includes a restricted discretionary consent pathway within RCAs in specified circumstances. The changes I have recommended to the provisions do not generally alter the circumstances in which consent is	

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					required. However some development is permitted, and I consider permitting such activities remains appropriate.
Deborah Brown	S124	S124.1	Seek Amendment	That 15 Cashmere View Street is included as a suburban character area.	Accept Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that Cashmere View and Fairview Streets meets the criteria to be a RCA. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.
		S124.2	Seek Amendment	[In relation to character areas] that resource consents are required before any development can proceed.	Accept in part The changes I have recommended to the provisions do not generally alter the circumstances in which consent is required. However some development is permitted, and I consider permitting such activities remains appropriate.
Simon Brown	S125	S125.1	Seek Amendment	That 15 Cashmere View Street is included as a suburban character area.	Accept Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that Cashmere View and Fairview Streets meets the criteria to be a RCA. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
		S125.2	Seek Amendment	[In relation to character areas] that resource consents are required before any development can proceed.	Accept in part The changes I have recommended to the provisions do not generally alter the circumstances in which consent is required. However some development is permitted, and I consider permitting such activities remains appropriate.
Chris Wells	S126	S126.1	Seek Amendment	That 15 Cashmere View Street is included as a suburban character area.	Accept Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that Cashmere View and Fairview Streets meets the criteria to be a RCA. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.
		S126.2	Seek Amendment	[In relation to character areas] that resource consents are required before any development can proceed.	Accept in part The changes I have recommended to the provisions do not generally alter the circumstances in which consent is required. However some development is permitted, and I consider permitting such activities remains appropriate.
Michael Fisher	S127	S127.1	Seek Amendment	Amend rule 14.5.3.1.3 RD14 (b) iii by removing the location requirement for accessory buildings to the rear of the main residential unit. This rule does not apply:	Reject The requirement for smaller accessory buildings to be located to the rear of the main residential unit reflects that a key characteristic of many RCAs is spacious front yards, with generally low fencing, lawn areas and planting, and accessory buildings in this area has the potential to

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				iii. to accessory buildings that are less than 30m ² and located to the rear of the main residential unit on the site and are less than 5 metres in height;	undermine the spacious and open character resulting from this. I consider the potential effects on the values of RCAs from this type of development warrants a consent pathway.
		S127.2	Oppose	Retain current 8 metre height limit in the Beckenham character area.	Accept in part Height is one of the attributes which contribute to the special character values which Policy 14.2.5.9 directs is maintained and enhanced and 8m is not consistent with the height of dwellings in this character area. However Ms Rennie supports a small increase to 6.5m.
		S127.3	Seek Amendment	Include extra provision point to rule 14.5.3.2.8 (a) i. as number 3. 3. except where adjacent residential units are closer to the front boundary.	Reject I do not consider it appropriate to include a standard that relates to adjoining properties, particularly given those properties may not reflect the predominant overall character of a RCA. Exempting compliance with the setback standard in this instance would therefore not retain those important characteristics of the built form and landscape elements that have been identified as contributing to the values of these areas and would therefore be inconsistent with the policy direction.
		S127.4	Seek Amendment	That provision rules 14.5.3.2.8 (a) ii and 14.5.3.2.8 (a) iii with regard to side and rear setbacks be changed to 1 metre within the Beckenham Character area.	Accept in part Ms Rennie has recommended the side yard requirement is amended to provide for a 1m (rather than 2m) setback on one side, but considers it appropriate to retain 3m on the other.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons	
		S127.5	Seek Amendment	That provision rule 14.5.3.2.9 (a) be amended to 50% maximum building coverage.	Accept in part The purpose of the building coverage limitation is to maintain an appropriate balance between buildings and open space. The technical assessments and Ms Rennie's evidence supports the standard being increased to 40%, but do not support a higher 50% threshold.	
Sulekha Korgaonkar	S128	S128.1	Support	Retain Ryan as a residential character area and the provisions that maintain the streets character.	Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.	
		S128.2	Support			
		S128.3	Support			
Melissa Macfarlane	S135	S135.1	Support	Retain any applicable residential character qualifying matters for the St Albans Malvern Street area.	Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Malvern is retained.	
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2015.3	Susan Wall	Support	Accept Reasons as above.
Irene Marks	S136	S136.1	Support	Support inclusion of Ryan Street as a residential character area with provisions that maintain its character as a street of bungalows (and trees).	Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.	
Aaron Jaggar	S141	S141.1	Seek Amendment	List Ryan Street as a Residential Character Area.	Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.	
		S141.2	Seek Amendment			
Bill Marks	S143	S143.1	Support	Supports the identification of Ryan Street as a Character Area.	Accept	

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.
Jill Edwards	S162	S162.2	Seek Amendment	That the area surrounding and including Rose st should require a resource consent for development and that the area be zoned as a suburban character area	Reject Accept in part <u>In her primary evidence</u> , Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet only Cashmere View Street meets the criteria to be a RCA. <u>However, in her supplementary evidence in response to Panel request #80, Ms Rennie recommended a change to include Fairview Street as well. This incorporates the southern side of Rose Street. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.</u>
James and Adriana Baddeley	S164	S164.3	Seek Amendment	That Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) be identified as a Residential Character Overlay Area.	Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
Catherine & Peter Baddeley	S165	S165.1	Seek Amendment	That Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) be identified as a Residential Character Overlay Area.	Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
Bernard Hall JP (Retired)	S168	S168.1	Support	Please retain RYAN STREET, CHRISTCHURCH, 8011 as a CHARACTER STREET without multistory infill structures.	Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	Accept Reasons as above.
			FS2037.226	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	
		S168.2	Support	Please retain RYAN STREET, CHRISTCHURCH, 8011 as a CHARACTER STREET without multistory infill structures.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.
		Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	Accept Reasons as above.	
		FS2037.227	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support		
		S168.3	Support	Please retain RYAN STREET, CHRISTCHURCH, 8011 as a CHARACTER STREET without multistory infill structures.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.
Sonya Grace	S174	S174.1	Support	Seek that Ryan Street becomes a Character Street and to not allow medium to high density housing into Ryan Street.	Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.	
Sean Walsh	S179	S179.1	Oppose	Request that Cashmere View Street (including #13 Cashmere View Street) Somerfield be a suburban charter area/street. Request that resource consent be required before any development can proceed.	Accept Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that Cashmere View and Fairview Streets meets the criteria to be a RCA. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.	
		S179.2	Oppose			
		S179.3	Seek Amendment			

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
Josiah Beech	S180	S180.1	Support	Fully and completely supports all the Qualifying Matters proposed by the Council.		Accept in relation to RCA QM. I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.229	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept Reasons as above.
		S180.4	Support	[F]ully support[s] the Residential Character Area Qualifying Matter		Accept I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.232	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept Reasons as above.
Roseanne Hawarden	S182	S182.2	Seek Amendment	That Jane Deans Close be included as a Residential Heritage Area.		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
Riccarton Bush - Kilmarnock	S188	S188.13	Seek Amendment	Jane Deans Close should [have intensification restricted through a Qualifying Matter].		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
Residents' Association						concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.250	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject Reasons as above
			FS2052.298	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Support	Reject Reasons as above
			FS2082.101	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	Accept Reasons as above
Riccarton Bush - Kilmarnock Residents' Association	S188	S188.16	Seek Amendment	Both sides of Matai St West from Straven Rd east to the railway line, including the area north to the Avon River, should be a Qualifying Matter restricting further residential intensification.		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.253	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject Reasons as above
			FS2052.301	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Support	Reject Reasons as above
Logan Brunner	S191	S191.3	Support	[No changes to existing character areas]		Accept in part For the reasons set out in this report, I have recommended removal or reduction in some of the RCAs, but otherwise recommend their retention.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
Addington Neighbourhood Association	S205	S205.12	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 I consider that maintenance of buildings is a matter that sits outside the District Plan, and in any case, those applying in RCAs are generally larger than those which would otherwise apply under the MDRS.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2082.132	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	Accept Reasons as above
Catharina Schupbach	S217	S217.1	Support	Retain provisions relating to Residential Character Areas.		Accept in part For the reasons set out in this report, I have recommended some changes to the provisions applying in RCAs, but these are consistent with the general intent of PC14 as notified.
		S217.2	Support	Retain Evesham Crescent and Bewdley Street Residential Character Area.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Bewdley is retained.
Michael Dore	S225	S225.8	Seek Amendment	The History, Character and Heritage of our City of Christchurch should be protected at all costs.		Accept in part I consider RCAs are appropriate to maintain those areas identified as having a character that is, in the whole, worthy of retention. However, I do not agree that the outcome required should be “protection at all costs”.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.319	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						Reasons as above
		S225.9	Oppose	The History, Character and Heritage of our City of Christchurch should be protected at all costs.		Accept in part I consider RCAs are appropriate to maintain those areas identified as having a character that is, in the whole, worthy of retention. However, I do not agree that the outcome required should be “protection at all costs”.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.320	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
Alex Prince	S227	S227.1	Seek Amendment	Amend Lower Cashmere (Fairview Street/Cashmere View/Ashgrove Terrace) to be in a residential character area.		Accept in part <u>In her primary evidence</u> , Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that only Cashmere View Street meets the criteria to be a RCA. <u>However, in her supplementary evidence in response to Panel request #80, Ms Rennie recommended a change to include Fairview Street as well.</u> As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards. As <u>not all</u> the surrounding streets do not meet the criteria, I do not recommend an RCA is applied to them.
Martin Winder	S228	S228.1	Seek Amendment	Retain the Character Area on Hackthorne Road but exclude the vacant property at 75a Hackthorne Road.		Accept in part I recommend that the proposed RCA for Cashmere is retained.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					With respect to 75a Hackthorne Road, this site fronts the street, and forms part of a consistent, coherent grouping overall. If this property is excluded, then its development without application of the RCA controls has the potential to undermine the consistency and integrity of the wider area.
Susanne Schade	S241	S241.1	Seek Amendment	[S]eek[s] council to apply the Qualifying Matter Residential Character Area to Scott Street in Sydenham.	Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
Property Council New Zealand	S242	S242.20	Seek Amendment	In broad terms, we are comfortable with the proposed intention of introducing resource consent requirements as a restricted discretionary activity to help protect Character Areas. However, 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. This can be achieved through enabling and encouraging greater height and density within high density zone precincts, town centres and metropolitan centres.	Accept For the reasons set out in this report, I recommend retaining the restricted discretionary activity status.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
Jean-Michel Gelin	S247	S247.1	Seek Amendment	Create a character area including Forfar Street to limit the possible height of the new building and the sunlight access for the 1 Storey houses of the street.		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.340	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject Reasons as above
		S247.2	Seek Amendment	Create a character area including Forfar Street to limit the possible height of the new building and the sunlight access for the 1 Storey houses of the street.		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.341	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject Reasons as above
William Bennett	S255	S255.1	Seek Amendment	That Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) be identified in the Christchurch District Plan as a Medium Density Residential zone and a Residential Character Overlay Area and be made subject to the rules that apply to Residential Character areas: or, If Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) are not included as a		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA. <i>Note – this report does not address the alternate relief sought as it does not relate to RCAs.</i>
		S255.2	Seek Amendment			
		S255.3	Seek Amendment			
		S255.4	Seek Amendment			

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				Residential Character Area, that the Area be zoned Medium Density Residential.	
Francine Bills	S278	S278.1	Seek Amendment	Mersey Street, which runs south of Westminster Street to Berwick Street, be incorporated in the Severn Residential Character Area [including 1-54 Mersey Street, 11-19 Berwick Street, and 116-136 Westminster Street].	Reject This area was assessed during the preparation of PC14 using the methodology applied to RCAs, and did not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
		S278.2	Seek Amendment		
Waipapa Papanui-Innes-Central Community Board	S288	S288.7	Support	The Board supports all Qualifying Matters.	Accept in relation to RCA QM. I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA
Bron Durdin	S303	S303.3	Seek Amendment	Expand Character Areas to include other areas with established trees and gardens. (e.g. lower Cashmere, Beckenham, Hillsborough, Cracroft, Somerfield, Opawa)	Reject Ms Rennie notes that RCAs of this scale would cover a much more extensive area than other RCAs, and contain a much larger range of buildings, making it difficult to determine consistent character attributes, and therefore these areas do not have a sufficient level of consistent built form and landscape elements to be considered an RCA.
Jo Jeffrey	S316	S316.1	Seek Amendment	[Apply a Residential Character Area to Merivale.] Protect Merivale streets from any [multi-storey] development permanently and apply a heritage ruling on these streets.	Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
		S316.2	Seek Amendment	[Lower maximum building heights in Merivale - relates to request for Residential Character Area]		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA. I therefore do not consider there is justification for a lower height limit to be applied in relation to character.
Rosemary Baird Williams	S341	S341.1	Support	Retain the Evesham Crescent and Bewdley Street Residential Character Area.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Bewdley is retained.
Colin Gregg	S376	S376.1	Seek Amendment	That Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) be identified [as] a Residential Character Overlay Area.		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.487	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject Reasons as above
			FS2069.2	Hilton Smith	Support	Reject Reasons as above
Kate Gregg	S381	S381.1	Seek Amendment	Seeks that Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) be identified in the Christchurch District Plan as a Medium Density Residential zone and a Residential		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and
		S381.2	Seek Amendment			

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
		S381.3	Seek Amendment	Character Overlay Area and be made subject to the rules that apply to Residential Character areas.	concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
		S381.12	Seek Amendment	Amend provision 14.5.1.3 to the following: [sets out proposed rule.]	Accept in part For the reasons set out in this report, I have recommended some changes to the provisions applying in RCAs, but these are consistent with the general intent of PC14 as notified.
		S381.14	Seek Amendment	That Character Areas have a range of other special limits on built form, dependent on the values of that particular Character Area, including:	Accept in part For the reasons set out in this report, I have recommended some changes to the provisions applying in RCAs, but these are consistent with the general intent of PC14 as notified.
		S381.19	Seek Amendment	- the width of building frontages	
		S381.20	Seek Amendment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - landscaping - setbacks (larger than typical) - building coverage - outdoor living space requirements - minimum glazing facing the street - fencing - garaging and car ports - building separation <p>Generally the built form requirements are stricter than the underlying zoning would otherwise allow. If these rules are not met, resource consent is needed (restricted discretionary activity status).</p>	

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
		S381.22	Seek Amendment	[That the] minimum net site area for subdivision varies between Character Areas in the Medium Density Zone, but is generally larger than the underlying Zone requirement.	Accept in part For the reasons set out in this report, I have recommended some changes to the provisions applying in RCAs, but these are consistent with the general intent of PC14 as notified.
Johnny Phelan	S436	S436.1	Seek Amendment	That Roker Street West of Selwyn street not be included in a character area.	Accept PC14 did not propose to include this area in the Roker RCA.
David Allan	S437	S437.5	Seek Amendment	[Supports] the character areas [qualifying matter]	Accept I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.
		S437.6	Seek Amendment	[Supports] the preservation of character areas	Accept in part For the reasons set out in this report, I have recommended removal or reduction in some of the RCAs, but otherwise recommend their retention.
Richard Scarf	S482	S482.1	Support	[S]upport[s] the reduction of the Character Area that includes Hanmer and Gilby street.	Accept No changes are recommended to the Englefield RCA.
Daniel Rutherford	S499	S499.3	Seek Amendment	Please remove both titles of our property at 20 Macmillan ave/20b Macmillan ave from the residential character area.	Reject These sites front the street, and form part of a consistent, coherent grouping overall. If these sites are excluded, then their development without application of the RCA controls has the

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					potential to undermine the consistency and integrity of the wider area.
Hamish West	S500	S500.1	Oppose	1 - Remove all qualifying matters. 2 - Deliver MDRS in its original form	Reject in relation to RCAs. I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.
Kyri Kotzikas	S502	S502.2	Seek Amendment	Seeks that Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) be identified as a Medium Density Residential zone and a Residential Character Overlay Area and be made subject to the rules that apply to Residential Character areas.	Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
James Carr	S519	S519.7	Seek Amendment	A better solution than retaining the current height limit and recession plane rules in [Character] areas might be to adopt the MDRS rules in these areas, but apply much stricter limits on site coverage, especially hard site coverage, as well as front (and maybe side) setbacks to work with the existing streetscape.	Accept in part. The recession planes applying in RCAs are already those of the underlying zoning. With respect to height, the height limits proposed in PC14 reflect the existing height of dwellings in each area. Ms Rennie considers that the MDRS height limit would enable three storey development, which she does not consider would be generally consistent with the values of these areas. However, she has recommended an increase in the height limit in the Heaton and Cashmere RCAs from 7m to 8m.
		S519.26	Support		
Chris Wilson	S530	S530.1	Seek Amendment	[Seeks that the area identified as] Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) to be identified as Residential	Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				Character area, as it was under the operative plan.	concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
Joanne Nikolaou	S581	S581.1	Seek Amendment	[Seeks] [t]hat council agrees the Cashmere View Somerfield Area [be] designated a Suburban Character Area.	Accept Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that Cashmere View and Fairview Streets meets the criteria to be a RCA. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.
Jaimita de Jongh	S583	S583.2	Seek Amendment	That Fairview and Cashmere View Streets be included in a character area.	Accept in-part <u>In her primary evidence,</u> Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that only Cashmere View Street meets the criteria to be a RCA. <u>However, in her supplementary evidence in response to Panel request #80, Ms Rennie recommended a change to include Fairview Street as well.</u> As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards. <u>As the surrounding streets do not meet the criteria, I do not recommend an RCA is applied to them.</u>
		S583.5	Support	Supports Beckenham Loop Character Area.	Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Beckenham is retained.
Claudia M Staudt	S584	S584.2	Oppose	Oppose High Density zoning of property at 21 Helmores Lane, and surrounding area bounded	Reject

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				by, Holmwood Road, Rossall Street, Hagley Park and Fendalton Road (Planning Map 31 and CC) Seeks this to be rezoned Medium Density, and/or to also be regarded as a new QM Residential Character Area (as per previous SAM 8).	Former SAMs were assessed in 2015 as part of the District Plan review and determined not to meet the thresholds set out in the methodology to be included as RCAs. <i>Note – this report does not address the alternate relief sought as it does not relate to RCAs.</i>
		S584.3	Seek Amendment	New QM Residential Character Area (as per previous SAM 8) for the area bounded by, Holmwood Road, Rossall Street, Hagley Park and Fendalton Road (Planning Map 31 and CC).	Reject Former SAMs were assessed in 2015 as part of the District Plan review and determined not to meet the thresholds set out in the methodology to be included as RCAs.
Murray Cullen	S630	S630.2	Support	[Retain Character areas]	Accept
		S630.3	Support	[Retain Character areas]	I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.
		630.4	Support	[Retain] the proposed Area-specific built form standards that apply to the Beckenham Character Area.	Accept in part Some minor changes are recommended to the standards in response to other submissions, but do not alter their intent.
		630.5	Seek Amendment	[Consider] some fine tuning of the development rules for the Character Area.	Accept in part Some minor changes are recommended to improve the PC14 rule package.
Catherine & Peter Morrison	S664	S664.1	Oppose	Zone area as SAM8 type of zoning in order to retain its character. The closest outcome looks like the Residential Character overlay.	Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and
		S664.2	Oppose	Rezoned to Residential Special Character.	

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
		S664.4	Oppose	Seeks residential special character overlay in Desmond Street and the close surrounding streets of Helmores Lane and Rhodes Street up to Rossall Street.		concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
Lawrence & Denise May	S665	S665.1	Seek Amendment	That Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) be identified in the Christchurch District Pan as a Medium Density Residential zone and a Residential Character Overlay Area and be made subject to the rules that apply to Residential Character areas.		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
		S665.5	Seek Amendment	[That the following proposed changes are adopted]: [Sets out framework for Character Areas]		Accept in part For the reasons set out in this report, I have recommended some changes to the provisions applying in RCAs, but these are consistent with the general intent of PC14 as notified.
		S665.6	Seek Amendment			
Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	S685	S685.77	Oppose	[Retain existing minimum net site area of 250m ²]		Reject Ms Rennie considers that retaining the varied pattern of development in Lyttelton is important in maintaining values and that the 450m ² density proposed is appropriate to conserve the character values and enable sufficient space to address sloping sites.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
		FS2037.1181	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject Reasons as above	

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
			FS2082.422	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	Accept Reasons as above
		S685.78	Oppose	[Retain existing maximum site coverage of 60%]		Accept The technical assessment and Ms Rennie supports retaining the current 60% site coverage limit within the Lyttelton RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1182	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept Reasons as above
			FS2082.423 FS2082.429	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	Reject Reasons as above
Robyn Thomson	S686	S686.6	Seek Amendment	Create a planned Putaringamotu-Riccarton Precinct Qualifying Matter to cover the area represented by the Riccarton Bush Kilmarnock Residents Association. should be designated a qualifying matter to preserve the special character and history of this area which includes Riccarton Bush and House, Mona Vale, Britten Stables and other sites of historical and cultural importance alongside the residential character of the neighbourhood.		Reject It is not clear what specific area the submitter is referring to, nor exactly what qualifying matter should be applied and why. To the extent that it relates to neighbourhood, and if an RCA QM is sought, then Ms Rennie's evidence is that the methodology for assessing such areas relies on a site-by-site assessment against consistent area attributes. At a neighbourhood scale, there are a wide range of building ages, development patterns, materials, building style, typology, form and height, making it difficult to determine the character attributes. While there may be some pockets of intact character where an assessment with the established methodology could be

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						undertaken, these nuanced areas have not been identified by the submitter.
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	S695	S695.8	Seek Amendment	In terms of the proposed qualifying matters that relate to historic heritage (e.g., Residential Heritage Area and Character Area Overlay) and are proposed 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 papaKāinga housing in accordance with s.80E (1) (b) (ii) of the RMA.		Accept in part I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1001	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
			FS2082.459	Kāinga Ora	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
		S695.16	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.	Accept in part The potential impact of such an exemption on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA as a whole is unknown and in absence of this being able to be assessed, I consider the potential costs in terms of the impact on the values of the RCAs that such an exemption might have, do not outweigh the benefits of exempting such land. However, I consider that it is appropriate to amend the matters of discretion to allow for consideration of the needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui,	

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						as well as the effects of any development of Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1009	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
			FS2082.467	Kāinga Ora	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
		S695.17	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.		Accept in part The potential impact of such an exemption on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA as a whole is unknown and in absence of this being able to be assessed, I consider the potential costs in terms of the impact on the values of the RCAs that such an exemption might have, do not outweigh the benefits of exempting such land. However, I consider that it is appropriate to amend the matters of discretion to allow for consideration of the needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui, as well as the effects of any development of Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1010	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
			FS2082.468	Kāinga Ora	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
		S695.18	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 these area specific built form standards.		Accept in part The potential impact of such an exemption on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA as a whole is unknown and in absence of this being able to be assessed, I consider the potential costs in terms of the impact on the values of the RCAs that such an exemption might have, do not outweigh the benefits of exempting such land. However, I consider that it is appropriate to amend the matters of discretion to allow for consideration of the needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui, as well as the effects of any development of Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1011	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
			FS2082.469	Kāinga Ora	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
		S695.19	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.		Accept in part The potential impact of such an exemption on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA as a whole is unknown and in absence of this being able to be assessed, I consider the potential costs in terms of the impact on the values of the RCAs

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						that such an exemption might have, do not outweigh the benefits of exempting such land. However, I consider that it is appropriate to amend the matters of discretion to allow for consideration of the needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui, as well as the effects of any development of Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1012	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
			FS2082.470	Kāinga Ora	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
		S695.20	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.		Accept in part The potential impact of such an exemption on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA as a whole is unknown and in absence of this being able to be assessed, I consider the potential costs in terms of the impact on the values of the RCAs that such an exemption might have, do not outweigh the benefits of exempting such land. However, I consider that it is appropriate to amend the matters of discretion to allow for consideration of the needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui, as well as the effects of any development of Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1013	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
			FS2082.471	Kāinga Ora	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
		S695.21	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.		Accept in part The potential impact of such an exemption on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA as a whole is unknown and in absence of this being able to be assessed, I consider the potential costs in terms of the impact on the values of the RCAs that such an exemption might have, do not outweigh the benefits of exempting such land. However, I consider that it is appropriate to amend the matters of discretion to allow for consideration of the needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui, as well as the effects of any development of Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga on the integrity and cohesiveness of the RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1014	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
			FS2082.472	Kāinga Ora	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
Ann-Mary & Andrew Benton	S698	S698.1	Seek Amendment	That Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) be identified in the Christchurch District Pan as a Medium Density Residential zone and a Residential Character Overlay Area and be made subject to the rules that apply to Residential Character areas.	Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
		S698.3	Seek Amendment	<p>That Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) be identified in the Christchurch District Pan as a Medium Density Residential zone and a Residential Character Overlay Area and be made subject to the rules that apply to Residential Character areas: or</p> <p>If Helmores Lane, Desmond Street and Rhodes Street (to Rossall Street) are not included as a Residential Character Area, that the Area be zoned Medium Density Residential: and,</p> <p>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,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Any further or other decisions that achieve the outcomes sought by this submission, or are</p>	<p>Reject</p> <p>Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.</p> <p><i>Note – this report does not address the alternate relief sought as it does not relate to RCAs.</i></p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				required as a consequence of the relief [sought].		
		S698.4	Seek Amendment	In recognition of the status of a Qualifying Mater,... propose introducing a resource consent requirement as a restricted discretionary activity... [Lists summary of Character Area rule rules included in PC14]		Accept in part For the reasons set out in this report, I have recommended some changes to the provisions applying in RCAs, but these are consistent with the general intent of PC14 as notified.
		S698.5	Seek Amendment			
Hilary Talbot	S700	S700.6	Support	[Re: Englefield Character Area] support the creation of the Heritage Area and the continuation of the character area with more stringent controls.		Accept No changes are recommended to the Englefield RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.551 FS2037.992	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept Reasons as above
Graeme Boddy	S703	S703.1	Seek Amendment	[Requests] status of Eastern Terrace between the iron bridge adjacent Bowenvale Avenue and the footbridge at Malcolm Street to be changed from being 'Protected by being to far from public transport' to the fuller protection of being 'Part of the Character Area of the Beckenham Loop'.		Accept This area is already included in the Beckenham Character Area.
Michelle Trusttum	S710	S710.3	Seek Amendment	Include Somerfield in Special Character Overlay.		Reject Ms Rennie notes that a RCA of this scale would cover a much more extensive area than other RCAs, and has a much larger range of buildings, making it difficult to determine consistent character attributes, and therefore it does not

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					<p>have a sufficient level of consistent built form and landscape elements to be considered an RCA.</p> <p><i>Note however that an area is Somerfield is recommended to be included as an RCA (Cashmere View)</i></p>
Mitchell Coll	S720	S720.43	Seek Amendment	Amend subclause 14.8.3.2.2(a) back to 250m ² .	<p>Reject</p> <p>Ms Rennie considers that retaining the varied pattern of development in Lyttelton is important in maintaining values and that the 450m² density proposed is appropriate to conserve the character values and enable sufficient space to address sloping sites.</p>
		S720.44	Seek Amendment	Amend subclause 14.8.3.2.4(a) back to 60%.	<p>Accept</p> <p>The technical assessment and Ms Rennie supports retaining the current 60% site coverage limit within the Lyttelton RCA.</p>
Michele McKnight	S726	S726.1	Seek Amendment	[Seeks] the council to mak[e] Gwynfa Ave and any other similar streets on this hill ... a special character overlay area.	<p>Reject</p> <p>Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.</p>
Antony Ellis	S732	S732.1	Support	[E]ndors[es] the extend of the character area overlay in Cashmere.	<p>Accept</p> <p>I recommend that the proposed RCA for Cashmere is retained.</p>
Christian Jordan	S737	S737.11	Support	Retain character areas across the city.	Accept in part

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				<p>These character areas should have recession plane, building height and setback rules similar to the operative plan.</p>		<p>I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.</p> <p>With respect to the standards applying, I do not consider it appropriate to apply the built form standards applicable to the current zoning (under the Operative Plan) of each RCA, as these are not targeted to manage the specific characteristics of the RCAs, and therefore would not align with Policy 14.2.5.9.</p>
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1481	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	Accept in part Reasons as above
		S737.12	Seek Amendment	<p>Add these areas to Special Character QM. Additional character areas of importance that should be included are:</p> <p>All of the Special Amenity Areas from the 1995 City Plan not already character areas including in particular:</p> <p>Fendalton SAM 8 and 8A Deans Bush SAM 7 and & A Opawa SAM 5 St James SAM 16 (plus Windermere Rd)</p> <p>Also the following larger areas which were not SAMs:</p>		<p>Reject</p> <p>Former SAMs were assessed in 2015 as part of the District Plan review and determined not to meet the thresholds set out in the methodology to be included as RCAs.</p> <p>With respect to larger areas, Ms Rennie notes that RCAs of this scale would cover much more extensive areas than other RCAs, and have a much larger range of buildings, making it difficult to determine consistent character attributes, and therefore they do not have a sufficient level of</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowles, Rutland, Papanui, Dormer - Normans, Papanui, Blighs, railway line - Gloucester, Woodham, Trent, England 		consistent built form and landscape elements to be considered RCAs.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.1482	Christchurch Civic Trust	Oppose	Accept Reasons as above
Richmond Residents and Business Association (We are Richmond)	S745	S745.1	Support	Seek that SAMS and Suburban Character Areas are retained.		<p>Accept in part</p> <p>I consider RCAs are appropriate to maintain those areas identified as having a character that is, in the whole, worthy of retention.</p> <p>I do not agree that it is appropriate to provide the same level of recognition to areas formerly identified as SAMS but which have not been identified as RCAs, noting that these SAMS were assessed in 2015 as part of the District Plan review and determined not to meet the thresholds set out in the methodology to be included as RCAs.</p>
		S745.4	Support			
		S745.5	Support			
Margaret Stewart	S755	S755.3	Support	Retain Character areas.		<p>Accept in part</p> <p>I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.</p> <p>With respect to Woodville Street, this area was assessed during the preparation of PC14 using the methodology applied to RCAs, and did not</p>
		S755.4	Support	Add Woodville Street, St Albans		

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						meet the criteria to be a RCA. I therefore do not recommend its inclusion.
New Zealand Institute of Architects Canterbury Branch	S762	S762.20	Seek Amendment	[Amend] the additional minimum [glazing] areas of 30% - 40%.		Accept in part For the reasons set out in this report, I recommend that this standard is deleted.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.785	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
		FS2082.558	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	Accept in part Reasons as above	
		S762.21	Seek Amendment	[Amend and reword clause] to enable new development to be in fitting with their immediate street neighbours.		Reject Built form standards need to be sufficiently clear as to whether they are met or not and the request would not achieve this. This approach would also apply an inconsistent standard to different sites within an RCA. The immediately neighbouring properties may also not reflect the predominant overall character of these areas, and further development in line with such properties may not retain those important characteristics that contribute to the values of these areas.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
FS2037.786	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject Reasons as above			

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
			FS2082.559	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	Accept Reasons as above
		S762.27	Oppose	[Retain current site coverage limits].		Accept in part I recommend increasing the site coverage limit to 40% (excluding Englefield and Bewdley), consistent with the original technical assessment and Ms Rennie's evidence.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.792	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
Megan Power	S769	S769.3	Seek Amendment	Add bold underlined text as shown above [to Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1]. "This rule does not apply to: rear sites or those located on private lanes in the Beckenham Character Area." Please note: The amendments sought that relate to "rear sites or those located on private lanes in the Beckenham Character Area" are provided in the context of the retention of the operative extent of the Beckenham Character Area, i.e. all rear sites and those located on private lanes are now and will be in the future included in the Beckenham Character Area boundary.		Reject This change is sought in conjunction with the submitter's request to retain the boundaries of the Beckenham RCA that are contained in the Operative District Plan. As I have not recommended that the extent of the Beckenham Character Area is changed, I do not consider the changes sought to these standards is appropriate.
		S769.4	Seek Amendment	Amend as shown in bold underlined text below. Amend 30sqm to 36sqm		Accept As the rule is intended to capture demolition of main residential units, this slight increase will still

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					capture main residential units, without capturing removal of double garages.
		S769.5	Seek Amendment	Amend 14.5.3.2.3 to include text shown as bold and underlined Beckenham (Rear sites and those located on private lanes) - 7m	Reject This change is sought in conjunction with the submitter's request to retain the boundaries of the Beckenham RCA that are contained in the Operative District Plan. As I have not recommended that the extent of the Beckenham Character Area is changed, I do not consider the changes sought to these standards is appropriate.
		S769.6	Seek Amendment	Amend to remove bold, strike through text ii. Within the Character Area Overlay for all activities: <i>B. A landscaping strip with a minimum width of <u>2 1 metres shall be planted along the rear boundary, and shall include trees that will grow to a minimum height of 6-8 metres.</u></i>	Reject The landscaping strip and associated planting of medium-scale trees of will assist in maintaining a sense of separation between dwellings and enable a landscape setting to be maintained, which contribute to the character of RCAs.
		S769.7	Seek Amendment	Add the following to Rule 14.5.3.2.8 i.: 3. This rule does not apply to rear sites or those located on private lanes in the Beckenham Character Area. Add the following to Rules 14.5.3.2.8 ii. and iii.: 2. This rule does not apply to rear sites or those located on private lanes in the Beckenham Character Area.	Reject This change is sought in conjunction with the submitter's request to retain the boundaries of the Beckenham RCA that are contained in the Operative District Plan. As I have not recommended that the extent of the Beckenham Character Area is changed, I do not consider the changes sought to these standards is appropriate.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				3. This rule does not apply to single storey accessory buildings less than 30m ² size located to the rear of sites.	In relation to the reducing the setback for smaller accessory buildings, I consider that this exception might reduce the separation between buildings and the consistency of this across an RCA.
		S769.8	Seek Amendment	Amend (Rule 14.5.3.2.13) to include bold, underlined text: iii. This rule does not apply to rear sites or those located on private lanes in the Beckenham Character Area.	Reject This change is sought in conjunction with the submitter's request to retain the boundaries of the Beckenham RCA that are contained in the Operative District Plan. As I have not recommended that the extent of the Beckenham Character Area is changed, I do not consider the changes sought to these standards is appropriate.
		S769.9	Seek Amendment	[Amend] Planning Map 46: Amend the extent of the proposed Beckenham Character Area to match the operative District Plan extent and include all sites within the operative extent within the Character Area, as shown in Map 1 and Map 2 [of the submission].	Reject Ms Rennie's evidence is that it is appropriate that rear lots are excluded from the Beckenham Character Area, as these sites are classified as neutral and in many cases cannot be seen from the street.
Robert Smillie	S770	S770.1	Support	[S]upport[s] the making of Ryan Street into a 'character' [area] and thereby give it some protections.	Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.
		S770.2			
Beckenham Neighbourhood Association Inc	S773	S773.2	Support	[Retain Character areas]	Accept
		S773.3	Support	[Retain Character areas]	I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.
		S773.4	Support	[Retain] the proposed Area-specific built form standards that apply to the Beckenham Character Area.		Accept in part Some minor changes are recommended to the standards in response to other submissions, but do not alter their intent.
		S773.5	Seek Amendment	[Consider] some fine tuning of the development rules for the Character Area could be considered. For example, the proposed building setback from the street (8 m), minimum building width facing the street (10 m), and minimum building floor area (150 m ²) are sometimes larger than equivalent measurements on original character bungalows (at least in our area) whose general street scene these rules seek to protect.		Accept in part Some minor changes are recommended to improve the PC14 rule package.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.763	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above
Rebecca Lord	S776	S776.1	Support	[S]eek[s] that the council does make Ryan Street a character area.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Ryan is retained.
Marie Dysart	S791	S791.6	Support	Support QM- Character area over the Beckenham Loop (Tennyson Street, Heathcote River, Colombo Street).		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Beckenham is retained.
		S791.7	Support			

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons			
Benjamin Love	S799	S799.1	Oppose	[That Residential Character Areas are removed.]		Reject I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.			
						Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
						FS2082.592	Kāinga Ora	Support	Reject Reasons as above
		S799.2	Oppose	[That Residential Character Areas are removed.]		Reject I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.			
						Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
						FS2082.593	Kāinga Ora	Support	Reject Reasons as above
Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board	S804	S804.4	Support	The Community Board supports the qualifying matters in the proposal and in particular the following are of local interest in Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote: ... Residential Character areas...		Accept I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.			
		S804.9	Support	Supports the inclusion of the new character areas in Roker St, Spreydon and Bewdley and Evesham Crescent on Barrington.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCAs for Bewdley and Roker are retained.			

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
		S1077.2	Support	Supports the inclusion of the new character areas in Roker St, Spreydon and Bewdley and Evesham Crescent on Barrington.		Accept I recommend that the proposed RCAs for Bewdley and Roker are retained.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.665	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above..
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	S805	S805.4	Oppose	[O]pposes the current approach in relation to including Residential Character Areas as a qualifying matter. The submitter requests to undertake further assessment to weigh the benefits of character protection against the wider opportunity costs of development limitations in key areas. Based on the results of this study, reduce the extent of residential character controls.		Accept in part I have identified those RCAs where I consider that the wider lost opportunity costs of development limitations in key areas outweigh the benefits of protecting character and recommended the removal or reduction in RCAs in those instances.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
		FS2019.1	Sulekha Korgaonkar	Oppose	Accept in part Reasons as above.	
		S805.5	Oppose	[O]pposes the current approach in relation to including Residential Character Areas as a qualifying matter. The submitter seeks that residential character is provided for by instituting design controls in the overlays which allow for special/residential character to be considered and incorporated in design while		Reject Ms Rennie's view is that development at the scale anticipated by MDRS would undermine the special character values in RCAs. I therefore do not consider that the policy direction and objectives would be met if the level of

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				enabling levels of development anticipated by the zones.	development anticipated by the underlying zoning is enabled.
		S805.6	Oppose	That the designated Character Areas are reduced in extent.	Accept in part I have identified those RCAs where I consider that the wider lost opportunity costs of development limitations in key areas outweigh the benefits of protecting character and recommended the removal or reduction in RCAs in those instances.
Linda Morris	S816	S816.1	Support	The submitter supports the Character Area for Beckenham.	Accept I recommend that the proposed RCA for Beckenham is retained.
Kāinga Ora	S834	S834.38	Seek Amendment	<p>Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.</p> <p>For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p> <p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have</p>	<p>Reject</p> <p>These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.		<p>view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.</p>
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2030.9	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.32	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.31	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.39	Seek Amendment	Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.		<p>Reject</p> <p>These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				<p>For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p> <p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.</p>		<p>retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.</p>
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
			FS2030.10	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.33	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.32	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.40	Seek Amendment	<p>Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.</p> <p>For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p> <p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.</p>		<p>Reject</p> <p>These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9. I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2030.11	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.34	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.33	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.41	Seek Amendment	Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan. For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area		Reject These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
			<p>Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p> <p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.</p>			<p>because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.</p>
			<p>Further submission No.</p>	<p>Further Submitter</p>	<p>Support / Oppose</p>	
			<p>FS2030.12</p>	<p>Amy Beran</p>	<p>Seek Amendment</p>	<p>Accept in part Reasons as above.</p>
			<p>FS2044.35</p>	<p>Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Reject</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						Reasons as above.
			FS2045.34	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.42	Seek Amendment	<p>Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.</p> <p>For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p> <p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.</p>		<p>Reject</p> <p>These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2030.13	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.36	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.35	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.43	Seek Amendment	Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan. For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays. In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga		Reject These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.		<p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.</p>
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2030.14	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.37	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.36 FS2045.37	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.44	Seek Amendment	Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further		Reject

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
				<p>analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.</p> <p>For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p> <p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.</p>	<p>These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2030.15	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.38	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.38 FS2045.39	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.45	Seek Amendment	Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan. For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays. In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.		Reject These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified. For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						<p>with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.</p>
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2030.16	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.39	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.40 FS2045.41	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.46	Seek Amendment	Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.		Reject These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				<p>For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p> <p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.</p>		<p>thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.</p>
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
			FS2030.17	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.40	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.42	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.47	Seek Amendment	<p>Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.</p> <p>For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p> <p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.</p>		<p>Reject</p> <p>These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9. I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2030.18	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.41	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.43	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.48	Seek Amendment	Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan. For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area		Reject These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
			<p>Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p> <p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.</p>			<p>because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.</p>
			<p>Further submission No.</p>	<p>Further Submitter</p>	<p>Support / Oppose</p>	
			<p>FS2030.19</p>	<p>Amy Beran</p>	<p>Seek Amendment</p>	<p>Accept in part Reasons as above.</p>
			<p>FS2044.42</p>	<p>Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Reject</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						Reasons as above.
			FS2045.44	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.49	Seek Amendment	<p>Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.</p> <p>For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p> <p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.</p>		<p>Reject</p> <p>These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2030.20	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.43	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.45	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2052.13	Christchurch International Airport	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
		S834.50	Seek Amendment	Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan. For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.		Reject These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				<p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.</p>		<p>elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.</p>
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2030.21	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.44	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.46	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						Reasons as above.
		S834.51	Seek Amendment	<p>Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters and undertake further analysis to determine the exact values of the resources that the Council seeks to manage in the District Plan.</p> <p>For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p> <p>In the event that the Character Area qualifying matter remains, explicit provision is sought for the ability to develop Papakāinga/Kāinga Nohoanga, noting that local Rūnanga have purchased the former Lyttelton West School Site.</p>		<p>Reject</p> <p>These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.</p> <p>I do not consider that the RCA provisions preclude development of papakāinga housing; however within the RCA it would require resource consent to consider the built form and landscape elements of any such proposal, and I</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						have recommended amending the matters of discretion to better allow for consideration of the housing needs of Ngāi Tahu whānui in any resource consent process.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2030.22	Amy Beran	Seek Amendment	Accept in part Reasons as above.
			FS2044.45	Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
			FS2045.47	Carter Group Limited	Support	Reject Reasons as above.
Historic Places Canterbury	S835	S835.3	Support	The submitter supports this qualifying matter.		Accept I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.590 FS2037.688	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept Reasons as above
		S835.21	Support	The submitter welcomes the addition of three new character areas and while they regret the removal of two character areas in Sumner and the reduction in size of 7 of the existing character areas, they recognise that these no		Accept in part I consider that the technical assessments and s32 report appropriately demonstrate why the additions, removals and reductions are appropriate, and in particular, how the identified

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				longer meet the criteria and should therefore be removed or require boundary adjustments. They welcome the inclusion of Residential Character Areas as a Qualifying matter and the introduction of restricted discretionary status to help better manage and protect character areas. They also support more restrictive subdivision for character areas.		methodology for assessing character areas has been applied. With respect to activity status, for the reasons set out in this report, I recommend retaining the restricted discretionary activity status.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.608 FS2037.706	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above.
		S835.22	Support	The submitter welcomes the inclusion of Residential Character Areas as a Qualifying matter and the introduction of restricted discretionary status to help better manage and protect character areas.		Accept in part I consider that RCAs meet the requirements of the RMA to be identified as a QM, their inclusion will better achieve the objectives of the NPS-UD and Objective 3.3.8, and s5 and s7(c) of the RMA. With respect to activity status, for the reasons set out in this report, I recommend retaining the restricted discretionary activity status.
		Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose		
		FS2037.609 FS2037.707	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Accept in part Reasons as above.	
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	S853	S853.9	Support	Retain area-specific activities for Residential Banks Peninsula Zone as notified in 14.8.3.1.1 – 14.8.3.1.5.		Accept in part For the reasons set out in this report, a change is recommended to the site coverage standard.

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					Otherwise, they are recommended to be retained.
Maureen Kerr	S868	S868.2	Seek Amendment	Protect and maintain special character and quality of existing homes in area from Papanui Road to Watford Street.	Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
OCHT	S877	S877.9	Seek Amendment	Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters. For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. Delete all new built form standards for character areas. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.	Reject These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified. For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2019.3	Sulekha Korgaonkar	Oppose	Accept Reasons as above.
			FS2082.1237 FS2082.1305	Kāinga Ora	Seek Amendment	Reject Reasons as above.
		S877.10	Support	Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters. For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1. Delete all new built form standards for character areas. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.		Reject These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified. For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						these areas. This in turn, would not achieve Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2082.1238 FS2082.1306	Kāinga Ora	Seek Amendment	Reject Reasons as above.
		S877.11	Seek Amendment	<p>Delete all new or extended character areas as qualifying matters.</p> <p>For existing character areas retain the controlled activity status for new buildings that exists in the Operative Plan - Rule 14.5.3.1.2 C1.</p> <p>Delete all new built form standards for character areas. 14.5.3.2.3 Building height – Character Area Overlays, and 14.5.3.2.5 – 14.5.3.2.14 Built form rules – Character Area Overlays.</p>	<p>Reject</p> <p>These areas have been identified using the same methodology as applied to the review of RCAs. In my view, if the elements that give a particular area a special character that is worthy of retention are present, and the area meets the thresholds set out in the methodology, then they should be treated in the same manner as existing RCAs, and therefore included in PC14. This is because the effects of development of these areas has the same potential to undermine the elements which make up their overall character, and their cohesiveness and integrity, regardless of when the areas have been identified.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, application of a controlled activity status and deletion of the proposed built form standards would, in my view, result in development that is inconsistent with the values of the RCAs, and over time lead to a loss in the integrity and cohesiveness of these areas. This in turn, would not achieve</p>	

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						Objective 3.3.8 a. ii., Objective 14.2.5, or implement Policy 14.2.5.9.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2082.1239 FS2082.1307	Kāinga Ora	Seek Amendment	Reject Reasons as above.
Melissa Macfarlane	S1003	S1003.15	Seek Amendment	<p>Reinstate Rule 14.5.3.1.2(C1) as per the Operative Plan.</p> <p>Alternatively, amend this rule so that alterations or additions to existing dwellings and other buildings, and the erection of new buildings less than 30m² and fences and walls are all classified as controlled activities.</p> <p>New dwellings and accessory buildings over 30m² would be RDIS.</p>		<p>Accept in part</p> <p>For the reasons set out in this report, I do not support retention of a controlled activity status. I do not agree with amending the threshold to provide a controlled activity status for any alterations or additions, or to buildings under a certain size threshold beyond that already provided for. I do however consider that it would be appropriate to make additions to an existing residential unit, which are less than 30m², and which occur to the rear of the site a controlled activity, as this treats them on a similar basis to new dwellings at the rear, and reflect Ms Rennie's comments that it is development visible from the street that has greater potential effect on character values. I consider that alterations to the rear of a property should also be exempted from Rule 14.5.3.1.3 RD14.</p>
		S1003.16	Seek Amendment	<p>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. The proposed exclusions would still</p>		<p>Accept in part</p> <p>I do not agree with only applying the rules to these activities, but I have recommended some changes to the controlled and restricted</p>

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				need to apply, except where required to meet the above.		discretionary rules to reduce their application with respect to alterations and additions.
Jane Sutherland-Norton on behalf of Andrew Norton	S1006	S1006.1	Seek Amendment	Somerville and Lower Cashmere suburbs should be in a character area. Resource consent should be required before any development can proceed.		Reject Ms Rennie notes that a RCA of this scale would cover a much more extensive area than other RCAs, and has a much larger range of buildings, making it difficult to determine consistent character attributes, and therefore it does not have a sufficient level of consistent built form and landscape elements to be considered an RCA. <i>Note however that an area in Somerville is recommended to be included as an RCA (Cashmere View)</i>
Mark Winter	S1008	S1008.2	Seek Amendment	Retain a heritage and character status for Beverley Street.		Reject For the reasons set out in this report, I recommend that the proposed RCA for Beverley is removed.
Jeanne Cooper	S1031	S1031.1 S1032.2	Seek Amendment	Provide a buffer zone between character areas and RMD intensive housing [High Density Residential Zone].		Reject In my view, applying a buffer area, or additional controls outside the RCAs would have the effect of applying a qualifying matter to those properties, and I do not consider that this would meet the tests under sections 77J or 77L of the RMA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2082.828	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	Accept

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Recommendation and Reasons
					Reasons as above.
Jono De Wit	S1053	S1053.2	Oppose	Oppose the Piko Crescent Character Area.	Reject For the reasons set out in this report, I recommend that the proposed RCA for Piko is retained.
Joanne Nikolaou	S1054	S1054.1	Seek Amendment	Seek that a new Character Area be included for Cashmere Somerfield.	Reject Accept in part <u>In her primary evidence, Ms Rennie has assessed this area using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that Cashmere View Street meets the criteria to be a RCA. In her supplementary evidence in response to Panel request #80, Ms Rennie recommended a change to include Fairview Street as well. As the area is not one to which Policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies, I consider it appropriate to identify it as an RCA, with accompanying built form standards.</u> Ms Rennie notes that a RCA of this scale would cover a much more extensive area than other RCAs, and has a much larger range of buildings, making it difficult to determine consistent character attributes, and therefore it does not have a sufficient level of consistent built form and landscape elements to be considered an RCA.
Dr. Bruce Harding	S1079	S1079.1	Seek Amendment	Seek clarification on the RHA 8 (Macmillan Avenue) boundary, as it was all covered in the Special Amenity Area (SaM 17 & 17A) provisions in the late 1990s City Plan. Why is	Reject Former SAMs were assessed in 2015 as part of the District Plan review and determined not to meet the thresholds set out in the methodology

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
				one end of the street singled out and the home of John Macmillan Brown (35 Macmillan Ave) excluded.		to be included as RCAs. The methodology applied to the assessment is set out in the respective Section 32 Reports and outline the reasons for any boundary changes.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2037.662	Christchurch Civic Trust	Support	Reject Reasons as above
Anton Casutt	S1088	S1088.2	Seek Amendment	Seeks that Scott Street, Sydenham is added to a Residential Heritage Area or Character Area.		Reject Ms Rennie has assessed this area (including this site) using the methodology applied to RCAs, and concluded that it does not meet the criteria to be a RCA.
Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board	S1090	S1090.2	Seek Amendment	Supports the Residential Character Areas, but considers there are other examples of areas with similar character to the areas proposed that should be identified in the Plan including areas of Hornby, South Hornby, Sockburn, Hei Hei, Islington, and Broomfield.		Reject Ms Rennie notes that RCAs of this scale would cover much more extensive areas than other RCAs, and have a much larger range of buildings, making it difficult to determine consistent character attributes, and therefore they do not have a sufficient level of consistent built form and landscape elements to be considered RCAs.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2064.185	Retirement Village Association	Oppose	Accept Reasons as above
Ian Cumberpatch Architects Ltd	S2076	S2076.56	Seek Amendment	Amend subclause 14.8.3.2.2(a) to be 250m2.		Reject

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought		Recommendation and Reasons
						Ms Rennie considers that retaining the varied pattern of development in Lyttelton is important in maintaining values and that the 450m ² density proposed is appropriate to conserve the character values and enable sufficient space to address sloping sites.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2099.68	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	Accept Reasons as above
		S2076.57	Seek Amendment	amend subclause 14.8.3.2.4(a) to be 60%.		Accept The technical assessment and Ms Rennie supports retaining the current 60% site coverage limit within the Lyttelton RCA.
			Further submission No.	Further Submitter	Support / Oppose	
			FS2099.69	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	Reject Reasons as above