





PC14 Council Reply Attachment 4 – Information record of changes made to planning maps as part of S42A Reports, including corrections to memorandum already provided to the IHP.


Entry #	Type	Source / Submitter(s)	Nature of additional change(s)	Reasons for change(s)	Notified & s42A Recommendation	S42A Officer
#1	Mapping Planning Map: 48 & 47	#879 – Rutherford Family Trust [Carlin Rutherford]	2 Crest Lane, Mt Pleasant. Remove Residential Hills Precinct, apply Suburban Hill Density Precinct.	The submitter did not present to the Panel, but subsequently made contact regarding the mapping error. FUZ was not considered appropriate for the site as the scale of the operative Monks Spur/Mt Pleasant Density Overlay was not sufficient to warrant a zone change, nor was it able to be argued as a qualifying matter. The initial application of the Residential Hills Precinct appears to be in error as the FUZ controls would seek to manage the overall site. With the recommendation to zone the site MUZ, consideration needs to be given to the LPTAA response, which is applicable to the site given its far proximity to an applicable bus route. The Suburban Hill Density Precinct should subsequently be applied, aligning with the zoning res	Notified: FUZ with Residential Hills Precinct Recommended: MRZ with Residential Hills Precinct	Ike Kleynbos / Ian Bayliss
#2	Mapping Planning Map: 45 & 44	#903 – Danne Mora Limited #916 – Milns Park Limited [Andrew Mactier]	North Halswell commercial centre & surrounds. Reduce walking catchment to 400m, applying HRZ accordingly and MRZ thereafter. The change would partially adopt the recommended spatial extent of intensification shared on behalf of the submitter (see Map 2), noting that this is not comprehensive. Image below showing 400m versus 600m walking catchment, showing recommended TCZ and HRZ zoning:	A position was put forward through the hearing by the submitter that North Halswell is unique and is not directly comparable to other TCZ centres due to the bespoke level of enablement the Plan provides for the centre. This has been considered further and the argument does have merit. The centre is restricted to a total of 27,000 sqm of retail and office space, compared to the likes of Linwood, which has 60,000 sqm of office and retail and has the same proposed zoning. Centres that permit a similar scale of retail and office space are typically Larger Local Centres (e.g. Merivale), which adopt a walking catchment of 5mins / 400m. Reducing the walking catchment down to this level would align with the approach taken to date.	Notified: TCZ with 400m walking catchment used to apply HRZ in surrounds. Recommended: Expanded TCZ [Woolworths - #740] with 600m walking catchment used to apply HRZ in surrounds.	Ike Kleynbos / Kirk Lightbody


Entry #	Type	Source / Submitter(s)	Nature of additional change(s)	Reasons for change(s)	Notified & s42A Recommendation	S42A Officer
						
#3	Mapping Planning Map: 50	JWS – Planning Experts – Cashmere Worsleys ODP Area – 4 Dec 2023 #257 – Cashmere Land Developments Limited	Cashmere and Worsleys Development Plan area – 235 Worsleys Road (Lot 525 DP 515978) and 245 Worsleys Road (Lot 524 DP 515978). Remove Suburban Hill Density Precinct, except for the aforementioned sites. Sites with this precinct should not also have the Residential Hills Precinct, which should apply to residual areas (shown with red dots below). 	Please refer to the JWS document. To summarise, the LPTAA logic has been to only apply this to areas reasonably anticipated to see uplift – i.e. not newly developed areas as propensity to develop would be extremely low, removing the need for a QM response. Only the two sites recommended remain undeveloped and would have merit in applying the QM. The Residential Hills Precinct would be superfluous as the minimum allotment size is the same for the Suburban Hill Density Precinct. The former Precinct should only apply in developed areas to manage vacant allotments.	Notified: FUZ with Residential Hills Precinct (partially). Recommended: MRZ with Suburban Hill Density Precinct and Residential Hills Precinct.	Ike Kleynbos / Ian Bayliss
#4	Mapping Planning Map:	#760 – ChristchurchNZ #751 – Christchurch City Council	Retain operative zoning as OCP – Open Space Community Park Zone.	This was inadvertently changed to LCZ through notification and s42A recommendation.	Notified: LCZ	Kirk Lightbody


Entry #	Type	Source / Submitter(s)	Nature of additional change(s)	Reasons for change(s)	Notified & s42A Recommendation	S42A Officer
	39 Buchan Playground – 41 Buchan Street			This is an error. The error was noted in the submissions of CCC (#751) and ChristchurchNZ (#760).	Recommended: LCZ Right of Reply: OCP	
#5	Mapping & Provisions	#689 – Canterbury Regional Council	Creation of new “Loess Soil Management Area” covering operative Residential Hill areas and Lyttelton Township areas zoned as Residential Banks Peninsula.	Responds to JWS on Port Hills Stormwater QMs dated 11 December 2023 and 24 April 2024. This introduces a new certified permitted pathway for development, subject to the completion of an erosion and sediment control plan for works at greater densities than operative zoning.	Notified: RH & RBP with various QM overlays Recommended: MRZ with Suburban Hill Density Precinct and Suburban Density Precinct, plus various QM overlays Right of Reply: MRZ with Suburban Hill Density Precinct and Suburban Density Precinct, plus various QM overlays and Loess Soil Management Area	Ike Kleynbos
#6	Mapping	Questioning by the Panel when Mr Kleynbos was on the stand (1 November 2023).	Removal of LCIP response for southern sections of the Belfast (Northwood response): 	These areas on Regent’s Park Drive, Cunliffe Road, Tracy Place, and Willowview Drive are geographically isolated and distinct from the LCIP response around the Belfast (Northwood) commercial centre. Walking catchment distances are likely to exceed the intended walking catchment response by a large margin due to the severance of walkability across Main North Road (State Highway 74).	Notified: MRZ with LCIP Recommended: MRZ with LCIP Right of Reply: MRZ	Ike Kleynbos
#7	Mapping	Ongoing central city building heights discussions through the hearings with submitters and experts.	Update to the Central City Building Heights Map to reflect the changes made to recommended permitted building heights through the hearings.	The proposed Central City Building Heights Map is a useful visual tool to clearly show what building height applies where in the central city. Minor changes are needed, namely to the areas south of the South Frame, west of Montreal Street, and in the northern part of the city.	Changes to notified heights map to reflect what has been recommended through the hearings.	Holly Gardiner / Andrew Willis
#8	Mapping (revised map to be provided to IHP, as part of Appendix H8)	#1054 - Joanne Nikolaou	Enlargement of Cashmere View Character Area	Ms Rennie’s supplementary evidence in response to IHP information request 80 (Appendix N), indicated that Ms Rennie now recommends that Fairview Street	Notified: No CA in this location Recommended in s42A:	Jane Rennie/Liz White

Entry #	Type	Source / Submitter(s)	Nature of additional change(s)	Reasons for change(s)	Notified & s42A Recommendation	S42A Officer
				and parts of Rose Street be part of the Cashmere View Character Area	CA based around Cashmere View Street Right of reply: Enlargement of Cashmere View Character Area to include Fairview Street	
#9	Appendix H1 provided to IHP as additional information	#1054 - Joanne Nikolaou	A correction is required to the table of summary information for CAs, for the Cashmere View CA, to modify the number of properties in the area.	There will now be a total of 90 properties in this Character Area, and the total number of properties in Character Areas will now be 3086.	Notified: No CA in this location Recommended in s42A: 43 properties Post hearing re- evaluation: 90 properties	Jane Rennie/Liz White
#10	Mapping	As per IHP information request #55 on the LPTAA response	Recognition of the #8 bus route, remove the Precinct approach within an 800m walkable catchment from the bus route, north of the Lyttelton tunnel:  Note that any area that has the Suburban Density Hill Precinct removed, should instead have the Residential Hill Precinct applied to protect hillside development and ensure alignment with the Port Hills Stormwater QM approach.	This new bus route is at a high frequency and would meet the criteria for the LPTAA response not to apply.	Notified: RS, RH, and RBP zones Recommended: MRZ, with Suburban Density Precinct and Suburban Hill Density Precinct Right of Reply: MRZ, except for Lyttelton Township, which should be Suburban Density Precinct	Ike Kleynbos
#11	Minor wording additions and changes	Consequential changes to address inconsistencies in built form rules between RHAs and CAs, and Suburban Density or Suburban Hill Density Precincts, where these apply to the same locations. These inconsistencies arose	New Clause 14.5.3.2.b at the beginning of 14.5.3 Area specific built form standards for the MRZ zone; rewording of a. to make it clearer; and new clause c. to clarify that specific rules in 14.5.3 prevail over general rules in 14.5.2.	In RHAs and CAs which are within Suburban Density or Suburban Hill Density Precincts, there are conflicts within the built form rules eg for Lyttelton RHA and CA. This situation needs to be resolved.	Notified: no conflict Recommended in s42A: Rezoning of Lyttelton to MRZ (SD) and rezoning of part of the Cashmere CA and Macmillan RHA to MRZ (Suburban Hill Density), with new (and different) built form rules in each case.	Glenda Dixon/Liz White

Entry #	Type	Source / Submitter(s)	Nature of additional change(s)	Reasons for change(s)	Notified & s42A Recommendation	S42A Officer
		during s42A reporting by different authors.			Right of reply: Clarify that the specific built form rules for the relevant RHAs and CAs prevail over the MRZ (SD) and MRZ (SHD) built form rules	
#12	Mapping	S42A report on Residential Heritage Areas p128 - Appendix 9.3.7.8.5 - Inner City West RHA. See also para 46 of Glenda Dixon's rebuttal evidence.	Interactive mapping for PC14 currently shows the RHA removed from all of the Carter site at 32 Armagh St. This is incorrect. The RHA was recommended to be removed from the bulk of the site, but retained over the "Blue cottage" and its setting. This is subject to the IHP agreeing that its scheduling be retained.	Mapping does not accurately reflect s42A recommendation.	Notified: all of site was shown as RHA Recommended in s42A: RHA be removed over the bulk of the site but retained over the blue cottage and setting. Right of reply: Amend mapping to reflect s42A.	Glenda Dixon
#13	Mapping	S42A report on Residential Heritage Areas p127 - Appendix 9.3.7.1 - Chester Street RHA, and paragraphs 8.1.8 and 8.1.9 of this report.	Interactive mapping for PC14 does not show all the changes recommended. For FENZ site, the area removed from RHA should be added to the interface area. Three properties on Barbadoes St are recommended to be added to the RHA, and 349 Barbadoes St adjoining these, should be added to the interface overlay. Council's submission point 751.45 indicates that 327 Barbadoes and 281 Armagh should be removed from the interface area.	Mapping does not accurately reflect s42A recommendation.	Notified: All of FENZ site shown as RHA, 327 Barbadoes and 281 Armagh in interface area. Recommended: Changes as per column 4. Right of reply: Amend mapping to reflect s42A.	Glenda Dixon
#14	Mapping	S42A report - Marcus Langman. Appendix 9.3.7.9.3 and 9.3.7.9.8 - Englefield and Piko/Shand RHAs	Council's submission point 751.45 indicates that 4 other properties should be removed from interface areas. These are at 202 Fitzgerald, 32 Avonside, 109 Rattray and 2R Shand.	Mapping does not reflect s42A recommendations on Council submission.	Notified: the four properties at addresses listed were included in interface areas around Englefield and Piko/Shand RHAs. Recommended: these four properties deleted from interface areas. Right of reply: Amend mapping to reflect s42A.	Glenda Dixon/Marcus Langman
#15	Mapping	Panel request on 20.11.23 for conferencing on possible Ravensdown air discharge buffer (Panel Information Request #58)	Residential properties within 240m of the Ravensdown Hornby site at 312 Main South Road retain their operative zoning of Residential Suburban.	The change to zoning due to a change to recommendation. Justification is set out in the Planners Joint Witness Statement (JWS) 'Ravensdown Industrial Interface', and associated appendices, dated 18.04.24.	Notified: MRZ with some HRZ. Recommended in s42A: MRZ with greater extent being HRZ (recommended by Ike Kleynbos). Right of reply: RS zoning within 240m of Ravensdown Hornby site (312 Main South Road) as set out in Joint Witness Statement.	Brittany Ratka

Entry #	Type	Source / Submitter(s)	Nature of additional change(s)	Reasons for change(s)	Notified & s42A Recommendation	S42A Officer
#16	Mapping	Panel at City Wide QM hearing week 2 - Which existing natural hazard overlays are being carried over and what zoning applied	Retain operative zoning for sites that have a 70% or greater overlap with the HFHMA or FPMA. Retain operative zoning for sites that have a 30% or greater overlap with the CCMA 1 and 2, RMA 1, and MMMA 1.	The change to zoning due to a change to recommendation. Justification is set out in the response to Panel Information Request #16 (refer to Table G.2 in the Memo on 11 April 2024).	Notified: Zoning aligns with MDRS and Policy 3 of NPSUD. Recommended in s42A: Zoning aligns with MDRS and Policy 3 of NPSUD. Right of reply: Retain operative zoning as set out in Table G.2 of Council Memo dated 11 April 2024.	Brittany Ratka
#17	Mapping	Presentation to Panel by Sarah Oliver on Coastal Hazards QMs on 16 April 2024 – refer to paragraph 10 of Sarah Oliver's Summary Statement.	Rezone all properties under the Amended Proposal that are located within the Tsunami Risk Management Area and zoned Residential Hills to be rezoned to Medium Density Zone with the Suburban Hill Density Precinct applied to these properties (estimated at 100 properties). Refer to Attachment B of Sarah Oliver's Summary Statement 16 April 2024.	A zone approach is considered inappropriate given the small scale of influence (~100 sites) and the LPTAA response via the Suburban Hill Density Precinct achieves the same density outcomes.	Notified: RH, with TMA and LPTAA Recommended in s42A: RH, with TMA and Suburban Hill Density Precinct. Right of reply: MRZ, with TMA and Suburban Hill Density Precinct.	Sarah Oliver
#18	Mapping	Providing for MDRS and Policy 3 enablement where the impact of the Tsunami Risk Management Area is minor.	S42A report Sarah Oliver paragraph 13.44.a "The retention of the Operative District Plan residential zoning for all properties where the impact of the Tsunami Risk Management Area on the property is 30% or greater.	To provide for intensification where the risk to property and lives is low.	Notified: Mix of RS and RSDT, and MRZ. Recommended in s42A: MRZ where property impacted by the TRMA 30% or less. Right of Reply: Application of the recommendation and proposed zone boundary changes. No change to the spatial extent of the TRMA however.	Sarah Oliver
#19	Mapping	#916 – Milns Park Limited, regarding zoning along Kearns Drive and adjacent RNN/FUZ areas.	Rezone residential parcels currently shown as FUZ to MRZ, as shown in re box below:  Rezone the area below to all being FUZ:	As per the conclusions of the s42A report of Ian Bayliss, pages 74-76. The zoning of Kearns Drive was incorrectly shown on s42A mapping. Due to the walking catchment being updated for North Halswell, the current RNN areas should be retained as FUZ, as per the conclusions of Mr Bayliss.	Notified: FUZ (Future Urban Zone) Recommended in s42A: Medium Residential Density Zone Right of reply: Medium Residential Density Zone	Ian Bayliss

Entry #	Type	Source / Submitter(s)	Nature of additional change(s)	Reasons for change(s)	Notified & s42A Recommendation	S42A Officer
						
#20	Mapping	Response #16 to Panel – existing natural hazard overlays included as QMs	Include the Remainder of Port Hills and Banks Peninsula Slope Instability Management Area (where within PC14 zones) as part of the Slope Hazard QM mapping layer.	Aligns with recommendation to include this layer as a QM.	Notified: Not clearly included as a QM. Recommended in s42A: Not clearly included as a QM. Right of reply: Included as a QM (within response 16).	Brittany Ratka
#21	Mapping Planning map: Series A/interactive map	#751.143 - Council, Marcus Langman's evidence para 102 (w)	<p>Correct the zoning of the following sites/parts of sites to HRZ in line with surrounding zoning:</p> <p>283 Papanui Road 51 Browns Road 41 Ranfurly Street 45 Ranfurly Street 2 Helmores Lane 16 Helmores Lane 69 Riccarton Road 59 Hansons Lane, 69, 71 and 73 Suva St 24 Main South Road, and 25 and 25A Yaldhurst Road.</p> <p>The following sites recommended for HRZ zoning in Marcus Langman's evidence at para 102 (w) were also spot zoned MRZ at notification but are now showing on the interactive map as HRZ:</p> <p>122 Papanui Road 399 Papanui Road 1 Harewood Road 153 Holly Road 20 and 20A Mona Vale Avenue 65 Riccarton Road</p>	Some sites containing/adjoining heritage items/settings were spot zoned MRZ at notification within areas of HRZ zoning. Mapping does not accurately reflect s42A recommendation.	Notified: MRZ Recommended in s42A: HRZ Right of reply: Amend mapping to HRZ to reflect s42A.	Suzanne Richmond/Marcus Langman
#22	Mapping	#1052 - Oxford Terrace Baptist Church	Amend zoning in accordance with s42A recommendation of Ike Kleynbos, to apply HRZ and	Drafting error; the property appears to be made up of two titles: Part Lot 1 DP 3349 and Lot 1 DP 489887.	Notified: MRZ and HRZ.	Ike Kleynbos

Entry #	Type	Source / Submitter(s)	Nature of additional change(s)	Reasons for change(s)	Notified & s42A Recommendation	S42A Officer
			<p>associated Precinct to entire property (avoid split zoning):</p> 		<p>Recommended in s42A: MRZ and HRZ, with Central City Residential Precinct over HRZ.</p> <p>Right of Reply: HRZ, with Central City Residential Precinct.</p>	
#23	Mapping	Panel at City Wide QM hearing week 2 - Which existing natural hazard overlays are being carried over and what zoning applied	<p>This relates to changes since Entry #16 further above.</p> <p>High Flood Hazard Management Area and Flood Ponding Management Area for sites that have a 70% or greater overlap: where the status quo zoning would be Residential New Neighbourhood, the PC14 zoning of Future Urban Zone be applied.</p> <p>Slope Hazard QM for sites that have a 30% or greater overlap with the CCMA 1 and 2, RMA 1, and MMMA 1: where the status quo zoning would be Residential Hills, the PC14 zoning of Residential Medium Density with Suburban Hill Density Precinct and Suburban Density Precinct be applied.</p>	This reflects that the Suburban Density Hills Precinct/Future Urban Zone would result in the same outcome without the need to retain the status quo zoning.	<p>Notified: Zoning aligns with MDRS and Policy 3 of NPSUD.</p> <p>Recommended in s42A: Zoning aligns with MDRS and Policy 3 of NPSUD.</p> <p>Right of reply: Retain operative zoning as set out in Table G.2 of Council Memo dated 11 April 2024. Except RNN to be FUZ where 70% overlap with HFHMA and FPMA, and RH to be MRZ with Suburban Hill Density Precinct and Suburban Density Precinct where 30% or greater overlap with CCMA 1 and 2, RMA 1 and MMMA1.</p>	Brittany Ratka
#24	Mapping	Error in mapping regarding notified 'Large Lot Residential Zone' naming	Any area zoned 'Large Lot Residential Zone' as per s42A Recommendation, should be shown as ' Residential Large Lot Zone '.	<p>Notified mapping mistaking applied the National Planning Standards name for what is operatively 'Residential Large Lot Zone'. This error was carried forward to s42A recommended, with select areas that were proposed to be rezoned shown as 'Residential Large Lot Zone'.</p> <p>There is no rule framework for a 'Large Lot Residential Zone' and should not apply. The PC14 proposal seeks to build on the operative 'Residential Large Lot Zone'.</p>	<p>Notified: Large Lot Residential Zone</p> <p>Recommended in s42A: Large Lot Residential Zone & Residential Large Lot Zone.</p> <p>Right of reply: Residential Large Lot Zone (only)</p>	Ike Kleynbos