

IN THE MATTER OF Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF Proposed Plan Change 14 Housing and
Business Choice pursuant to Part 5, subpart
5A and Part 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource
Management Act 1991

MINUTE 4: RECORD OF PRE-HEARING MEETING HELD ON 1 AUGUST 2023

Record of pre-hearing meeting

Background

- [1] The Independent Hearing Panel (IHP) for Plan Change 14 Housing and Business Choice (PC 14) convened a pre-hearing meeting on Tuesday 1 August 2023 for the following purposes:
- (a) Introduction of the IHP and key Secretariat staff
 - (b) Declaration of interests
 - (c) Introduction of Council staff and/or representatives, submitters and further submitters in attendance
 - (d) Receive and hear from Council staff and/or representatives, submitters and further submitters any applications for the IHP to consider any preliminary legal issues including any issues regarding the scope of Plan Change 14 and/or submissions.
 - (e) Hear and consider any feedback on the draft hearing schedule
 - (f) Hear and consider any feedback on the draft hearing procedures
 - (g) To provide an opportunity for submitters to ask any procedural questions or clarify any matter if it is not related to the merits of the plan change.
- [2] Prior to the pre-hearing meeting, the IHP requested the Christchurch City Council¹ (the Council) and invited submitters² to file memoranda or send an email providing responses to a number of questions related to the agenda.
- [3] We received responses from the Council and submitters as recorded in Appendix 1 to this record.
- [4] We record that we did not receive the memoranda from the parties represented by Chapman Tripp until immediately prior to the meeting so did not have the opportunity to consider their responses in detail until after the meeting, but have since considered these. We read and considered all other memoranda and emails prior the meeting. We also received further correspondence from Mr Townshend after the meeting.³

¹ IHP Minute 3, paragraph 28

² IHP Minute 3, paragraph 27

³ Pre-hearing application filed post pre-hearing meeting submitter 599 David Townshend

- [5] This Minute records the outcomes of the pre-hearing meeting and any amendments to the hearing schedule and draft procedures.
- [6] We have not referred to all matters raised on an individual basis but have grouped responses received according to the issues raised.

Attendances

- [7] The Council was represented by legal counsel Mr Cedric Carranceja and Mr David Randall and senior Council staff Mark Stevenson and Sarah Oliver who are involved in the preparation of PC 14.
- [8] Appendix 2 sets out those submitters and their representatives who attended the pre-hearing meeting, including those who appeared and spoke to various issues raised.

Preliminary legal issues

- [9] The memoranda filed by parties ahead of the pre-hearing meeting set out possible preliminary legal issues that the IHP may wish to consider before the substantive hearings of submissions. These included:
- (a) Whether the access to sunlight qualifying matter (QM), which applies to most residential zones complies with the requirement for the Council to notify an Intensification Planning Instrument pursuant to section 80F and/or is an eligible qualifying matter under section 77I.⁴
 - (b) Whether the proposed Airport noise influence area QM, proposed pursuant to section 77I(e) on the basis that it is required for the purpose of ensuring the safe and efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure is proposed under section 77K as an existing qualifying matter that is operative in the District Plan at the date of notification of Plan Change 14, or whether it is proposed (or ought to have been proposed) under section 77J and 77L of the Act as a new qualifying matter.⁵

⁴ Issue raised by submitter 599 David Townshend

⁵ The Airport Influence Area QM relies on a remodelled noise contour based on the 50dB Ldn Annual Average Noise Contour which does not follow the 50 dBA Ldn Noise Contour included in the operative District Plan.

- (c) Related to (b) whether a submission by Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)⁶ which proposes an alternative Outer Envelope Contour as the Airport Noise Influence QM is outside of the scope of PC 14.
- (d) Whether submissions seeking changes to the zoning of land which is not zoned as a qualifying residential zone, to MDRS or a qualifying residential zone is outside of the scope of an Intensification Planning Instrument.⁷

[10] In relation to the issue of whether we should hear these matters ahead of the substantive hearing, the Council's position was broadly that there are no scope issues that should be determined ahead of the substantive hearings, because these issues ultimately required consideration of evidence and to the extent there were issues of scope then the IHP could consider these at the substantive hearing.⁸ Ryman Healthcare, the Retirement Villages Association and the Strategic Infrastructure Submitters supported that approach.⁹

[11] Some submitters favoured the consideration of these matters ahead of the substantive hearings, so they could have some clarity as to whether and to what extent they should participate in the substantive hearings, or whether their efforts would be wasted.

Access to Sunlight Qualifying Matter

[12] Mr Townshend submitted it was more efficient to address this discrete legal issue at the outset. He thought the clarification would assist submitters who supported and those who opposed the QM. We heard a range of views, some submitters such as the Christchurch Civic Trust thought preliminary clarity would assist, and others, such as Mrs Broughton, representing the Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board, herself and others felt the issues should be considered in the round.

[13] Although Mr Townshend has raised an issue of interpretation of the Act, which is a legal question, we consider that in all cases, of the eligibility of all qualifying matters the IHP would need to hear submissions on the law and hear the evidence about how the changes proposed in PC 14 respond to the legislative requirements and higher order

⁶ 852 Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)

⁷ Rased by Ms Aston on behalf of submitter 881 Red Spur Ltd

⁸ Paragraphs 13 to 27 Council Memorandum of counsel, 28 July 2023

⁹ Memoranda filed by Chapman Tripp 1 August 2023: 749 Ryman Healthcare Limited and 811 Retirement Villages Associated Limited and Strategic Infrastructure Submitters: 852 Christchurch International Airport, 852 Lyttelton Port Company and 853 Orion New Zealand Limited

planning directions, as a whole before making any determination on the legality of any QM.

[14] As expressed at the pre-hearing meeting we are also concerned about the utility of the IHP making a preliminary finding on a point of law in advance of considering the evidence, when our powers are limited to making recommendations to the Council, we don't make the final decision. Even if we could make a discrete legal finding, we would need to issue a separate preliminary report to the Council, who would then need to consider it and may or may not agree with our recommended interpretation. This is likely to add to the complexity and delay of completing our reporting in accordance with the Act.

[15] At this point we are not minded to set aside separate hearing time before the exchange of evidence to consider the issue raised by Mr Townshend before receiving and hearing the evidence of Council and submitters. We will consider Mr Townshend's legal points at the substantive hearing as part of our wider inquiry.

Airport Noise Influence contour QM

[16] Commissioners McMahon and Matheson disclosed conflicts of interest with regard to the airport related noise matters and recused themselves from considering these matters. The following records the outcomes reached by Commissioners Robinson, Munro and Coutts.

[17] Mr Matheson legal counsel, on behalf of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities initially requested that the IHP consider a preliminary legal argument regarding the use by the Council of the recently updated airport noise contours as the basis of the airport noise-related qualifying matter.¹⁰ He submitted that the Council appeared to be relying on section 77K in its s32 Report which provides for existing qualifying matters, being those which exist under the operative plan. Mr Matheson submitted that, because the data set is new it more properly falls within the requirements of s77I and subject to assessments under 77J and subject to 77L.¹¹

[18] Ms Thomas for Summerset raised a related scope issue, relating to the submission by Christchurch International Airport (CIAL) who are seeking to introduce updated remodelled 50DbA Ldn Air Noise Annual Average or Outer Envelope contours.

¹⁰ The Airport Influence Area QM relies on a remodelled noise contour based on the 50dB Ldn Annual Average Noise Contour which does not follow the 50 dBA Ldn Noise Contour included in the operative District Plan.

¹¹ 834 Memorandum of Kainga Ora, 28 July 2023

Summerset considered the introduction of the new proposed contours to beyond the scope of PC 14.¹² Ms Thomas also made the point that insufficient time was available to consider the implication of this material on Summerset properties.

[19] Following some discussion, Mr Matheson for Kāinga Ora suggested it may assist if the Council could clarify whether they were relying on section 77K or 77J. Mr Carranceja explained the Council would proffer sufficient evidence to meet the more fulsome obligations of 77L regardless. We invited the Council to file a further memorandum by Friday 4 August clarifying its position.

[20] Ms Hawkins for CIAL had not addressed that point in its memorandum. Ms Hawkins indicated that CIAL may wish to file a memorandum following discussion with the Council but did not do so.

[21] Counsel for the Council filed a memorandum on 4 August 2023 explaining the approach it has taken and submitted that:

20. The Council's position remains that no preliminary issue requires determination in respect of the Airport Noise (QM) or otherwise. In short that is because:

- (a) the query initiated by Kāinga Ora regarding whether it is an existing or new qualifying matter comes down to a question of evidence, which can be evaluated by the Panel in due course; and
- (b) while Summerset Group asserts that the relief sought by CIAL is outside scope, the Council considers that:
 - (i) CIAL's submission clearly falls within the ambit of PC14 by addressing the extent to which that instrument changes the pre-existing *status quo*, because CIAL effectively seeks no change to the *status quo* (ie by extending the Airport Noise QM to retain *status quo* development rights within the '2023 Outer Envelope 50dB Ldn contour');
 - (ii) no issue arises as to public participation, in terms of the second limb of the orthodox scope test; and

¹² 433 Memorandum of Summerset Group Holdings Limited, 28 July 2023

- (iii) in any event, issues of scope should not be the subject of preliminary determinations by the Panel, for the reasons given in counsel's memorandum dated 28 July 2023.

[22] Having reviewed the explanations of counsel, and without deciding the issue raised by Mr Matheson for Kāinga Ora we are of the view that the Council should proceed to file evidence that supports a more fulsome evaluation under section 77L as they have indicated, which we will consider along with the evidence of CIAL and other submitters in due course and we will address the scope issue at the substantive hearing of the Airport Noise QM.

[23] For Summerset, we will address issues of scope at the substantive hearing. For the avoidance of doubt, while we are encouraging submitters to make one presentation, a submitter is welcome to choose to attend additional hearing sessions as required to address their submission with the caveat that they avoid repetition and where needed simply cross reference evidence called at earlier hearing sessions.

Rezoning

[24] Cashmere Park Limited, Hartward Investment Trust, and Robert Brown sought a preliminary determination on whether their request to rezone land from the operative Residential New Neighbourhood and Rural Urban Fringe Zone to Medium Density Residential was within the scope of the plan change.

[25] Ms Aston for Red Spur Limited sought a similar early determination of a requested rezoning in relation to a property in the Rural Hills (Redmund Spur) Precinct. Several representatives and submitters in attendance indicated that submissions raised matters of rezoning.

[26] We asked the Council to clarify its position in relation to the rezoning requests. We understand this will be addressed in the s42A Report which are due today. Once this is available the submitter can reflect on their position and advise whether there is an issue we should consider. It is noted that if rezonings are on the table and scope is not disputed then this requires hearing time. We will update the schedule in to provide for these issues within the Residential part of hearings.

Responses to draft hearing schedule

- [27] Council and a number of submitters sought clarification on the due date of legal submissions and their length. We confirmed legal submissions are due five working days before the party is scheduled to appear at the hearing. We confirmed that the Council is not limited to 10 pages, but all other parties should use this as a guide and keep the submissions concise and not repeat the evidence they are to call.
- [28] Kāinga Ora and Strategic Infrastructure Submitters requested refinements to the hearing schedule to provide for a staged evidence exchange. This was suggested due to resourcing challenges as the many expert witnesses are involved in multiple hearing processes, and further it was suggested this might assist the IHP by allowing witnesses to refine their evidence as earlier stages proceeded.
- [29] We have previously indicated our desire to hold to one exchange date (Minute 3) in response to earlier requests. We see this as being more efficient as the IHP and all parties will have all evidence at the same time and it will assist submitters being able to attend one hearing session, rather than attending on multiple occasions. Some submitters were concerned about the split and the potential that evidence may come in after their hearing that affects their position.
- [30] We expressed the view that there were a range of submitters, and whilst corporate submitters experienced resourcing challenges, a large number of submitters were not being paid to attend and multiple appearances created difficulties for them. We remain of the view that the process we have designed endeavours to be fair and creates an even playing field, with all parties having access to the same information before they prepare their evidence, and therefore have equal opportunity to put their best foot forward.
- [31] The approach suggested by Kāinga Ora and the Strategic Infrastructure Submitters would mean that we may not have all relevant evidence before us before we start hearings. While we have divided the hearing structure into topic groups for time management purposes, it is still one hearing on PC 14 and it is likely we will have many areas of overlap. If we stage the exchange of evidence whilst we are in the midst of hearings that later evidence could have assisted our understanding of an earlier topic. Accordingly, the IHP reconfirms the scheduled dates for the filing of evidence being: s42A reports and Council evidence in chief on 11 August 2023, and submitters and further submitter expert evidence in chief on 15 September 2023.

[32] Related to this issue is the request by Kāinga Ora, and supported by Council and others for the provision of rebuttal evidence. We had deliberately not provided for that step in the process, because it can become a repetitive and potentially an adversarial exercise unless carefully managed, generating quantities of further material that does not always add to our understanding of the issues. We have made directions regarding expert conferencing as another tool to refine issues for the hearing, and provided the opportunity for witnesses to advise of any changed opinions when they gave their evidence in chief.

[33] Mr Matheson for Kāinga Ora made a case that there was a fairness issue at play and that there was a risk that submitters may not hear those changes if they were left to be made on the day. To that extent we do see that rebuttal can add a degree of transparency in what is a complex process.

[34] We agree that there may in limited circumstances be a place for rebuttal, but they are rare. We refer to clause 8.4 of the Environment Court Practice Note 2023¹³, which states:

8.4. Rebuttal evidence

(a) Rebuttal evidence may only be called in response to evidence that could not reasonably have been anticipated. That may include:

- i. addressing a matter which could not reasonably have been foreseen before the witness was called or exchanged their statement of evidence; or*
- ii. where a party or witness is otherwise taken by surprise.*

(b) Rebuttal evidence must be strictly limited to statements addressing the evidence-in-chief sought to be rebutted and must not repeat evidence already presented or introduce any new matter.

(c) The admission of rebuttal evidence is a matter for the Court's discretion, to be exercised in the interests of fairness to the parties and ensuring that the Court is as fully informed about relevant matters as is reasonably practicable.

[35] Accordingly, we agree to amend the hearing procedures to include a similar requirement and will require parties wishing to call rebuttal evidence to make an application for leave

¹³ <https://environmentcourt.govt.nz/assets/Practice-Note-2023-.pdf>

to do so from the IHP, and our discretion will be exercised in accordance with the Environment Court Practice Note. We will set the date for leave applications to be made by 29 September 2023, and if granted (applications will be considered and determined by 5pm on 2 October). If leave is granted rebuttal evidence to be filed by midday 9 October 2023. The amended hearing procedures will be available and published on the IHP website¹⁴ by Tuesday 15 August 2023. The updated hearing topics schedule will be available by Friday 18 August 2023.

[36] We note that whilst not discussed at the pre-hearing the memorandum from Chapman Tripp on behalf of the Strategic Infrastructure submitters has suggested that it would assist if the Council were to prepare a proposed list and schedule of expert witness conferencing. We agree, and have asked the IHP Director to request that list from the Council so it can be circulated by 31 August 2023.

Section 42A Reports and Council submissions on PC 14

[37] We indicated in the draft hearing procedures at paragraph 30 that we did not want the Council s42A report writers to evaluate or provide recommendations on the Council's own submissions. Our view was that the Council should provide separate expert assessment on the merits of those submissions.

[38] Our concern is that Council staff were providing their reports as expert witnesses and that there was a risk to their independence if they were the author of the submissions of Council.

[39] Mr Carranceja explained in his memorandum that the approach to submissions by Council was a pragmatic approach to addressing some errors and omissions in the plan change and s42A reports. He said these changes were more of a technical nature.

[40] When asked if the changes were neutral or substantive Mr Carranceja said that some were more substantial and may affect other submitters.

[41] We asked for some clarity on these, and were told the issue is understood by Council and they are to be addressed in the s42A reports.

[42] Having considered the explanation, and stated our concerns about dual roles, we will leave the decision as to how Council presents its case to the counsel for the Council

¹⁴ [IHP website: chch2023.ihp.govt.nz](http://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz)

and remove the direction from the procedures as requested in the Council's memorandum of 28 July 2023.

Other issues

Relationship between Plan Change 13 and Plan Change 14.

[43] Mr Carranceja provide an explanation as to the overlap between PC 13 and 14. As we understand it the Council has duplicated some parts of PC 13 which apply within the qualifying residential zones into PC14 to support the application of the Residential Character and Heritage QM's. Whether or not those particular matters are eligible as QMs may be influenced by the outcome of a High Court appeal decision on a recent Environment Court declaration¹⁵, which addressed the scope of Intensification Planning Instruments and related provisions. Until such time as that issue is resolved the Council wishes to pursue both plan changes.

[44] Our concern is to ensure that submitters on PC 13, who have made submissions on matters within the scope of PC 14 have an opportunity to be heard in our process. even if they have not referenced PC 14. There is a high probability that members of the public concerned about the positive or negative effect of the IPI on heritage may have been confused by the overlap. The Council has assured us that all affected submitters have been included in the list of submitters and further submitters on PC 14. We wish to make it clear that we have not been delegated the power to hear submissions or make recommendations on PC 13.

[45] We have requested the Council explain the overlap clearly in their s42A Report.

[46] We have considered Robert Manthei's memorandum¹⁶ and record that the broader issues raised may best be directed to the Minister for the Environment given our functions.

[47] The issues raised in the memorandum of Victoria Neighbourhood Association¹⁷, if material to the merits of PC 14 can be raised by them in their presentation at the substantive hearing.

¹⁵ *Waikanae Land Company v Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga* [2023] NZEnvC 056 (Waikanae)

¹⁶ 200 Robert Manthei, Memorandum filed for Pre-Hearing Meeting, 16 July 2023

¹⁷ 61 Victoria Neighbourhood Association, Memorandum, 30 July 2023

[48] Several submitters in attendance asked questions relating to or seeking clarification of matters within the hearing procedures or discussed during the meeting. If submitters require further assistance they may wish to seek guidance from the Friend of Submitter.

[49] The IHP Secretariat will seek information from submitters on the hearing topic they wish to attend and the number of witnesses they will call to assist with the completion of the hearing schedule.

Strategic and Mechanics of PC 14

[50] On behalf of the Panel, at the hearing Commissioner McMahon set out a range of 'strategic' and 'mechanics of how PC 14 works' information matters that he requested Council provide and speak to at the commencement of the hearing in order that all parties have a common bundle of information that can be readily referenced (and potentially added to). Council confirmed that an information bundle will be made available.

[51] To assist with this, attached to this Minute in Appendix 3, is a brief summary of Commissioner McMahon's request. To be clear, this information being requested in Appendix 3 falls squarely into the category of factual and non-evaluative information.

Dated 11 August 2023



Cindy Robinson

Chair

for Independent Hearings Panel

Appendix 1

Documents filed for the pre-hearing meeting:

Memorandum of Counsel for Christchurch City Council:

- 28 July 2023 sa
- 1 August 2023

Documents filed by Submitters:

Submitter	Submitter Number
Robert Manthei	200
Summerset Group	433
Cashmere Park Ltd, Hartward Investment Trust and Robert Brown	593
David Townshend	599
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	834
Ministry of Justice	910
Cambridge 137 Limited	1092
Victoria Neighbourhood Association	61
Ryman Healthcare	749
Retirement Villages Association	811
Various submitters represented by Chapman Tripp: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Carter Group Limited• The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch• Church Property Trustees• Daresbury Limited• LMM Investments 2012 Limited• Malcolm Hollis• Ross Clarke• Crichton Development Group Limited	814 and 824 823 825 874 826 FS 2040 691 850
Strategic Infrastructure Submitters Christchurch: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• International Airport Limited (submitter 852)• Lyttelton Port Company Limited (submitter 853)• Orion New Zealand Limited (submitter 854)	852 853 854

Documents filed post pre-hearing meeting:

Submitter Name	Submitter Number
David Townshend - email: Pre-hearing Application – 1 and 2 August	599

Memorandum of Counsel for Christchurch City Council – 4 August 2023

Appendix 2

Submitters and their representatives who attended the pre-hearing meeting:

Submission Number	Submitter Name	On Behalf Of	RSVP Attendees recorded
39	Dr Lynette Hardie Wills	Ilam and Upper Riccarton Residents' Association, Inc.,	Dr Lynette Hardie Wills and Helen Broughton
53	Simon Watts	Brighton Observatory of Environment and Economics	Simon Watts
61	Geoffrey Banks	Victoria Neighbourhood Association (VNA)	Geoff Banks, Chair and Rae James
87	David East		David East
91	David Mountfort	The Glenara Family Trust	David Mountford
151	Defyd Williams	Papanui Heritage Group	Defyd Williams, Chair
161	Marilyn Goulter		Marilyn Goulter
184	Kelly Bombay	University of Canterbury	Kelly Bombay
200	Robert J Manthei		represented by Rae James and Geoff Banks
209	Lauren Roberts		Lauren Roberts
243	Ella Shields	Ravensdown Limited	Ella Shields and Jayne Whyte
259	Andrea Millar	Ara Poutama Aotearoa	Monique Thomas
278	Francine Bills		Francine Bills
328	Bruce Taylor		Bruce Taylor
376	Colin Gregg		Andrew Schulte (Cavell Leitch)
380	Karina Hay	South Shore Resident's Association (SSRA)	Karina Hay
381	Kate Gregg		Andrew Schulte (Cavell Leitch)
388	Sally Elford	M.I.I.G Limited	Sally Elford
443	Christine Hetherington	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Monique Thomas (Greenwood Roche) and Christine Hetherington or Stephanie Styles (Boffa Miskell)
502	Kyri Kotzikas		Andrew Schulte
593	Holly Luzak	Cashmere Park Ltd, Hartward Investment Trust and Robert Brown	Bryan McGillan, Holly Luzak and Samantha Gardner (Elliot Sinclair), Sarah Everleigh
599	David Townshend		David Townshend
665	Lawrence & Denise May		Andrew Schulte (Cavell Leitch)
681	Andrew McCarthy		Andrew McCarthy
685	Glenn Murdoch	Canterbury / Westland Branch of Architectural Designers NZ	Glenn Murdoch, Regional Chair Canterbury/Westland
689	Jeff Smith	Environment Canterbury / Canterbury Regional Council	Jeff Smith and Meg Buddle, and Lucy Delatour (Wynn Williams)
691	Ross Clarke		Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
695	Amy Beran	Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) Rūnanga	Andrew Scott, General Manager and Amy Beran
698	Ann-Mary & Andrew Benton		Andrew Schulte (Cavell Leitch)
705	Alex Booker	Foodstuffs	Samantha Gardner (Anderson Lloyd)
706	Sam Kealey	NHL Properties Limited	Anita Collie (Town Planning)
716	Anita Collie	Wigram Lodge (2001) Limited	Anita Collie (Town Planning)
723	Juliette Lovett	Brooksfield Limited	Anita Collie (Town Planning)

Submission Number	Submitter Name	On Behalf Of	RSVP Attendees recorded
729	Andrew Mactier	Independent Producers Limited	Andrew Mactier, Senior Planner Davie Lovell-Smith
740	Matt Bonis	Woolworths	Matt Bonis
749	Luke Hinchey	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
760	Adele Radburn	ChristchurchNZ	Adele Radburn
809	Anita Collie	Scenic Hotel Group Limited	Anita Collie (Town Planning)
810	Anita Collie	Regulus Property Investments Limited	Anita Collie (Town Planning)
811	Luke Hinchey	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
814	Jo Appleyard	Carter Group Limited	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
817	Elizabeth Harris		Anita Collie (Town Planning)
821	Anita Collie	Athena Enterprises Limited and Josephine Enterprises Limited	Anita Collie (Town Planning)
823	Jo Appleyard	The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
824	Jo Appleyard	Carter Group Limited	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
825	Jo Appleyard	Church Property Trustess	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
826	Jo Appleyard	LMM Investments 2012 Limited	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
827	Anita Collie	MGZ Investments Limited	Anita Collie (Town Planning)
834	Brendon Liggett	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	Bal Matheson, Josh Neville, Brendan Liggett, Nardia Yosen
848	Richard Peebles	Peebles Group Limited	Jeremy Phillips (Novo Group)
850	Hamish Wright	Crichton Development Group Limited	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
851	Robert Leonard Broughton		Bob Broughton
852	Jo Appleyard	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
853	Jo Appleyard	Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
854	Jo Appleyard	Orion New Zealand Limited (Orion)	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
867	Robina Dobbie		Robina Dobbie

Submission Number	Submitter Name	On Behalf Of	RSVP Attendees recorded
874	Laura Stewart	Daresbury Ltd	Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee, Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
881	Fiona Aston	Red Spur Ltd	Fiona Aston
883	Fiona Aston	Miles Premises Ltd	Fiona Aston and Sarah Eveleigh
884	Fiona Aston	Troy Lange	Fiona Aston
886	Helen Broughton		Helen Broughton
902	Faye Collins	Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board	Helen Broughton, Chair
903	Patricia Harte	Danne Mora Limited	Andrew Mactier (Davie Lovell-Smith)
904	Jeremy Phillips	880 Main North Road Limited	Jeremy Phillips (Novo Group)
908	Ross Gray	Christchurch Civic Trust	Ross Gray, Chair, Hamish Gilchrist Deputy Chair, Anne Dingwall and Professor Chris Kissling
910	Fiona Small	Ministry of Justice	Shane Scott and Lucy de Latour (Wynn Williams)
918	Geoff Banks		Geoff Banks
1050	Defyd Williams	Papanui Heritage Group	Defyd Williams, Chair
1055	Anita Collie	The Rannerdale Trust	Anita Collie (Town Planning)
1056	Anita Collie	Mitre Hotel Holdings Limited	Anita Collie (Town Planning)
1062	Alice Burnett	Hughes Developments Limited	Andrew Mactier (Davie Lovell-Smith)
1071	Richard Peebles	Peebles Group Limited	Jeremy Phillips (Novo Group)
1089	Ross Gray	Christchurch Civic Trust	Ross Gray, Chair, Hamish Gilchrist Deputy Chair, Anne Dingwall and Professor Chris Kissling
1090	Faye Collins	Waipuna Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board	Helen Broughton, Chair
1092	Wynn Williams	Cambridge 137 Limited	Lucy de Latour (Wynn Williams)
2077	Anita Collie	Christchurch Casinos Limited	Anita Collie (Town Planning)
FS 2015	Susan Wall		Susan Wall
FS 2040	Malcolm Hollis		Annabel Hawkins, Lucy Forrester, Annabelle Lee and Ben Williams (Chapman Tripp)
FS 2059	Jeremy Phillips	Kauri Lodge Rest Home 2008 Limited	Jeremy Phillips (Novo Group)
FS 2072	Duncan McApline	Yaldhurst Rural Residents Association Incorporated (YRRA)	Helen Broughton
FS 2089	Fiona Aston	Four Star Development Ltd and Gould Developments Ltd	Fiona Aston
	Jane West	Friend of the Submitter	Jane West, Friend of the Submitter
COUNCIL	As proponent	Christchurch City Council	Cedric Carranceja, David Randall (Buddle Findlay), Mark Stevenson and Sarah Oliver
		Christchurch City Council	John Higgins and Sian Daly

Appendix 3

Strategic and Mechanics of PC 14

A. Capacity

- [1] Presentation of business and housing supply and demand figures for the short, medium and long term scenarios required by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) (raw numbers and percentages). In particular:
- (a) For business and housing demand, please outline the different NZ Statistics growth scenarios and the scenario(s) adopted by the Council;
 - (b) For supply, please distinguish between the spectrum of supply scenarios ranging from theoretical capacity to realistic/feasible capacity; and
 - (c) Please reference the source (page references) of the above information in the Council evidence/s42A and s32 reports and associated documents (e.g. report from Mr Osborne and most recent Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment report for Christchurch).

B. Spatial extent and boundaries of Centres and Intensified Residential Zones

- [2] How have the various **centres** proposed in PC 14 been derived having regard to Policy 3(a) and 3(b) of the NPS-UD: In particular:
- (a) What were the equivalent commercial zones in the operative district plan (ODP); and
 - (b) Using those originating commercial zones as the starting point, what have those zones been proposed as in PC 14 and what is the split between the total area of the relevant zones to the various new centres zones in terms of both hectareage and percentages.
- [3] How have 'relevant' residential zones been "sliced and diced" in terms of being recategorized to high and medium density zones. In particular:
- (a) What are the 'relevant' zones from the ODP;
 - (b) Using those originating zones as the starting point what have those zones been proposed as in PC 14 and what is the split between the total area of the 'relevant'

zones in the ODP to MDZ and HDZ zones in terms of both hectareage and percentages;

- (c) In general terms, how were the spatial extents (area and boundaries) of the MRZ and HRZ zone determined with reference to Policy 3(c) and 3(d) of the NPS-UD (i.e. what was the methodology of applying “*walkable catchments*” of policy 3(c) and the “*within and adjacent*” in terms of policy 3(d); and
- (d) How were the “*commensurate*” building heights and densities determined with reference to “*the level of commercial activity and community services*” in terms of policy 3(d).

C. Provisions in Centres and Intensified Residential Zones

[4] What are the key provisions of the centres and intensified residential zones (ignoring QMs) in terms of:

- (a) What is the key objective/policy direction/flavour for these business and residential zones;
- (b) What is the ‘enabling’ framework (rules, standards, activity status and default activity status) in the centres and intensified residential zones in terms of:
 - (i) Residential activity in the centres and intensified residential zones;
 - (ii) Height in intensified residential zones; and
 - (iii) Density in centres and intensified residential zones.

D. Qualifying Matters

[5] Identify all qualifying matters (QM).

[6] Using a tabular format, for each QM list them and identify for each QM the following matters:

- (a) How they qualify and how they have been qualified (i.e. reference the legislation as follows for each QM):
 - (i) The approach for **existing**, qualifying matters explicitly listed in s771(a) to (i) or s770(a) to (i) and already contained in the operative District Plan when

the IPI was notified. Identify whether the 'alternative' evaluation process to justify inclusion as a qualifying matter was undertaken as specified in s77K and s77Q, respectively;

- (ii) The approach for **new** qualifying matters explicitly listed in s77I(a) to (i) or s77O(a) to (i), not already contained in the operative District Plan and proposed to be introduced at the time of the notification of the IPI. Identify whether an evaluation process as specified in s77J and s77P has been undertaken; and
 - (iii) The approach for '**other**' qualifying matters as provided for in s77I(j) and s77O(j). Identify whether an evaluation process described in (ii) above applies, together with 'further' requirements specified in s77L and s77R.
- (b) Identify in the relevant s32 report where the above evaluations have been undertaken:
- (c) What effect does each QM have on density and height (explain how it operates) i.e.
- (i) Are they plan making (i.e. effectively changing zoning);
 - (ii) Resource consent focused (i.e. overlay or precinct);
 - (iii) How they are affected by QM (i.e. how do the provisions in the overlays control height and density); and
 - (iv) (to the extent possible), provide a factual presentation of the effect of each QM on capacity (possibly in terms of dwelling numbers).

E. Plan Change 14 Mechanics

- [7] A 'road map' of how the provisions in PC 14 work across the whole of the district plan.