

**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

---

**ADDENDUM TO PART 3 OF RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT IN RELATION TO WIND  
ASSESSMENTS FOR TCZ, NORTH HALSWELL, BELFAST/NORTHWOOD AND  
SYDENHAM CATCHMENTS**

---

## Introduction

- [1] This addendum to Part 3 of the Recommendations Report is issued by the Independent Hearings Panel (the Panel) established by the Christchurch City Council (the Council) to conduct the hearing of submissions on proposed Plan Change 14 Housing and Business Choice (PC 14) notified by the Council and to make recommendations to the Council, after the hearing of submissions is concluded, pursuant to Part 5, subpart 5A and Part 6 of Schedule 1, of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).
- [2] The purpose of this addendum is to correct and clarify parts of the Recommendations Report in response to matters of clarification requested by the Council in accordance with RMA Schedule 1, clause 101(4)(c) as set out in the Memorandum of Counsel filed on 8 August 2024 (the Council's Memorandum).<sup>1</sup>
- [3] The Council's requests are detailed in a table attached to the Council's Memorandum. The Panel has separately responded to matters of clarification in its Minute 51 and in further addenda to Part 4 and Part 5 of the Recommendations Report. This addendum relates only to requests **18. Wind, 19. North Halswell Catchment, 26. Belfast/Northwood Catchment and 28. Sydenham Catchment.**
- [4] Corrections to the paragraphs identified below are deletions shown as ~~strike through~~ and additions underlined.

## Wind Assessments

- [5] The Council has identified that the Panel's Recommendation is silent on the issue of whether there should be a wind assessment for commercial buildings within Riccarton, Hornby, and Papanui TCZs above 22m. In requesting the clarification, the Council has referred to the evidence of Ms Blair<sup>2</sup> where she recommended a new sub-chapter specifically dealing with wind effects in the MRZ, HRZ, TCZ and LCZ zones.
- [6] The Panel does not recommend that a wind assessment be required in the TCZ for commercial buildings in Riccarton, Hornby and Papanui above 22m.
- [7] To assist the Council in its decision making, the Panel clarifies the reasons why the Panel was silent on the issue. In the context of Part 3 of our Recommendations Report, neither Mr Lightbody who was the evaluative planning witness for the Council in relation

---

<sup>1</sup> [Memorandum of Counsel for Christchurch City Council - Regarding further clarifications, 8 August 2024](#)

<sup>2</sup> [Statement of Evidence of Hermione Blair, 11 August 2023](#)

to commercial zones and the associated provisions outside of the CCZ, nor Ms Williams the urban design witness who supported the increase in height to 32m for the larger Town Centres, recommended any wind related rule or standard in their s42A Reports. Ms Blair was a witness who provided evidence principally in relation to the workability of provisions in residential zones, and her statement does not address the application of wind rules to commercial zones. The fact that her proposed new Chapter 6.13 Wind<sup>3</sup> could apply to a commercial zone, is not a substitute for a s32, or s32AA evaluation. Ms Gardiner, answered questions from the Panel on the topic of wind, but did not have any definitive views on the appropriate approach outside the CCZ.<sup>4</sup> The Council's Memorandum of 11 April 2024, provided further notes from Council witnesses in response to Panel questions.<sup>5</sup>

- [8] Further the Panel notes that the bundle of provisions included with the Council's Reply did not include a version of Chapter 6.13. The technical evidence of Mr Green,<sup>6</sup> which formed part of the Council's Residential Part 3 of the Section 32 Report, and presented at the hearing did not address wind effects in commercial zones other than the CCZ. A review of the video transcript confirms that when asked by the Panel about the application of his recommendations to other commercial zones Mr Green did not know whether his assessment technical report of June 2022 (referenced in footnote 1 to his primary evidence) assessed other commercial zones.<sup>7</sup>

## **North Halswell**

- [9] The Council has asked if the Panel could clarify what the NPS-UD Policy 3 catchment around the North Halswell Centre is.
- [10] The Panel clarifies that the commensurate catchment is the adjacent MRZ zone, which in this case is the MRZ that applies within the outline development plan for North Halswell, as shown in Appendix 8.10.4. On review of our Part 3 Recommendations Report we have identified that there are two typographical errors in paragraph [305] and we take the opportunity to make the correction to improve the clarity of our Recommendations. The references to ODP should be 'outline development plan' shown in Appendix 8.10.4, and the correction is shown below:

---

<sup>3</sup> [Statement of Evidence of Hermione Blair, 11 August 2023](#) at Appendix C

<sup>4</sup> Hearing 31 October 2023, Session 1 Morning.

<sup>5</sup> [Memorandum of Counsel for Christchurch-City-Council - Information requests, 11 April 2024](#) at Appendix B

<sup>6</sup> [Statement of Evidence of Mike Green, 11 August 2023](#)

<sup>7</sup> In answer to questions from the Panel in during the hearing on 25 October 2023, Morning Session 1

[305] For North Halswell Town Centre we recommend that the submission from Danne Mora Limited and Milns Park Limited is accepted in part, and that incorporation of MDRS into the residential areas of the ~~ODP~~ Outline Development Plan 8.10.4, and to the extent the ~~ODP~~ Outline Development Plan 8.10.4 enables greater height and density of urban form than the MDRS, that they be retained and are commensurate for the role and function of that centre for the reasons set out in Part 7 of the Report.

### **Belfast/Northwood**

[11] The Council has identified that there is a conflict in the Panel's Recommendation in Part 3 of the Report at [304](c) and Part 7 (page 44) where on the one hand the Panel has recorded that it accepted the Council's notified zoning which is shown as MRZ with the Local Centre Intensification Precinct (LCIP) applying within a 400m catchment but then at Page 44 of Part 7 the Panel recommends that a site adjacent to the Town Centre be zoned HRZ. Part 3 of the Panel's Report recommends that the LCIP be deleted. The Council has sought clarification as to whether the Panel intends that the LCIP retained, or the MRZ only applies or if the HRZ apply.

[12] The Panel confirms that the HRZ applies to the same area that was subject to the LCIP and provides for the same enabled height of 14m as notified and recommended by the Council s42A Report of Mr Klyenbos.<sup>8</sup>

[13] Accordingly the Panel amends paragraph [304](c) of Part 4 of its report as follows:

[304](c) Belfast/Northwood, the commensurate catchment is appropriately represented by the ~~zones~~ area identified as the Local Centre Intensification Precinct (LCIP) as shown on PC 14 notified Planning Maps except that the LCIP is to be removed and replaced with HRZ in that same area.

### **North and South Sydenham**

[14] The Panel confirms the catchment for the Sydenham North LCZ catchment as that described in paragraph [306](c), however we wish to make corrections to the street names which contain typographical errors:

---

<sup>8</sup> [s42A Report of Ike Kleybos, 11 August 2023](#) at 6.1.100

[306](c) For Sydenham, 400m measured from the intersection of Colombo Street and Wordsworth Street. The catchment extends north to Carlyle Street, to Gasson Street, ~~Burleigh~~ Burlington Street, to Johnsons Street and to Orbell Street and back to the Railway corridor. For clarity we note there is also a small pocket of HRZ in the vicinity of Fairfield and Disraeli Street, which we find that the MRZ is more appropriate as it is outside of our identified catchment.

[15] The Panel also draws the Council's attention to paragraph [308] which further describes the overlapping nature of the Sydenham South NCZ, and reconfirms that for NCZ, the commensurate response is the adjacent MRZ zone, not just adjacent sites. Due to the overlap of the Sydenham North and South centres the Panel has taken a more liberal approach to defining the LCZ catchment in [306](c). No additional HRZ has been recommended beyond that described in [306](c) and [308].

### **Neighbourhood Centre Zones**

[16] In relation to NCZ the Panel confirms its approach in [309] not to identify a geographical catchment. By way of further clarification, we found the MRZ zone itself to be the commensurate response adjacent to those centres. The varying scale of neighbourhood centres did not lend themselves to the identification of a sub geographical catchment within the adjacent residential zones, so we found that the MRZ zone itself, is the commensurate response.

[17] The clarifications and corrections are to be read as part of and supplementary to the original Part 3 Recommendations Report.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> [IHP Recommendations Report - Part 3 - 29 July 2024](#)



Cindy Robinson – Chair



David McMahon – Deputy Chair



Karen Coutts



Alan Matheson



Ian Munro

15 August 2024