

SUMMARY STATEMENT

1. My name is Sarah-Jane Oliver. I am the City Planning Team Leader for the Christchurch City Council.
2. I have prepared evidence on behalf of the **Christchurch City Council** in relation to strategic planning matters and the Strategic Directions Chapter 3 Objectives.
3. My appearance today is in relation to sections 3 to 11 of my s42A report.
4. In response to the IHP Minute 4 I table a document providing an overview of the key facts and mechanics of PC14 including information in relation to:
 - Housing and business capacity
 - Spatial extents and boundaries of centres and intensified residential zones
 - Associated heights and densities for centres and intensified residential zones
 - Qualifying matters, how they have been identified and the required evaluation
 - Mechanics of how the intensification instruments and qualifying matters manage land use development.
5. I have minor corrections to make to my primary s42A report and table a corrected version with changes highlighted in yellow and apologise for these omissions and errors. The omissions and errors include some submitter names and numbers, cross references to appendices, references to source information and formatting corrections (specifically, footnote references not being in superscript). These omissions and minor errors do not change the substance of my report nor any of my recommendations.

Strategic Overview and in relation to Strategic Directions Chapter 3

6. The background to PC14 and statutory obligation on Council regarding the intensification planning instrument. I do not propose to restate the legal aspects as these have been discussed in the opening legal submissions.
7. An overview of the Notified Proposal and the approach to qualifying matters, summarised within our response to Minute 4.
8. A summary of submissions received and key themes emerging, including what I consider to be the overarching issues raised by submitters on PC14, being:
 - The Notified Proposal should be more, or conversely less, enabling of development with corresponding different positions on the future urban form of Ōtautahi Christchurch.
 - That Qualifying Matters (QMs) are an inappropriate barrier to development, adversely impact on development capacity, and are not necessary to achieve a well-functioning urban environment.

- Conversely, the proposed QMs are appropriate and necessary to achieve a well-functioning urban environment, better achieve the principles of sustainable management, do not adversely impact on development capacity, and (some) should be amended to be less enabling of development than under the Notified Proposal.
9. I have provided an overview of an Amended Proposal drawn from and referencing Council's planning experts.
 10. I have addressed in a broad sense those submissions on the whole of the plan change, but with a specific focus on those who have raised concerns with social impact (also addressed by Ms Foy), the quality of the urban environment, and infrastructure.
 11. To summarise the broad direction for PC14 is in essence, setting out a much bigger building envelope for the city. The NPS-UD direction is not a wholly new direction for Otautahi Christchurch, as an intensification policy framework is already provided for under the Operative District Plan.
 12. The resulting additional enablement, as proposed through either the Notified Proposal and the Amended Proposal, will cater for 80 to 100 years or more of growth and demand. The level of enablement PC14 provided through the application of MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, goes well beyond the Future Development Strategy requirements to plan for sufficient housing capacity for the next 30 years.
 13. For context, by 2051 the city is projected to reach a resident population of just under 500,000, demanding some 35,000 additional homes over the next 30 years. Demand is expected to be relatively even for two bedroom and three+ bedroom dwellings.
 14. I am confident that even with all proposed qualifying matters in place, under either the Notified or Amended Proposal, PC14 will achieve the desired long term market flexibility and competitiveness and facilitate opportunities for a broad range of housing types.
 15. Of greatest issue and challenge for Otautahi Christchurch is shifting housing preferences for higher density living in more desired locations. It is very important, in my view, that the planning framework ensures quality and attractive medium and particularly high density housing and neighbourhoods.
 16. Furthermore, it is important that the city's special characteristics are maintained and protected; strategic and city infrastructure is protected and can function in an efficient and effective manner; and future populations are not directed into locations at risk from hazards.

17. There is strong community expectation for overall improvement in amenity values. In my opinion NPS-UD Policy 6 does not further define or constrain the direction of section 7 of the Act in relation to the “maintenance and enhancement of amenity values and the quality of the urban environment”. I consider that the directed changes as a consequence of greater intensification, can still take account of amenity impacts and associated adverse effects when determining a new and much larger urban form for this city.

Strategic Directions under Chapter 3

18. I turn now to the proposed strategic directions objectives under Chapter 3 that provide the overarching direction for the district. Under the Notified Proposal four objectives were proposed to be amended and one new added, namely:
- Obj 3.3.3 Ngai Tahu mana whenua
 - Obj 3.3.4 Housing bottom lines and choice
 - New Obj 3.3.7 Well-functioning urban environment
 - Obj 3.3.7 to be 3.3.8 Urban growth, form and design
 - Obj 3.3.9 Natural and cultural environment
19. Through my consideration of submissions it is my recommendation to:
- Split the new proposed Objective 3.3.7 to fall (in part) to Objective 3.3.1 and include the required objective (under clause 6(1) to Schedule 3A of the RMA (s77G(5)) relating to a well-functioning urban environment, and two other directions reflective of NPS-UD Policy 1 matters (e) and (f) relating to supporting the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and an urban environment that is resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change, and in response to a submission resilience to natural hazards.
 - I have proposed amendments to the operative Objective 3.3.7 Urban growth, form and design, and also suggested that Objective 3.3.7 could be drawn together with Objective 3.3.4 Housing Bottom lines.
 - The proposed amendments to Objective 3.3.7 are to:
 - describe the overall long term urban form for the city under one key direction;
 - recognise changing amenity values but still achieving quality urban environments;
 - give recognition to Ngai Tahu manawhenua to express their cultural traditions and norms; and
 - recognise the special characteristics of qualifying matters.

20. I do wish to make one correction to my position regarding now numbered Objective 3.3.8.a.viii (proposed under my rebuttal to be renumbered back to Objective 3.3.7). The Carter Group Limited's requested rewording of that objective is "...*has good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces including by way of public or active transport.*" On further consideration I wish to change my recommendation with respect to the final words in that objective for that as a strategic direction it is my view that the city should be aspiring towards achieving good accessibility "...*by way of public **and** active transport*".

Date: 10 October 2023

Sarah-Jane Oliver