

APPENDIX H – Table 1: PC14 Rezoning Requests Accept and Reject Table Response to IHP Request #34 - IHP RECOMMENDATIONS

This Appendix Table is based on the Reply by the Christchurch City Council to matters arising during the hearing of submissions on proposed plan change 14, 17 May 2024 - Attachment 4: Zoning Requests Accept/Reject tables reflecting the Council Reporting Officers' final recommendations: *Table 1 Response to request #34 – Table of Council's position on rezoning requests by submitters*

This table includes the Independent Hearing Panel (the Panel) recommendations on the zoning requests and should be read in conjunction with Part 7 of the IHP Recommendations Report.

Response to request #34 – Table of Council's **position on rezoning requests by submitters**

The following provides an overview of all zoning requests made via submissions on PC14, but does not include requests to change a residential zone to a different residential zone. The latter is addressed in the s42A report of Mr Kleynbos and not otherwise repeated here. Zoning requests have been categorised under the following headings:

- Non-residential to non-residential requests:
 - This includes zone requests, for example, to change a proposed Mixed Use Zone to City Centre Zone, or Specific Purpose (School) Zone to Industrial General Zone.
- Non-residential to residential requests:
 - This includes zone requests, for example, to change a operative Specific Purpose (School) Zone to High Density Residential Zone or any other residential zone.
- Residential to non-residential requests:
 - This includes zone requests, for example, to change a Medium Density Residential Zone to a Local Centre Zone.

These requests can be found on the following pages:

NON-RESIDENTIAL TO NON-RESIDENTIAL REQUESTS.....	2
NON-RESIDENTIAL TO RESIDENTIAL REQUESTS.....	31
RESIDENTIAL TO NON-RESIDENTIAL REQUESTS.....	68

Footnote references from Council Reply included: Authors of merit recommendations are specified within the recommendations themselves, or footnoted with references to relevant section 42A reports.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

NON-RESIDENTIAL TO NON-RESIDENTIAL REQUESTS

(including commercial to a different commercial)

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
<p>Foodstuffs – 705 (Pak n' Save Papanui)</p> <p>S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>171 Main North Road</p> <p>Planning Map 24</p>	<p>Operative – Commercial Local Zone, Industrial General Zone</p> <p>Notified – Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Industrial General Zone</p> <p>Requested – Local Centre Zone</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of this land, just a renaming of the zone to match the National Planning Standards. Not an "extension of a zoning change" per Motor Machinists.</p>	<p>Accept – Foodstuffs has sought the site of the proposed Pak n' Save Papanui is rezoned from Medium Density Residential, Industrial General Zone and Neighbourhood Centre Zone to a Local Centre Zone. Those parts of the site zoned Industrial General and Neighbourhood Centre are within a walking catchment of the Papanui Large Town Centre. The Industrial General Zone permits unlimited height, except within 20m of a residential zone unlike the Local Centre zone which permits buildings up to 14m in height. Resource consent for a supermarket has been issued and is currently being implemented at 171 Main North Road. While there is a change in use of the site, the change in zoning sought to Local Centre opens up the ability for development and use of the site for a range of activities. In doing so, there is a need to consider the effects of the change on centres in the immediate surrounds, noting the short distance to the Papanui Key Activity Centre and Cranford Retail Park on Cranford Street.</p> <p>Objective 15.2.2 anticipates commercial activity being focussed in centres in a way and at a rate that supports the function of Town Centres as a major focal point (clause (ii)), gives primacy to Key Activity Centres (clause (iv)) and that is consistent with the role of each centre as defined in Policy 15.2.2.1 (Clause v). This gives effect to the CRPS. Mr Heath has confirmed that no distributional effects would arise in relation to the Papanui KAC, or significant adverse effects on the function and vitality of other Local Centres, therefore I am satisfied the</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject on the basis of scope as set out in Part 1 of the Report.</p> <p>The submitters request is not related to the implementation of NPS-UD Policy 3(d) or MDRS.</p> <p>The submission is not an extension of zoning per <i>Motor Machinists</i> and may raise natural justice issues.</p>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				rezoning request has merit and can be accepted. ^{1 2}		
690 - Redwood Gardens Holding Limited S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	567 Wairakei Road, Harewood Planning Map 23	Operative – Industrial General Zone Notified – Industrial General Zone Requested – Commercial Zone	Reject – PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of this land. Not an "extension of a zoning change" per Motor Machinists. Furthermore, the land is not within a Policy 3 NPS-UD catchment.	Reject – The key outcomes sought in the CDP (Objective 15.2.2), and CRPS (Objective 6.2.6(3)) are that commercial activity is to be focused within centres, and any expansion of commercial activity outside centres is to not give rise to significant adverse distributional and urban form effects (Objective 3.3.10). The potential commercial distributional effects arising from the rezoning of the sites to commercial are not included in the submission. The site is surrounded by industrial zoned sites and the rezoning of the site would effectively create a new commercial centre that may impact on other centres and there is no evidence to justify in the context of the framework established in the District Plan. While the site has commercial activities and buildings on it and there is a mix of activities in the industrial zone, the recognition of existing commercial activities by way of spot-zoning is not considered appropriate as it would result in an incoherent pattern of zoning, reducing certainty of where activities are anticipated and presenting a risk of reverse sensitivity effects for existing industrial uses in the area, noting the car repair businesses nearby. It would also be inconsistent with the objective for commercial activities to be focused in centres. It is my opinion based on the information provided and how that information aligns with the objectives	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.

¹ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 157-162 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

² Summary Statement of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 4 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Summary-Statement-Commercial-Hierarchy-Hearing-24-October-2023.pdf>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				and policies of the CDP and CRPS that rezoning the sites commercial would not be the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives and policies of the CDP and CRPS. ³		
821 - Athena Enterprises Limited and Josephine Enterprises Limited S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	9, 9A and 9B Sheffield Crescent, Harewood Planning Map 23	Operative – Industrial General Zone Notified – Industrial General Zone Requested – Commercial Zone	Reject – PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of this land. Not an "extension of a zoning change" per Motor Machinists. Furthermore, the land is not within a Policy 3 NPS-UD catchment.	Reject – The key outcomes sought by the CDP (Objective 15.2.2), and CRPS (Objective 6.2.6(3)) are that commercial activity is to be focused within centres, and any expansion of commercial activity outside centres is to not give rise to significant adverse distributional and urban form effects (Objective 3.3.10). The potential commercial distributional effects arising from the rezoning of the sites to commercial are not included in the submission. The site is surrounded by industrial zoned sites and the rezoning of the site would effectively create a new commercial centre that may impact on other centres and there is no evidence to justify in the context of the framework established in the District Plan. While the site has commercial activities and buildings on it, the recognition of existing commercial activities by way of spot-zoning is not considered appropriate as it would result in an incoherent pattern of zoning, reducing certainty of where activities are anticipated and presenting a risk of reverse sensitivity effects for existing industrial uses in the area, noting the car repair businesses nearby. It would also be inconsistent with the objective for commercial activities to be focused in centres. It is my opinion based on the information provided and how that information aligns with the objectives and policies of the CDP and CRPS that rezoning the sites to be commercial would not be the	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.

³ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 134 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				most appropriate way to achieve the objectives and policies of the CDP and CRPS. ⁴		
848 - Peebles Group Limited S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	468-470 Cranford Street, Redwood Planning Map 24	Operative - Rural Urban Fringe Zone Notified – Rural Urban Fringe Zone Requested – Local Centre Zone	Reject – PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of this land. Not an "extension of a zoning change" per Motor Machinists. Furthermore, the land is not within a Policy 3 NPS-UD catchment.	Reject – The key outcomes sought in the CDP (Objective 15.2.2), and CRPS (Objective 6.2.6(3)) are that commercial activity is to be focused within centres, and any expansion of commercial activity outside centres is to not give rise to significant adverse distributional and urban form effects (Objective 3.3.10). Policy 15.2.2.4 provides policy direction in the consideration of proposals for the outward expansion of a centre and can assist in determining the appropriateness of the expansion sought. Policy 15.2.2.4 reinforces objective 15.2.2 by seeking to ensure an expanded centre remains commensurate with a centre's role while not having significant adverse effects including distributional effects. The potential commercial distribution effects arising from the rezoning of the sites to commercial are not included in the submission. Policy 15.2.2.4 also requires consideration of whether the proposal is integrated with the provision of infrastructure, that adverse effects are managed at the interface with adjoining zones and the centre is coherent in its form. These matters have not been addressed by the submitter. Any expansion is also to be response to growth in the surrounding catchment. Intensification of the existing residential zoned land in the immediate surrounds is enabled by the proposed rezoning of land to High Density Residential and Medium Density Residential, particularly to the north west and west. However, the High Density Residential zoning	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.

⁴ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 135 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>proposed is a response to Policy 3 of the NPS UD and enables intensification around the Papanui Key Activity Centre. The expansion of this centre in close proximity to Northlands Mall may give rise to adverse effects on the function of the KAC. The submitter may provide economic evidence regarding this issue. It is my opinion based on the provided information and how that information aligns with the objectives and policies of the CDP and CRPS that rezoning the sites commercial would not be the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives and policies of the CDP and CRPS.⁵</p>		
<p>849 - Entropy MMX Limited</p> <p>S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>142-144 Winters Road, Mairehau</p> <p>Planning Map 25</p>	<p>Operative - Rural Urban Fringe Zone</p> <p>Notified – Rural Urban Fringe Zone</p> <p>Requested – Industrial or Residential zones</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of this land. Not an "extension of a zoning change" per Motor Machinists.</p> <p>Furthermore, the land is not within a Policy 3 NPS-UD catchment.</p>	<p>Reject – there is not a demonstrated shortfall in the capacity for industrial activities and Council's most recent Business Capacity Assessment prepared under the NPS UD shows there is a significant over-supply of industrial land at a city-wide level. While this is at a macro-level, there is not any evidence at a local level provided by the applicant. In terms of location, the site benefits from close proximity to the strategic road network. While the immediately surrounding land is zoned rural, it is noted that there are residential properties on Winters Road including the eastern end where access is available to the state highway. The rezoning of the subject land to industrial could give rise to effects on amenity associated with heavy vehicle movements. The suitability of the road network to accommodate heavy vehicles would also need to be assessed to be satisfied that the proposed rezoning is appropriate (amongst other technical assessments). Having regard to the information provided in the</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.</p> <p>No evidence was provided in support of the submission.</p>

⁵ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 137 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				submission, I do not consider the rezoning appropriate for the reasons described above. ⁶		
883 - Miles Premises Ltd S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	400 [Russley Road], 475 Memorial Avenue and 500, 520 and 540 Avonhead Road Planning Map 23	Operative - Industrial Park Zone Notified – Industrial Park Zone Requested – Commercial or Residential zones	Reject – PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of this land. Not an "extension of a zoning change" per Motor Machinists. Furthermore, the land is not within a Policy 3 NPS-UD catchment.	Reject – I consider here the appropriateness of the rezoning to commercial. The key outcomes sought in the CDP (Objective 15.2.2), and CRPS (Objective 6.2.6(3)) that commercial activity is to be focused within centres, and any expansion of commercial activity outside centres is to not give rise to significant adverse distributional and urban form effects (Objective 3.3.10). The potential commercial distributional effects arising from the rezoning of the sites to commercial are not included in the submission. With regard to urban form effects, the site sought for rezoning is significant in the context of the surrounds. At approx. 21 ha, the area sought for rezoning is larger than the North Halswell Key Activity Centre and would therefore have the effect of creating a new centre. A number of the business and related activities that the submission seeks provision for are currently provided for in the Industrial Park zone, including industrial, office (ancillary), accommodation, health and other community activities). To extend this to a full range of retail, office, entertainment and recreational activities will draw demand away from the locations anticipated for such activities. The location of the site is in close proximity to Spitfire Square, a commercial area at the airport less than 500m away, and also in proximity to Avonhead Mall to the south (approx. 1.5 km). Having regard to the distribution of centres in proximity to the site, there is a risk that the development of the	Reject	Commissioners McMahon and Matheson recused from hearing this submission. Reject for the reasons recommended by Council. See further evaluation in Part 7 of the Report

⁶ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 138 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>subject land for commercial activities could draw demand away from existing centres, reducing the ability for those centres to perform their intended role. This would be inconsistent with Objective 15.2.2 of the District Plan. The change of zoning to commercial could also displace demand for land zoned Industrial Park in a location with a high profile that may otherwise be attractive to businesses.</p> <p>It is my opinion based on the information provided and how that information aligns with the objectives and policies of the CDP and CRPS that rezoning the sites to enable commercial activities would not be the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives and policies of the CDP and CRPS.⁷</p>		
<p>904 - 880 Main North Road Limited</p> <p>S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>874-880 Main North Road</p> <p>Planning Map 12</p>	<p>Operative – Industrial General Zone, no Brownfield overlay Proposed - Industrial General Zone, no Brownfield overlay Requested – Add Brownfield overlay</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of, or overlays for, this land. Not an "extension of a zoning change" per Motor Machinists.</p> <p>Furthermore, the land is not within a Policy 3 NPS-UD catchment.</p>	<p>Reject – I have considered the appropriateness of applying a brownfield overlay to a site that has been identified as a greenfield priority area on Map A of the CRPS.</p> <p>To give effect to the CRPS, the site was rezoned from rural to industrial during the District Plan Review in 2016 and it has not been developed previously to my knowledge. Its most recent use being for grazing/ rural activities. The submission refers to the challenges of industrial development of the site with reference to "various reasons". It is not apparent what constraints have impeded the development but it is assumed to be a lack of demand and other constraints. While brownfield redevelopment is supported and encouraged in the planning framework of the CRPS and CDP , the District</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.</p>

⁷ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 140 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>Plan defines "Brownfield" as "abandoned or underutilised commercial or industrial land, or land no longer required by a requiring authority for a designated purpose." The site in question is currently farmland, is yet to be utilised and thus is not deemed to be a Brownfield site. The site adjoins Main North Road and is surrounded to the south, east and north east by industrial zoned land as part of a larger greenfield area. Without consideration of the wider block, east to the railway line, the introduction of a brownfield overlay for the site could impact on the function of the wider block (bound by Main North Road in the west and railway line in the east) as being for primarily industrial activities, in giving effect to policy 6.2.6 (1) of the CRPS. It is considered appropriate that the extent of the area considered for residential development is revisited and alternative methods are considered i.e. zoning outside Plan Change 14.</p> <p>For the reasons described above, I do not consider it appropriate to apply a brownfield overlay to the subject land.⁸</p>		
<p>386 - Balmoral Limited</p> <p>S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>336 and 340 Preston's Road and 427 and 435 Marshland Road, Marshland</p> <p>Planning Map 19</p>	<p>Notified – Rural Urban Fringe Zone Notified – Rural Urban Fringe Zone Requested – Local Centre Zone</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of this land. Not an "extension of a zoning change" per Motor Machinists.</p>	<p>Reject – The subject land is outside the urban area and greenfield priority areas defined on Map A of the CRPS. The rezoning to enable commercial activities would therefore not give effect to Objective 6.2.1 of the CRPS, which is to "Avoid(s) urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas for development, unless expressly provided for in the CRPS". Objective 3.3.7(a)(iii) of the CDP similarly outlines that urban activities are only provided for within the existing urban areas or</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.</p>

⁸ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 141 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>areas identified in Map A. Policy 8 of the NPS-UD requires Council to be responsive to plan changes that would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, even if unanticipated by planning documents.</p> <p>The submission does not demonstrate that the rezoning would contribute significantly to capacity or a well-functioning urban environment. The key outcomes sought in the CDP (Objective 15.2.2), and CRPS (Objective 6.2.6(3)) are that commercial activity is to be focused within centres, and any expansion of commercial activity outside centres is to not give rise to significant adverse distributional and urban form effects (Objective 3.3.10). The subject land is directly opposite the Local Centre zone of Prestons, being across Marshland Road on the same intersection. The rezoning sought by this submission could therefore be considered as an extension of the existing (but not rezoned) Prestons centre. Policy 15.2.2.4 provides policy direction for consideration of proposals for the outward expansion of a centre and can assist in determining the appropriateness of the expansion sought. This reinforces objective 15.2.2 by seeking to ensure the expanded centre remains commensurate with the centre's role while not having significant adverse effects including distributional effects on the wider hierarchy.</p> <p>The potential commercial distribution effects arising from the rezoning of the sites to commercial are not included in the submission and the submitter may provide this when evidence is filed. Policy 15.2.2.4 also requires</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>consideration of whether the proposal is integrated with the provision of infrastructure, that adverse effects are managed at the interface with adjoining zones and the centre is coherent in its form. The submission notes the direct interfaces and states that the proposed provisions for the LCZ address that interface and ensure on-going maintenance of rural amenity. Any expansion is also to be response to growth in the surrounding catchment. While land to the east, known as Prestons, is to be rezoned to MRZ and enables intensification, the Prestons area is also subject to a qualifying matter restricting development due to the vacuum wastewater system. It is therefore not clear of the demand that supports the rezoning of the subject land.</p> <p>The subject land is a relatively short distance from the Homebase Large Format Centre and the Shirley Key Activity Centre (Palms). Without a demonstrated demand and consideration of the distributional effects of the proposed rezoning, there is a risk of impacting on the two centres to the south. The extent of the area zoned Large Format at Homebase has recently been extended to QEII Drive as the outcome of a private plan change with limitations on retail activities to support recovery of the Palms. The proposed rezoning should therefore be considered in this context. The submission refers to the existing activities on the site including a medical centre, pre-school and church and the rezoning is sought to allow for their continued development or re-development. The recognition of existing activities does not in itself warrant the rezoning of the subject land to commercial, which</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>enables a wide range of activities including retail and office activities.</p> <p>On the basis of the preceding analysis, I do not consider the rezoning to be appropriate in the context of the CDP and CRPS.⁹</p>		
<p>823 - The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch</p> <p>S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>2 Lydia Street, Papanui</p> <p>Planning Map 24</p>	<p>Operative – Industrial General Zone, no Brownfield overlay</p> <p>Notified – Industrial General Zone, no Brownfield overlay</p> <p>Requested - Apply brownfield overlay to the site</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of, or overlays for, this land. Not an "extension of a zoning change" per Motor Machinists.</p>	<p>Accept – The Catholic Diocese of Christchurch seek a Brownfield Overlay is applied to 2 Lydia Street, being land currently zoned Industrial General and subject to a designation for a proposed school, being a new campus for Marion College. The site is within a walkable catchment of Papanui TCZ. The site has been under-utilised for industrial activities and would therefore fit within the definition of Brownfield in the District Plan, being “abandoned or underutilised commercial or industrial land, or land no longer required by a requiring authority for a designated purpose.” In the context of Policy 16.2.2.1 that defines criteria for the definition of a brownfield site, the land is previously used industrial land (policy 16.2.2.1 (a)(1) that is under-utilised (Policy 16.2.2.1(a)(ii)). In the context of Policy 16.2.21(a)(iv) that the redevelopment should not adversely affect the supply of land to meet anticipated supply needs of industrial activities. Council’s most recent Business Capacity Assessment prepared under the NPS-UD shows there is a significant over-supply of industrial land at a city-wide level. This is at a macro-level and there is not any evidence at a local level provided by the applicant. This may be provided when submitter’s evidence is filed.</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for the reasons in Part 3 of the Report</p>

⁹ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 145 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>The last criteria (v) under policy 16.2.2.1 is that the location is not surrounded by industrial activities and/or will not erode the anticipated outcomes for an industrial area. The site itself is being developed for a school and the land directly to the east is being developed for a new Pak n’ Save supermarket. To the south east is the head office of Foodstuffs, comprising offices. It can therefore be concluded that the land to the east is not used for industrial activities and is not anticipated to be. The industrial zoned land to the west and south-west of the subject land is used for a range of light industrial activities and other uses incl. garage, automotive repair, fitness, furniture shops and towing services (amongst other uses). It is accessed off Vagues Road rather than Lydia Street and with existing rules to manage the interface, it is my conclusion that it will not be adversely affected by the subject land being identified by way of a brownfield overlay.</p> <p>The Brownfield Overlay would enable the site to be developed for residential activities as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, the relevant policy considerations being in Policy 16.2.2.2 of the Industrial Chapter. I consider the relief sought is the accords with Objective 16.2.2 and policy 16.2.2.1, while also giving effect to Policy 6.3.8 of the CRPS, which anticipates that regeneration of existing brownfield areas is encouraged. On this basis, I recommend the relief is accepted. Notwithstanding this, I consider the zoning of the area requires a review in a more comprehensive manner, having regard to the surrounding land uses.¹⁰</p>		

¹⁰ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 149 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
691 - Ross Clarke S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	370, 390 & 432 Johns Road, Harewood Planning Map 11	Operative – Rural Urban Fringe Zone Notified – Rural Urban Fringe Zone Requested – Industrial General Zone	Reject – PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of this land. Not an "extension of a zoning change" per Motor Machinists. Furthermore, the land is not within a Policy 3 NPS-UD catchment.	Reject – The subject land is outside the urban area and greenfield priority areas defined on Map A of the CRPS. The rezoning to enable industrial activities would therefore not give effect to Objective 6.2.1 of the CRPS, which is to "Avoid(s) urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas for development, unless expressly provided for in the CRPS". Objective 3.3.7(a)(iii) of the CDP similarly outlines that urban activities are only provided for within the existing urban areas or areas identified in Map A. Policy 8 of the NPS-UD requires Council to be responsive to plan changes that would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, even if unanticipated by planning documents. The submission does not demonstrate that the rezoning would contribute significantly to capacity or a well-functioning urban environment. There is not a demonstrated shortfall in the capacity for industrial activities and Council's most recent Business Capacity Assessment prepared under the NPS UD shows there is a significant over-supply of industrial land at a city-wide level. It is noted from the submission that the submitter has recently undertaken an economic assessment of available land with the conclusion that there is likely to be a shortage of suitable/ available land. Following the filing of evidence, the report and any additional information will be sought from the applicant. In terms of location, the site benefits from close proximity to the strategic road network, directly adjoining Johns Road. However, access and the capacity of the	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>network to safely accommodate traffic movements associated with the site's development would need to be assessed to be satisfied that the proposed rezoning is appropriate (amongst other technical assessments).</p> <p>Having regard to the information provided in the submission, I do not consider the rezoning appropriate for the reasons described above and without additional information to consider the merits.¹¹</p>		
<p>2- Greg Olive S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>419 Halswell Junction Road, Halswell Planning Map 44</p>	<p>Operative – Residential New Neighbourhood Zone / Residential Suburban Zone Notified – Medium Density Residential Zone Requested – Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 proposes to change this RNN to MRZ. Changes to a different urban non-residential zone (e.g. MUZ) does not address the proposed change to the status quo and is outside scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i>.</p> <p>Furthermore, the land is not within a Policy 3 NPS-UD catchment.</p>	<p>Reject – With regard to the merits, Objective 15.2.3 (a) is to “Recognise the existing nature, scale and extent of commercial activity within the Commercial Office and Mixed Use Zones...”. The site is currently used for residential activity and it is understood the rezoning is sought as an alternative to enable the establishment of structures as a buffer to the adjoining residential lots.</p> <p>The Mixed use zone enables a range of activities including industrial, entertainment, recreation, community activities (including education, health care, spiritual) and residential amongst other activities. A number of these activities and their associated employment can generate vehicle trips and while rules enable an assessment of high-trip generating activities, the appropriateness of the location for these activities should be considered as part of the request for rezoning.</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for the reasons recommended by Council. Further evaluation in Part 7 of the Report</p>

¹¹ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 151 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>The site is within 400m of the end of the Orange line bus stop and therefore within walking distance of a bus route. It is also in close proximity to the southern motorway and there is a potential for reliance on private vehicle to access the site. The land to the west is zoned rural and land to the south east has been developed for housing since the earthquakes of 2010-11.</p> <p>Therefore, the opportunities for intensification of land use in close proximity are limited and the catchment for activities/ services on the site may therefore be wider, drawing people from further afield. In terms of the uses enabled, there is no evidence of a shortfall to justify land being zoned Mixed-use, particularly in terms of industrial land supply. Having regard to the information provided in the submission, I do not consider the rezoning appropriate for the reasons described above. The alternative is the consideration of bespoke rules for the site to enable structures for the purpose of mitigating noise or a consenting process.¹²</p>		
855 – Lendlease S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	Hornby Commercial Centre Planning Map 36 and 37	Operative – Commercial Core Zone Notified – Town Centre Zone Requested – Metropolitan Centre Zone	Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose	Reject – Refer to s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 31 – 46 ¹³ for planning merits in regard to commercial centre zoning.	Reject	Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the Report] Reject, but on merits. Further reasons set out in

¹² s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 152 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

¹³ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – pg 31- 46 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			<p>any substantive rezoning (e.g. to a more intensive commercial zone). Substantive rezoning requests are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i>. See also paragraphs 4.9 and 5.4 to 5.5 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here).</p> <p>Also refer to cross-examination of Mark Arbuthnot (Week 4).</p>			Part 7 and in Part 3 of the Report
104 – Colin McGavin S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	Papanui Commercial Centre Planning Map 24	Operative – Commercial Core Zone Notified – Town Centre Zone Requested – Local Centre Zone	Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose	Reject – Refer to s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 31 – 46 ¹⁴ for planning merits in regard to commercial centre zoning.	Reject	Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the Report Reject on merits as per s42A Report of Mr Lightbody and for

¹⁴ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – pg 31- 46 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			<p>any substantive rezoning (e.g. to a less intensive commercial zone). Substantive rezoning requests are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i>. See also paragraphs 4.9 and 5.4 to 5.5 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here).</p>			<p>the reasons outlined in Part 3 of the Report relating to the Centre's Hierarchy.</p>
<p>188 – Riccarton Bush Kilmarnock Residents Association</p> <p>S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>Riccarton Commercial Centre</p> <p>Planning Map 31</p>	<p>Operative – Commercial Core Zone Notified – Town Centre Zone Requested – Neighbourhood Centre or Town Centre zones</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning (e.g. to a less intensive commercial zone). Substantive rezoning requests</p>	<p>Reject – Refer to s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 31 – 46 ¹⁵ for planning merits in regard to commercial centre zoning.</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 the Report.</p> <p>Reject on merits as per s42A Report of Mr Lightbody and for the reasons outlined in Part 3 of the Report relating to the Centres Hierarchy</p>

¹⁵ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – pg 31- 46 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i> . See also paragraphs 4.9 and 5.4 to 5.5 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here).			
260 – Scentre (New Zealand) Limited S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	Riccarton Commercial Centre Planning Map 31	Operative – Commercial Core Zone Notified – Town Centre Zone Requested – Metropolitan Centre Zone	Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning (e.g. to a more intensive commercial zone). Substantive rezoning requests are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i> . See also paragraphs 4.9 and 5.4 to 5.5 of	Reject – Refer to s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 31 – 46 ¹⁶ for planning merits in regard to commercial centre zoning.	Reject	Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 the Report Reject, on merits. Further reasons set out in Part 7 an Part 3

¹⁶ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – pg 31- 46 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			<p>Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here).</p> <p>Refer to cross-examination of Vaughan Smith (Week 3).</p>			
<p>638 - Central Riccarton Residents' Association Inc</p> <p>S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>Riccarton Commercial Centre</p> <p>Planning Map 31</p>	<p>Operative – Commercial Core Zone</p> <p>Notified – Town Centre Zone</p> <p>Requested – Neighbourhood Centre or Local Centre zones</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning (e.g. to a more intensive commercial zone). Substantive rezoning requests are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i>.</p>	<p>Reject – Refer to s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 31 – 46 ¹⁷ for planning merits in regard to commercial centre zoning.</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the Report</p> <p>Reject on merits as per s42A Report of Mr Lightbody and for the reasons outlined in Part 3 of the Report] relating to the Centre's Hierarchy</p>
<p>686 - Robyn Thomson</p> <p>S42A author:</p>	<p>Riccarton Commercial Centre</p>	<p>Operative – Commercial Core Zone</p> <p>Notified – Town Centre Zone</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to</p>	<p>Reject – Refer to s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 31 – 46 ¹⁸ for planning merits in regard to commercial centre zoning.</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the</p>

¹⁷ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – pg 31- 46 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

¹⁸ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – pg 31- 46 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
Kirk Lightbody	Planning Map 31	Requested – Local Centre	the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning (e.g. to a more intensive commercial zone). Substantive rezoning requests are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i> . See also paragraphs 5.4 to 5.5 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here) .			Report on merits as per s42A Report of Mr Lightbody and for the reasons outlined in Part 3 of the Report relating to the Centre's Hierarchy
834 - Kainga Ora S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	Riccarton, Hornby, Papanui Commercial Centres Planning Maps 31, 24, 36, 37	Operative – Commercial Core Zone Notified – Town Centre Zone Requested – Metropolitan Centre Zone	Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose any substantive	Reject – Refer to s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 31 – 46 ¹⁹ for planning merits in regard to commercial centre zoning.	Reject	Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the Report Reject on merits as per s42A Report of Mr Lightbody and for the reasons outlined in Part 3

¹⁹ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – pg 31- 46 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			<p>rezoning (e.g. to a more intensive commercial zone). Substantive rezoning requests are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i>. See also paragraphs 4.9 and 5.4 to 5.5 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here).</p> <p>Refer to cross-examination of Jonathan Clease (Week 3).</p>			<p>of the Report relating to the Centres Hierarchy and for the reasons in Part 7 of the Report</p>
<p>834 – Kainga Ora S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>Church Corner, Sydenham and Merivale Commercial Centres Planning Map 30, 39, 31</p>	<p>Operative – Commercial Core Zone Notified – Local Centre Zone Requested – Town Centre Zone</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning (e.g. to a more intensive</p>	<p>Reject – Refer to s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 31 – 46²⁰ for planning merits in regard to commercial centre zoning.</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the Report Reject for the reasons set out in Part 7 of the Report</p>

²⁰ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – pg 31- 46 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			commercial zone). Substantive rezoning requests are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i> . See also paragraphs 4.9 and 5.4 to 5.5 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here).			
876 - Alan Ogle S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	Riccarton Commercial Centre Planning Map 31	Operative – Commercial Core Zone Notified – Town Centre Zone Requested – Neighbourhood or Town Centre zones	Reject in part (to the extent the submission seeks a change to NCZ) – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning (e.g. to a more intensive commercial zone). Substantive	Reject – Refer to s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 31 – 46 ²¹ for planning merits in regard to commercial centre zoning.	Reject in part (to the extent the submission seeks a change to NCZ)	Accept in part to the extent the submitter seeks a TCZ. Reject NCZ for the reasons recommended by Council.

²¹ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – pg 31- 46 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			rezoning requests are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i> . See also paragraphs 4.9 and 5.4 to 5.5 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here).			
678 – Logan Clarke S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	Addington Commercial Centre Planning Map 38	Operative – Commercial Core Zone Notified – Local Centre Zone Requested –Town Centre Zone	Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning (e.g. to a more intensive commercial zone). Substantive rezoning requests are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i> . See also paragraphs 4.9	Reject – Refer to s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 31 – 46 ²² for planning merits in regard to commercial centre zoning.	Reject	Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the Report Reject on merit for the reasons recommended by Council.

²² s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – pg 31- 46 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			and 5.4 to 5.5 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here) .			
740 – Woolworths S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	St Albans Commercial Centre Planning Map 32	Operative – Commercial Core Notified – Neighbourhood Centre Zone Requested – Local Centre Zone	Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning (e.g. to a more intensive commercial zone). Substantive rezoning requests are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i> . See also paragraphs 4.9 and 5.4 to 5.5 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here) .	Reject – Refer to s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 31 – 46 ²³ for planning merits in regard to commercial centre zoning.	Reject	Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the Report] Reject on merit for the reasons recommended by Council and as set out in Part 7, of the Report

²³ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – pg 31- 46 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			Refer to cross-examination of Matt Bonis (Week 3)			
<p>344 – Luke Baker-Garters</p> <p>S42A author: Holly Gardiner</p>	<p>All of Central City</p> <p>Planning Map Central City (CC)</p>	<p>Operative – Various, as shown on <i>Central City Planning Map</i></p> <p>Notified – Various, as shown on Map <i>PC14 Central City Zoning</i></p> <p>Requested – Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Reject – Outside of scope where non-Mixed Use Zones in the Central City (e.g. residential or commercial zones) are sought to be rezoned to a Mixed Use Zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test. See paragraph 5.1 to 5.6 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here).</p>	<p>Reject – Refer to s42A report of Ms. Gardiner pg 83 – 84 ²⁴ for planning merits in regards to rezoning the central city to mixed use.</p>	<p>Reject, except to the extent it applies to the operative Central City Mixed Use Zone and Central City Mixed Use (South Frame) Zone in the that remain unchanged.</p>	<p>Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the Report</p> <p>Reject on merit for the reasons recommended by Council.</p>
<p>147 – Rohan A Collett</p> <p>S42A author: Holly Gardiner</p>	<p>All of Central City</p> <p>Planning Map Central City (CC)</p>	<p>Operative – Various, as shown on <i>Central City Planning Map</i></p> <p>Notified – Various, as shown on Map <i>PC14 Central City Zoning</i></p> <p>Requested – Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Reject – Outside of scope where non-Mixed Use Zones in the Central City (e.g. residential or commercial zones) are sought to be rezoned to a Mixed Use Zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.</p>	<p>Reject - Refer to s42A report of Ms. Gardiner pg 83 – 84 ²⁵ for planning merits in regards to rezoning the central city to mixed use.</p>	<p>Reject, except to the extent it applies to the operative Central City Mixed Use Zone and Central City Mixed Use (South Frame) Zone in the that remain unchanged.</p>	<p>Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.</p>

²⁴ s42A of Holly Elizabeth Gardiner – pg 83 – 84 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/03-Holly-Gardiner-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

²⁵ s42A of Holly Elizabeth Gardiner – pg 83 – 84 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/03-Holly-Gardiner-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons			
			See paragraph 5.1 to 5.6 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here) .						
699 - Christs College S42A author: Clare Piper	64 Rolleston Avenue, Central City (SPSZ – Alternative Zones) Planning Map Central City	Operative – SPSZ (Specific Purpose (Schools) zone) with RCC (Residential Central City) alternative zone ²⁶ . Notified – SPSZ with MRZ alternative zone (RHA) Requested – SPSZ with HRZ (High density residential zone) alternative zone (as notified).	In scope - the originally notified proposed alternative zone for the Christ's College site was HRZ. While this was in error (the alternative zone should have matched the surrounding MRZ zoning), the Council accepts that the submission is in scope as it reflects the notified approach. ²⁷	Reject – The notified planning maps for this area show the surrounding residential zone as proposed to be MRZ with the QM RCA applied. The notified proposed SPSZ alternative zones, as per Appendix 13.6.6.3, for this site was HRZ. The notified alternative zone tables were amended to incorrectly assume all formerly RCC zoned land was to be transferred to HRZ in the SPSZ alternative zone tables and did not reflect the impact/application of the QM on SPSZ sites. The existing operative planning framework for SPSZ provides greater development for school sites than the surrounding. Proposed PC14 changes to SPSZ would see this sites' height increase from existing 11m to proposed 16m. Increasing this from proposed MRZ (16m) to HRZ (22m) would further exacerbate this difference compared to the surrounding residential zoned land with the proposed QM applied (12m). E.g: Heights for site: <table border="1" data-bbox="1077 1246 1585 1310"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1077 1246 1245 1310">Operative (SPSZ - RCC)</td> <td data-bbox="1245 1246 1413 1310">PC14 (SPSZ - MRZ)</td> <td data-bbox="1413 1246 1585 1310">PC14 (SPSZ - HRZ)</td> </tr> </table>	Operative (SPSZ - RCC)	PC14 (SPSZ - MRZ)	PC14 (SPSZ - HRZ)	Reject	Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the Report. Accept on Merit as notified alternative was HRZ
Operative (SPSZ - RCC)	PC14 (SPSZ - MRZ)	PC14 (SPSZ - HRZ)							

²⁶ [Plan-Change-14-HBC-NOTIFICATION-Sub-chapter-13.6-School.pdf \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

²⁷ Clare Piper's response to Panel request #62, which forms part of Appendix 1 to the Council's memorandum of counsel of 20 December 2023: [Appendix-I-Response-to-questions-62-and-66-Clare-Piper.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation			Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				11m	14m within 10m of internal boundary, otherwise 16m	14m within 10m of internal boundary, otherwise 22m		
				On merits, this submission is rejected. ²⁸				
872 – Oyster Management Limited S42A author: Holly Gardiner	Block bordered by Tuam Street, Madras Street, Lichfield Street, and Manchester Street, which includes the submitter's site at 229 Tuam Street Planning Map Central City	Operative – Central City Mixed Use (South Frame) Notified – Central City Mixed Use (South Frame) Requested – City Centre Zone or Central City Mixed Use Zone	Reject – PC14 does not propose a rezoning for this land. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test. See paragraph 5.1 to 5.5 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here) .	Reject – The submitter seeks to rezone their site and wider city block of Tuam, Manchester, Madras and Lichfield Streets from the Central City Mixed Use (South Frame) Zone to either City Centre Zone (preferred) or Central City Mixed Use Zone to provide for greater building height in the block. This rezoning request was assessed in Appendix B ²⁹ of Ms. Gardiner's section 42a report. The proposed changes to the Central City Mixed Use (South Frame) Zone under PC14 would increase the height limit from 17m to 21m, with the exception of sites that do not front High Street which have a proposed height limit of 32m. As outlined by Mr. Willis and recommended by Ms. Williams, this height was determined appropriate to ensure the buildings remain commensurate with ensuring the walkable network within the zone has access to sunlight, including the laneways and open spaces.	Reject	Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the Report Reject on merit as recommended by Council, but note Part 3 of the Report regarding provisions for the City Mixed Use (South Frame) Zone, which the Panel recommend being accepted Panel received and considered correspondence from Minter Ellison Rudd Watts, 22 September 2023.		

²⁸ Clare Piper's response to Panel request #62, which forms part of Appendix 1 to the Council's memorandum of counsel of 20 December 2023: [Appendix-I-Response-to-questions-62-and-66-Clare-Piper.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#). This response refers back to Ms Piper's section 42A report (10B).

²⁹ S42a Report – Holly Elizabeth Gardiner – Appendix B – Page 145 - 147 <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/03-Holly-Gardiner-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				In my view ³⁰ , changing the zoning from CCMU(SF) to CCZ would enable a far greater increase in height limit and would disrupt the function of the South Frame when viewed in the wider context of the zoning in the area. In conclusion, it is my recommendation that this rezoning request be rejected.		
61 – Victoria Neighbourhood Association S42A author: Holly Gardiner	Victoria Square Planning Map Central City	Operative – Commercial Central City Business and Avon River Precinct (Te Papa Ōtākaro) Zone Notified – City Centre Zone and Avon River Precinct (Te Papa Ōtākaro) Zone (i.e. no change) Requested – Redraw the CCZ zone boundary to be the southern side of Victoria Square to be consistent with other CCZ boundary locations which do not include the park areas around the River Avon.	Reject to the extent it seeks to rezone land currently zoned Avon River Precinct (Te Papa Ōtākaro) Zone.	Reject – Refer to s42A report of Holly Elizabeth Gardiner pg 82 ³¹ for planning merits in regard to this request.	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.
737 – Christian Jordan S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	Between Blenheim Rd and the Railway track	Operative – Mixed Use Zone Notified – Mixed Use Zone (i.e. no change)	Reject – PC14 does not propose a rezoning for the area between	Reject – The submitter seeks the removal of the Mixed Use Zone. The Mixed Use Zone enables predominately light industry activities which in this location features a mixture of manufacturing, associated retail and offices,	Reject	Reject on scope for reason it is not within a NPS-UD Policy 3 response and on

³⁰ S42a Report – Holly Elizabeth Gardiner – Appendix B – Page 145 - 147 <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/03-Holly-Gardiner-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

³¹ S42a Report – Holly Elizabeth Gardiner – Page 82 <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/03-Holly-Gardiner-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A Author	Location	Zone	Council Scope Recommendation	Council Merits Recommendation	Council Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
	Planning Map 37, 38	Requested - The mixed use zone should not apply between Blenheim Rd and the Railway track. The zone is otherwise a positive change.	Blenheim Rd and the Railway track. Furthermore, the land is not within a Policy 3 NPS-UD catchment.	and above ground residential. I consider the Mixed Use Zone is the most appropriate way to give effect to the act in achieving sustainable management.		merit for the reasons recommended by Council.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

NON-RESIDENTIAL TO RESIDENTIAL REQUESTS

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
749 - Ryman Healthcare Limited S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	20 Radcliffe Road, Belfast Planning Map 18	Operative – Commercial Core Zone Notified – Town Centre Zone Requested – High Density Residential	Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning (e.g. to a more intensive commercial zone). Substantive rezoning requests are outside of scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i> . See also paragraph 4.9 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here).	Accept – With regard to the merits of the request, the site has resource consent and is being developed for a retirement village. While the zoning of TCZ enables a wide range of activities, including residential, the intent of the zoning is to enable the site to serve the residential catchment as a focal point for commercial and community activities. As the function and role of the proposed centre is compromised, I consider a residential zoning to be appropriate. It reflects the current and anticipated use of the site. ³²	Reject	Accept for the reasons set out in Part 7 of the Report.
66 - Lisa Fabri ³³ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos	John Paterson Drive [farm and lifestyle blocks] Planning Map 44	Operative – RuUF (Rural Urban Fringe Zone) Notified – RuUF Requested – MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) or HRZ (High Density Residential Zone)	Reject – PC14 proposes no change from the Operative District Plan. Land is not in a policy 3 area nor in a relevant residential zone, pursuant to s77G of	Reject ³⁴ – The area is covered by LUC Class 1 and 2 soils and would struggle to be considered suitable under the NPS-HPL. Clause 3.5 (7) of the NPS-HPL states that prior to an RPS being updated, areas zoned rural or rural production with LUC 1-3 soils that are not within an identified future urban	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.

³² s42A report of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 163 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

³³ S42A report of Ike Kleynbos – Appendix E, page 34 (page 671 of PDF) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

³⁴ Rural expansion is considered out of scope under paras 6.1.114 and 8.1.4 in the s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			<p>the RMA. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.</p>	<p>development area should be treated as highly productive land and urban development is avoided (Policy 5). Clause 1.3 (4) states that zones referred to are those detailed in National Planning Standards, or nearest equivalent if not implemented. The District Plan has yet to implement National Planning Standards and therefore an equivalent must be derived from applicable zone objectives, policies, and rules. With this in mind, the RuUF zone provides for the same land use activities similar to other productive rural zones, such as Rural Banks Peninsula, albeit at a smaller scale. It is therefore considered that the nearest equivalent to RuUF is General Rural Zone. Further, this area is outside the CRPS Map A greenfield priority areas and would therefore not qualify as a 'future urban development area' under Clause 3.5 (7)(b)(i).</p> <p>Expansion into the rural area here would also be inefficient as it would require the further outward expansion of infrastructure, rather than consolidation in established areas. The nearest commercial centre is in Longhurst, some 2km walking distance from John Paterson Drive. Such a development would therefore be contrary to Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>It is recommended that the request is rejected on merit.</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
68 – Darren Fabri ³⁵ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos	John Paterson Drive Planning Map 44	Operative – RuUF (Rural Urban Fringe Zone) Notified – RuUF Requested – to a residential zone.	Reject – As above.	Reject – As above.	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.
210 - Victor Ong ³⁶ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos	565 Yaldhurst Road and surrounds Planning Map 29	Operative – RuUF (Rural Urban Fringe Zone) Notified – RuUF Requested – MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone)	Reject – As above.	Reject ³⁷ – While this site and surrounds are close to a commercial centre (Yaldhurst LCZ on Sir John McKenzie Avenue), the area is subject to the 50 & 55 dB Ldn Air Noise Contour under the operative Plan and remains in effect through PC14. Such an activity would therefore be contrary to Strategic Objective 3.3.12, being a noise sensitive activity within the Air Noise Contour. The area is covered also by LUC Class 2 soils and would struggle to be considered suitable under the NPS-HPL. Clause 3.5 (7) of the NPS-HPL states that prior to an RPS being updated, areas zoned rural or rural production with LUC 1-3 soils that are not within an identified future urban development area should be treated as highly productive land and urban development is avoided (Policy 5). Clause 1.3 (4) states that zones referred to are those detailed in	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ S42A report of Ike Kleynbos – Appendix E, page 28 (page 767 of PDF) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

³⁷ Rural expansion is considered out of scope under paras 6.1.114 and 8.1.4 in the s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>National Planning Standards, or nearest equivalent if not implemented. The District Plan has yet to implement National Planning Standards and therefore an equivalent must be derived from applicable zone objectives, policies, and rules. With this in mind, the RuUF zone provides for the same land use activities similar to other productive rural zones, such as Rural Banks Peninsula, albeit at a smaller scale. It is therefore considered that the nearest equivalent to RuUF is General Rural Zone. Further, this area is outside the CRPS Map A greenfield priority areas and would therefore not qualify as a 'future urban development area' under Clause 3.5 (7)(b)(i).</p> <p>It is recommended that the request is rejected on merit.</p>		
<p>244 - Harvey Armstrong³⁸ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos</p>	<p>75 Alderson Avenue Planning Maps 46 & 47</p>	<p>Operative – Rural Port Hills Zone / Residential Hills Zone Notified – Rural Port Hills Zone / Residential Hills Zone Requested – Residential Hills Zone [wholly] or special zoning to enable residential sites of 2,500 to 10,000 sqm.</p>	<p>Reject in part insofar as it relates the Rural Port Hills zoned part of the land – PC14 proposes no change from the Operative District Plan. Land is not in a policy 3 area nor in a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.</p>	<p>Reject³⁹ – The site is 27.7ha and straddles the upper ridge of Hillsborough along the edge of occupied residential zoning further to the south at lower elevations. Assuming 30% for roading and retaining, and a middled average allotment size of about 6,000 sqm (the approximate average of the submitter request), the site would yield just over 30 parcels. This is conservative estimate as a Residential Hill zoning</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.</p>

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Rural expansion is considered out of scope under paras 6.1.114 and 8.1.4 in the s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			That part zoned Residential Hills is already a Residential Hills zone.	<p>would set a vacant allotment size of 650 sqm.</p> <p>The site is located within a number of operative district plan features, most notably an Outstanding Natural Landscape/Feature and a number slope hazard layers, both feature types which have been proposed as QMs for PC14. The activity would therefore be contrary to Strategic Objective 3.3.6 3.3.9 of the District Plan and Chapters 11 and 12 of the CRPS.</p> <p>For this reason, it is recommended that the request is rejected on merit.</p>		
<p>388 – M.I.I.G Limited⁴⁰</p> <p>S42A author: Ike Kleynbos</p>	<p>Rural Urban Fringe zoned land located between QEII Drive south and Prestons Local Centre north, and between Prestons to the east and Marshlands Road to the west, in particular Part Rural Section 1705 [80 Mairehau Road].</p> <p>Planning Maps 19, 25 and 26</p>	<p>Operative – RuUF (Rural Urban Fringe Zone Notified – RuUF (Rural Urban Fringe Zone Requested – MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone)</p>	<p>Reject – As above. PC14 proposes no change from the Operative District Plan. Land is not a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.</p>	<p>Reject in part – This request canvases about 20 rural parcels to the south of the Prestons commercial area, over Mairehau Road to Queen Elizabeth II Drive, representing some 80ha if area. Assuming that the density of recently established residential units would continue (about 500-700 sqm), dwelling yield across this area could be in the order of 1,000 allotments (at a gross density of 12 hh/ha). It is noted that the submitter has requested MRZ zoning, which could provide a yield upwards of 70 hh/ha.</p> <p>Spatially, this would seen to be a logical extension of the near-complete Prestons development that has formed around the Prestons commercial area.</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.</p>

⁴⁰ Ibid.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>While this commercial area has been identified as an LCZ that is appropriate to intensify further through the LCIP, the area has a heavily restricted wastewater system, being within the Wastewater Constraint QM as a result of vacuum sewer capacity. Further, part of this area is also subject to LUC Class 2 Soils and a Flood Management Area. High Class soils are currently mapped over the south of the site, covering close to half of the total site area (aligning with the box culvert that bisects sites along a south-easterly axis). Rezoning over this extent would be contrary to the NPS-HPL.</p> <p>It is unclear how transport access would be facilitated. This would need to be done with care as both Marshlands Road and Mairehau Road are Minor Arterials and Queen Elizabeth II Drive is a Major Arterial, being State Highway 74 and has NZTA as the road controlling authority.</p> <p>The site is not listed in Map A of the CRPS. Objective 6.2.1 (3) recognises that other parts of the CRPS may provide for development where outside an urban area or not a greenfield development area.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.2 establishes the conditions for urban expansion. While an avoid direction for expansion, to summarise, this appears to be</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>conditional on the following being achieved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban consolidation, increasing over specified periods; 2. Intensifying within and around commercial centres and mixed use developments; 3. Supporting the CBD; 4. Developing in accordance with Map A development areas at a rate where infrastructure can support growth; 5. Sustainable growth of satellite towns beyond the Christchurch TA boundary; 6. Management of rural residential development; and 7. Provide for development opportunities on Māori Reserves. <p>Sub-clauses 5-7 are not relevant as the request is for residential zoning within the Christchurch TA boundary and does not relate to Māori Reserves. Urban consolidation in Christchurch has been occurring for several years, meeting and exceeding CRPS targets since 2018. This has been further reinforced through proposed PC14 intensification across both residential and commercial areas, meeting sub-clauses 1, 2, and 3. This rezoning would be seen to align with sub-clause 2, being in close proximity to the Prestons commercial centre. Sub-clause 4 supports development over greenfield priority areas and Future</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>Development Areas, which the site is not subject to.</p> <p>Turning to remaining relevant chapter 6 objectives, 6.2.1a establishes that “at least sufficient development capacity” is enabled, which the recommendation would support. Objective 6.2.3 is a broad focus on sustainability and seeks to provide for a range of housing densities. Objective 6.2.4 focuses on the efficient integration of transport infrastructure; the site has direct access to multiple arterial roads, but lacks public and active transport connections. Objectives 6.2.5 and 6.2.6 are not directly relevant to the request as these relate to commercial business centres and business land growth, however is close to the Prestons commercial centre.</p> <p>Relevant objectives (1-3, 5, 6, and 8) in the NPS-UD seek to deliver a well-functioning urban environment, supporting a competitive market that improves housing sufficiency and enables development that is either located within or around a commercial centre, or is well-serviced by existing or serviced transport, or there is high demand for housing in the area relative to other areas within the urban environment. Developments should also be achieved in a manner that takes into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, support greenhouse gas reductions and the</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>resilience to current and future effects of climate change.</p> <p>Focusing on the northern part of the site unaffected by high class soils, development in this area would be seen to adjacent to a local commercial centre and provide for some 24ha of largely vacant residential land within an area that has been successfully developed for several years. The #135 bus is the only local public transport route, which connects The Palms mall to New Brighton mall through Prestons and does not travel to the city centre. Rezoning here would only partially be supported by the NPS-UD as further investment in public and active transport routes are needed to increase accessibility and further reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that this area would need to undergo an involved level of master planning to establish a suitable structure plan to manage the aforementioned features of the area and to update the CRPS. Subject to this being achieved, there may be merit in re-zoning the northern proportion of the site, however a FUZ zoning is considered the most appropriate in this circumstance to ensure the adoption of a development plan. It is therefore recommended that the request is rejected in-part.</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
430 – Tracey Berry ⁴¹ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos	Westall Lane [private lane to the northwest of the Withells Road / Strathean Avenue intersection] Planning Map 23	Operative – RuUF (Rural Urban Fringe Zone) / RS (Residential Suburban Zone) Notified – RuUF / RS Requested – Residential zoning	Reject in part insofar as it relates the RuUF zoned part of the land – PC14 proposes no change from the Operative District Plan. Land is not a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test. That part zoned RS is already a residential zone.	Reject ⁴² – The private lane services six occupied residential properties, totalling about 2.5ha. These sites are within a 600m walking catchment from the Avonhead commercial centres. However, both the commercial centre, the site and its surround are subject to the Airport Noise Influence Area QM. Such an activity would therefore be contrary to Strategic Objective 3.3.12, being a noise sensitive activity within the Air Noise Contour. A 66 Kv Electricity Distribution Line also traverses the very north of the site. For these reasons, it is recommended that the request is rejected on merit.	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.
850 – Crichton Development Group Limited ⁴³ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos	5-19 John Paterson Drive and 451 Halswell Junction Road Planning Map 44	Operative – RuUF (Rural Urban Fringe Zone) Notified – RuUF Requested – MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone)	Reject – PC14 proposes no change from the Operative District Plan. Land is not in a policy 3 area nor is a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.	Reject – The area is covered by LUC Class 1 and 2 soils and would struggle to be considered suitable under the NPS-HPL. Clause 3.5 (7) of the NPS-HPL states that prior to an RPS being updated, areas zoned rural or rural production with LUC 1-3 soils that are not within an identified future urban development area should be treated as highly productive land and urban development is avoided (Policy 5). Clause 1.3 (4) states that zones	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.

⁴¹ S42A report of Ike Kleynbos – Appendix E, page 29 (page 768 of PDF) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

⁴² Rural expansion is considered out of scope under paras 6.1.114 and 8.1.4 in the s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

⁴³ Ibid.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>referred to are those detailed in National Planning Standards, or nearest equivalent if not implemented. The District Plan has yet to implement National Planning Standards and therefore an equivalent must be derived from applicable zone objectives, policies, and rules. With this in mind, the RuUF zone provides for the same land use activities similar to other productive rural zones, such as Rural Banks Peninsula, albeit at a smaller scale. It is therefore considered that the nearest equivalent to RuUF is General Rural Zone. Further, this area is outside the CRPS Map A greenfield priority areas and would therefore not qualify as a 'future urban development area' under Clause 3.5 (7)(b)(i).</p> <p>As the area is not identified in Map A of the CRPS, rezoning would be contrary to Chapter 6 of the CRPS and Strategic Objective 3.3.16 of the District Plan. Expansion into the rural area here would also be inefficient as it would require the further outward expansion of infrastructure, rather than consolidation in established areas.</p> <p>Relevant objectives (1-3, 5, 6, and 8) in the NPS-UD seek to deliver a well-functioning urban environment, supporting a competitive market that improves housing sufficiency and enables development that is either located within or around a commercial</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>centre, or is well-served by existing or serviced transport, or there is high demand for housing in the area relative to other areas within the urban environment. Developments should also be achieved in a manner that takes into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, support greenhouse gas reductions and the resilience to current and future effects of climate change.</p> <p>The nearest commercial centre is in Longhurst, some 2km walking distance from John Paterson Drive. However, the site is seen to be located within a 10-minute walk from a core bus stop (#7 bus – Knights Stream Park), meaning that re-zoning would align with Objective 3 of the NPS-UD. The site remains dislocated from urban Christchurch and would not align with the definition of a well-functioning urban environment under Policy 1, therefore could be seen to conflict with Objective 1.</p> <p>The northern parts of this area are also covered by the NZTA Future Works Designation for SH76, which appears to have been completed.</p> <p>Overall, it is recommended that the request is rejected on merit.</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
<p>880 – Cathedral City Development Ltd⁴⁴</p> <p>S42A author: Ike Kleynbos</p>	<p>85 Harry Ell Drive</p> <p>Planning Map 51</p>	<p>Operative – RuPH (Rural Port Hills Zone)</p> <p>Notified – RuPH Requested – MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) or FUZ (Future Urban Zone)</p>	<p>Reject – As above.</p>	<p>Reject – This 6.8ha site located on the upper ride of Cashmere hills and borders Victoria Park to the south, with occupied residential areas to the north. It is the property at the very end of Harry Ell Drive, being a cul-de-sac, largely representing the highest elevation of residential zoning at the end of Dyers Pass and Hackthorne roads.</p> <p>The street contains a potable water connection, gravity sewer main, and looks to contain stormwater discharge across private parcels via the rear of Allom Lane. A bus stop is about 10-minutes’ walk from the entry of the site; however, this section of service is at a lower, approximately 30-minute, frequency when compared to the rest of the service (#1 bus).</p> <p>The site appears to be most recently used for a pine plantation and is now vacant. It is at a gradient similar to nearby residential areas, potentially being more forgiving as it is closer to the crest of the ridge. There are no proposed PC14 QMs located over the site. However, the site would be subject to the LPTAA QM as the site is not within a walkable catchment from a core public transport route.</p> <p>If Harry Ell Drive would continue into the site and that this, alongside private</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.</p>

⁴⁴ Ibid.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>accessways would account for 20% of occupied space, just over 5.4ha of land would be able to be developed. If zoned and developed to MRZ, the site would yield over 450 units, however this may only be in theory given potential ground conditions and retaining that could be required. While minimum allotment size for surrounding residential areas is 650 sqm, lots around the site average about 850 sqm. If this density were to continue over the site the yield would total some 65 residential parcels, or just over 80 parcels at the minimum allotment size.</p> <p>The submitter has requested either MRZ or FUZ. The latter requires a minimum net density of 15 hh/ha, with a minimum allotment size of 300 sqm, allowing for 20% to be between 180-299 sqm. At a maximum utilisation of this density, the site would yield just over 200 parcels.</p> <p>The site is not listed in Map A of the CRPS, however may not be at a scale that could qualify to be captured. Objective 6.2.1 (3) recognises that other parts of the CRPS may provide for development where outside an urban area or not a greenfield development area.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.2 establishes the conditions for urban expansion. While an avoid direction for expansion, to</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>summarise, this appears to be conditional on the following being achieved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban consolidation, increasing over specified periods; 2. Intensifying within and around commercial centres and mixed use developments; 3. Supporting the CBD; 4. Developing in accordance with Map A development areas at a rate where infrastructure can support growth; 5. Sustainable growth of satellite towns beyond the Christchurch TA boundary; 6. Management of rural residential development; and 7. Provide for development opportunities on Māori Reserves. <p>Sub-clauses 5-7 of CRPS objective 6.2.2 are not relevant as the request is for residential zoning within the Christchurch TA boundary and does not relate to Māori Reserves. Urban consolidation in Christchurch has been occurring for several years, meeting and exceeding CRPS targets since 2018. This has been further reinforced through proposed PC14 intensification across both residential and commercial areas, meeting sub-clauses 1, 2, and 3. Sub-clause 4 supports development over greenfield priority areas and Future Development Areas, which the site is not subject to.</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>Turning to remaining relevant chapter 6 objectives, 6.2.1a establishes that “at least sufficient development capacity” is enabled, which the recommendation would support. Objective 6.2.3 is a broad focus on sustainability and seeks to provide for a range of housing densities. Objective 6.2.4 focuses on the efficient integration of transport infrastructure; the site forms the head of a local road that is located near a Minor Arterial Road, being Dyers Pass Road. Objectives 6.2.5 and 6.2.6 are not relevant to the request as these relate to commercial business centres and business land growth, which the site would not compete with or impact upon.</p> <p>Relevant objectives (1-3, 5, 6, and 8) in the NPS-UD seek to deliver a well-functioning urban environment, supporting a competitive market that improves housing sufficiency and enables development that is either located within or around a commercial centre, or is well-serviced by existing or serviced transport, or there is high demand for housing in the area relative to other areas within the urban environment. Developments should also be achieved in a manner that takes into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, support greenhouse gas reductions and the resilience to current and future effects of climate change.</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>Rezoning the site would provide more choice to develop over vacant housing land within an area in high demand, potentially reducing vacant land prices within the local catchment. Public transport is available at a limited capacity, with active transport lesser of an option given the gradient and elevation of the area. No operative Plan cultural or natural hazard features exist over the site; however, the site is subject to the Rural Amenity Landscape overlay (RAL 11.1 – Appendix 9.2.9.2.4).</p> <p>Objective 9.2.2.1.3 of the Plan seeks that listed Rural Amenity Landscapes are maintained. Supporting Policy 9.2.2.2.5 requires that development of on Port Hill radial spurs are protected, avoiding development that is visually prominent and breaks the skyline, or overly domesticates the landscape, enabling farming, conservation, or recreation activities that contribute to maintaining rural landscape qualities.</p> <p>To achieve the above, a development pattern that is more representative of a rural residential development is likely needed. In doing so, the development would conflict with CRPS Policy 6.3.9, which directs that no further rural residential development is provided for within the Christchurch City Plan area.</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>The concluding outcome is that whilst re-developing the site as a residential activity is likely to be supported by the NPS-UD and the CRPS in isolation, when seen against the landscape values of the site and associated controls, developing to align with such values would be contrary to the CRPS. It is therefore recommended that the request is rejected on merit.</p>		
<p>881 – Red Spur Limited⁴⁵ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos</p>	<p>NCZ area, end of Kitcheners Knoll Road, Redmund Spur Planning Map 50</p>	<p>Operative – CLZ (Commercial Local Zone) surrounded by Residential Hills Mixed Density Overlay – Redmund Spur Notified – NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone) surrounded by Residential Large Lot Zone (RLLZ) with Precinct Overlay Requested – NCZ to be relocated and expanded to be consistent with Stage 6 subdivision consent RMA/2022/2892.</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zones (Commercial Local Zone and Residential Hills Mixed Density Overlay – Redmund Spur) to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards (NCZ and LLRZ), retaining applicable standards. PC14 does not propose any rezoning of non-commercial land to NCZ in this area (whether for relocation or expansion of the existing CLZ). Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.</p>	<p>Accept – The proposed change would align with the granted subdivision plan for the area under RMA/2022/2892. Such a change would be logical, given how the site has developed, and moves the centre by a minor degree.</p> <p>The submission is not seeking to change land use controls for the NCZ area or upzone it further but would increase the size of the centre. Operative zoning has this commercial zone at 3,170m², whilst the consented subdivision plan has this commercial lot at 5,035m². Rule 15.1.1 P21(a)(iv) outlines the maximum amount of gross leasable floor area for the Redmund Spur Centre is 2,500m². Changing the zone spatial extent to match the approved subdivision would not change this operative retail limit, no further evidence was presented by the applicant to justify changing the retail limit. Overall, it would be</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for reasons in Part 7 of the Report.</p>

⁴⁵ s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – Appendix E, page 30 (page 769 of PDF) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			Refer to cross-examination of Fiona Aston (Week 6).	appropriate for the site to have a consistent zoning approach and as such there is merit to the rezoning request.		
881 – Red Spur Limited ⁴⁶ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos	Kitcheners Knoll Road / Redmund Spur Road Planning Map 50	Operative – Residential Hills with Mixed Density Overlay – Redmund Spur Notified – Large Lot Residential Zone (LLRZ) with Precinct Overlay Requested – MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) or Residential Hills with a Redmund Spur Density Precinct	Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone (Residential Hills Mixed Density Overlay – Redmund Spur) to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards (LLRZ) with a Precinct Overlay, retaining applicable standards. No substantive rezoning proposed. Not a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.	Reject – see paras 10.1.452 to 10.1.456 on page 244 of the s42A report from Ike Kleynbos.	Reject	Reject for reasons in Part 7 of the Report.
881 – Red Spur Limited ⁴⁷ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos	Kitcheners Knoll Road / Redmund Spur Road Planning Map 50	Operative – Residential Hills with Mixed Density Overlay – Redmund Spur / Rural Port Hills Zone Notified – Large Lot Residential Zone (LLRZ) with Precinct Overlay / Rural Port Hills Zone Requested – Replacing some of the residential zone with Rural Port Hills	Reject – PC14 only changes the name of the existing zone (Residential Hills Mixed Density Overlay – Redmund Spur) to the nearest equivalent zone name in the National Planning Standards (LLRZ) with a Precinct	Accept – The Redmund Spur site is a bespoke zone that lies amongst rural port hills zoned areas. These surrounding zones have a mixture of Rural Amenity Landscapes and Outstanding natural Landscapes. The proposal effectively seeks to ‘swap’ zonings by introducing RuPH where Residential Hills with the overlay is currently within outer arch of zoning central to the site, consequently	Reject	Reject for reasons in Part 7 of the Report

⁴⁶ s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – Appendix E, page 30 (page 769 of PDF) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

⁴⁷ Ibid.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
		Zone, whilst replacing the equivalent area of Rural Port Hills Zone with a residential zone (MRZ or Residential Hills)	Overlay, retaining applicable standards. No substantive rezoning proposed. Not a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.	<p>expanding the residential zoning at a near equivalent area slightly further east. It would appear that the net area of residential zoning for Redmund Spur would be unchanged.</p> <p>Both of these areas are covered by the operative Rural Amenity Landscape overlay (RAL 11.4). The ‘horseshoe shape’ of zoning for Redmund Spur aligns with flatter open areas of the port hills, with the inner part of this being a depression or gully, distinct from its surrounds. Part 9.2.2 of the plan recognises that these landscapes must be maintained by avoiding visual intrusion incongruous with the rural landscape of the Port Hills and Banks Peninsula, ensuring that subdivision, use and development does not result in over domestication of the landscape.</p> <p>The proposal is recommended to be accepted on merit, as there appears to be little no net difference in rural zoning, the overlay is not a s6 matter, and the change would align with the policy intent of the overlay.</p>		
172 – Traci Mendiola ⁴⁸ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos	8 Gilders Grove, Hillsborough Planning Map 47	Operative – RuUF (Rural Urban Fringe Zone) and Residential Hill Zone	Reject in part insofar as it relates the RuUF zoned part of the site – PC14 proposes no	Accept ⁴⁹ – The request relates to a 0.7ha site in Hillsborough that adjoins established residential areas, being at	Accepted in part (RH part of site)	Reject for the Reasons in Part 7 of the Report.

⁴⁸ s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – Appendix E, page 31 (page 770 of PDF) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

⁴⁹ The rezoning of Residential Hills to MRZ (and more generally) is considered from page 84 of the s42A of Ike Kleynbos – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
		<p>Notified – RuUF (Rural Urban Fringe Zone and Residential Hills Zone Requested – MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone)</p> <p>The site is split zone, with the occupied front proportion of the site being residentially zone and the larger rear proportion being rurally zoned.</p>	<p>change from the Operative District Plan. Land is not in a policy 3 area nor is RuUF zoned land a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test. The Residential Hills Zoned part of the site is considered a relevant residential zone and is within scope.</p>	<p>the end of a private cul-de-sac that adjoins Avoca Valley Road.</p> <p>No QMs have been proposed for the site through PC14, with applicable operative Plan overlays limited to geotechnical features of a lesser nature. These layers would either continue to apply or be able to be considered through conditions of consent, s106 of the Act, or the Building Act.</p> <p>The site is not listed in Map A of the CRPS, however may not be at a scale that could qualify to be captured. Objective 6.2.1 (3) recognises that other parts of the CRPS may provide for development where outside an urban area or not a greenfield development area.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.2 establishes the conditions for urban expansion. While an avoid direction for expansion, to summarise, this appears to be conditional on the following being achieved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban consolidation, increasing over specified periods; 2. Intensifying within and around commercial centres and mixed use developments; 3. Supporting the CBD; 4. Developing in accordance with Map A development areas at a rate where infrastructure can support growth; 		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>5. Sustainable growth of satellite towns beyond the Christchurch TA boundary;</p> <p>6. Management of rural residential development; and</p> <p>7. Provide for development opportunities on Māori Reserves.</p> <p>Sub-clauses 5-7 of CRPS objective 6.2.2 are not relevant as the request is for residential zoning within the Christchurch TA boundary and does not relate to Māori Reserves. Urban consolidation in Christchurch has been occurring for several years, meeting and exceeding CRPS targets since 2018. This has been further reinforced through proposed PC14 intensification across both residential and commercial areas, meeting sub-clauses 1, 2, and 3. Sub-clause 4 supports development over greenfield priority areas and Future Development Areas, which the site is not subject to.</p> <p>Turning to remaining relevant chapter 6 objectives, 6.2.1a establishes that “at least sufficient development capacity” is enabled, which the recommendation would support. Objective 6.2.3 is a broad focus on sustainability and seeks to provide for a range of housing densities. Objective 6.2.4 focuses on the efficient integration of transport infrastructure; the site is located on an established road servicing residential units that is located near a Minor</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>Arterial Road, being Port Hills Road. Objectives 6.2.5 and 6.2.6 are not relevant to the request as these relate to commercial business centres and business land growth, which the site would not compete with or impact upon.</p> <p>Relevant objectives (1-3, 5, 6, and 8) in the NPS-UD seek to deliver a well-functioning urban environment, supporting a competitive market that improves housing sufficiency and enables development that is either located within or around a commercial centre, or is well-serviced by existing or serviced transport, or there is high demand for housing in the area relative to other areas within the urban environment. Developments should also be achieved in a manner that takes into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, support greenhouse gas reductions and the resilience to current and future effects of climate change.</p> <p>Rezoning the site would provide more choice to develop over vacant housing land, potentially reducing vacant land prices within the local catchment. The site is located within 10-minutes' walk from a core bus route⁵⁰, being bus #8. No other operative features are</p>		

⁵⁰ It is acknowledged that the #8 bus route has been developed after the notification of PC14 and is considered to be a core bus route. Accordingly, residential sites located within at least an 800m walking catchment should not have an LPTAA response applied.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				relevant to the site; MRZ would seem to be supported by the NPS-UD. Extending MRZ here is a more logical zone boundary to a rural zone and avoids split-zoning a parcel. It is recommended that the request is accepted on merit.		
760 – ChristchurchNZ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos	Buchan Park [41 Buchan Street] Planning Map 39	Operative – OCP (Open Space Community Park Zone) Notified – LCZ (Local Centre Zone) Requested – OCP	Accept – Reversion to operative zoning is within scope.	Accept ⁵¹ – This change was made in error and should have retain operative zoning, being an open space zone. This request was accepted in the s42A report from Ike Kleynbos ⁵² but does not appear on s42A Recommendations mapping. It is recommended that the request is accepted on merit.	Accept	Accept for the reasons recommended by Council.
390 – Mike Singleton ⁵³ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos	Canterbury Agricultural Park [102 Curletts Road, Sockburn, and surrounds] Planning Maps 39 & 37	Operative – OMF (Open Space Metropolitan Facilities Zone) Notified – OMF Requested – HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) or MUZ (Mixed Use zone)	Reject – PC14 proposes no change from the Operative District Plan. Land is not in a policy 3 area nor is a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.	Reject ⁵⁴ – The site is made up of some 44ha and is located at a significant State Highway intersection between SH75 and SH76. The Ōpāwaho Heathcote River runs along its southern boarder and is only accessible via the State Highway along the northern and eastern boundaries. A stormwater reserve is located along the western boarder, which acts as the	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.

⁵¹ This error was also noted in the Council submission under #751.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – Appendix E, page 35 (page 774 of PDF) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

⁵⁴ Open space zones are considered a QM response, see s42A of Anita Hansbury (para 6.22.7) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/11-Anita-Hansbury-Section-42A-Report-FINAL.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>divider between it and the Nga Puna Wai sporting grounds.</p> <p>Three parcels appear to make up the sum of the site, with Council being the dominant landowner. The Canterbury Agricultural & Pastoral Association are the only other landowner and own the lot within the grounds where the main building is located.</p> <p>Ownership and interests to develop or otherwise aside, the site is currently highly constrained by the aforementioned surrounding features. A master planning exercise would be needed in order to appropriately manage effects on these features and effects on future occupiers. Due to the above, the request would be contrary to Chapter 6 of the CRPS and the prerequisites detailed therein, particularly in relation to the integration of transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Relevant objectives (1-3, 5, 6, and 8) in the NPS-UD seek to deliver a well-functioning urban environment, supporting a competitive market that improves housing sufficiency and enables development that is either located within or around a commercial centre, or is well-serviced by existing or serviced transport, or there is high demand for housing in the area relative to other areas within the urban environment. Developments should also be achieved in a manner</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>that takes into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, support greenhouse gas reductions and the resilience to current and future effects of climate change.</p> <p>The site is not subject to any operative Plan significant natural hazard or climate change related overlays or features. However, the site is currently zoned open space and re-zoning this for residential purposes would remove local access to open space. This is particularly relevant for Strategic Objective 3.3.9, which focuses on accessibility to a network of public open space and recreation.</p> <p>Overall, it is recommended that the request is rejected on merit.</p>		
<p>KI Commercial Limited⁵⁵ S42A author: Ike Kleynbos</p>	<p>51 Heberden Avenue, Scarborough Planning Map 48</p>	<p>Operative – RH (Residential Hills Zone) / RuPH (Rural Port Hills Zone) Notified – RH / RuPH Requested – MUZ (Mixed Use Zone) or RH (Residential Hills Zone) – either zone over entirety of site, and removal of all QMs</p>	<p>Reject in part insofar as it relates the RuUF zoned part of the site – PC14 proposes no change from the Operative District Plan. Land is not in a policy 3 area nor is RuPH zoned land a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.</p>	<p>Reject – This 2,757sqm property is located on the lower slopes of Scarborough Hill, encompassing moderate to steeply sloping ground (30-80°), as per the 2014 geotechnical statement prepared for the original subdivision. A 2022 subdivision application for is currently on hold pending further information (RMA/2022/1334). Outstanding consenting issues relate to geotechnical reporting, access, cultural impacts, and rural zone controls. The</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for the Reasons in Part 7 of the Report</p>

⁵⁵ s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – Appendix E, page 36 (page 775 of PDF) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>site is within the Ngā Tūranga Tūpuna area of cultural significance.</p> <p>PC14 has proposed a number of QMs that influence the site. All coastal hazards are located at the foot of the site along Heberden Avenue, with the entirety of the site being an area of cultural significance.</p> <p>The request would extend the zoning at the rear of the site by between approximately 7-12m in depth, adding approximately 770sqm of residentially zoned land. The reasons for the original zone boundary relative to the site boundary are unclear, however the effects of such a change can be considered with relevant QMs. These QMs remain relevant through such a zone change and should continue to apply to the site.</p> <p>The development would be contrary to Strategic Objective 3.3.9 and Objective 3.3.16 due to the effects on Ngāi Tahu values.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the request is rejected on merit.</p>		
887 – Jane Harrow ⁵⁶	384, 388, 420,	Operative – RuUF (Rural Urban Fringe Zone) / RNN	Reject to the extent the relief goes	Accept in part ⁵⁷ – This group of properties totals an area of some	Accept in part, to the extent the	Reject rezoning to rural fringe for the

⁵⁶ s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – Appendix D, page 98 (page 634 of PDF) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

⁵⁷ Rural expansion is considered out of scope under paras 6.1.114 and 8.1.4 in the s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
S42A author: Ike Kleynbos	422, 424, 426, and 434 Sawyers Arms Road. 123 & 141 Gardiners Road. Planning Map 18	(Residential New Neighbourhood Zone) Notified – RuUF / FUZ (Future Urban Zone) Requested – FUZ (Future Urban Zone) or MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone)	beyond seeking the retention of the notified FUZ part of the land – PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning, but only changes the name of the RNN Zoned part of the land to FUZ. Land is not in a policy 3 area nor a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.	32.1ha and is located along the edge of residential areas on the northwestern side of Christchurch City. The Gardiners Road sites have been historically split zoned due to the alignment of the operative Airport Noise Contour, resulting in areas affected by the contour being rurally zoned and unaffected areas being RNN (now FUZ). All Sawyers Arms Road sites are fully affected by the contour under the operative Plan. Airport noise contours have been reviewed and proposed to be adjusted, being incorporated as an updated QM. This has modified the spatial extent of the contour in this area, meaning that contour would no longer apply to either of the Gardiners Road sites, nor 388 and 384 Sawyers Arms Road. The majority of 420, 424, and 426 Sawyers Arms Road is covered by the contour, with all of 422 Sawyers Arms Road covered. Based on these changes, there is merit in reviewing the rural-residential zone boundary according to the new contour. Doing so would zone approximately 17.5ha of land. At a maximum RNN density of 25 hh/ha, this would enable the development of some 430 residential units, or about 260 residential units at the 15 hh/ha minimum density for the zone. Given the greenfield nature of this area and the applicability of the LPTAA, a FUZ	submission seeks retention of the FUZ part of the land as notified. Otherwise, reject.	reasons recommended by Council but the Panel recommends to accept the request for MRZ for reasons in Part 4 of the Report

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>response would be considered appropriate.</p> <p>Part of this area is detailed in Map A of the CRPS. The boundary of the greenfield priority area aligns with the operative extent of the Airport Noise Contour. With the contour now being remodelled and proposed to be reduced in this area, there appears to be a case to extend the greenfield priority area accordingly. Policy 6.3.5 of the CRPS has an avoid direction for development beneath the contour. Objective 6.2.1 (3) recognises that other parts of the CRPS may provide for development where outside an urban area or not a greenfield development area.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.2 establishes the conditions for urban expansion. While an avoid direction for expansion, to summarise, this appears to be conditional on the following being achieved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban consolidation, increasing over specified periods; 2. Intensifying within and around commercial centres and mixed use developments; 3. Supporting the CBD; 4. Developing in accordance with Map A development areas at a rate where infrastructure can support growth; 		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>5. Sustainable growth of satellite towns beyond the Christchurch TA boundary;</p> <p>6. Management of rural residential development; and</p> <p>7. Provide for development opportunities on Māori Reserves.</p> <p>Sub-clauses 5-7 of CRPS Objective 6.2.2 are not relevant as the request is for residential zoning within the Christchurch TA boundary and does not relate to Māori Reserves. Urban consolidation in Christchurch has been occurring for several years, meeting and exceeding CRPS targets since 2018. This has been further reinforced through proposed PC14 intensification across both residential and commercial areas, meeting sub-clauses 1, 2, and 3. As previous, the area is partially within an identified greenfield priority area in Map A, which appears to have been shaped by the operative Airport Noise Contour, seemingly addressing sub-clause 4.</p> <p>Sub-clause 4 also requires that Policy 6.3.12 is met if the area is a Future Development Area. The area is considered to partially represent a greenfield priority area and is therefore not considered to be relevant. Re-zoning areas no longer affected by the Airport Noise Contour is therefore seen to align with Objective 6.2.2.</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>Putting the issues of airport noise and CPRS aside, the area is covered by LUC Class 2 Soils. Clause 3.5 (7) of the NPS-HPL states that prior to an RPS being updated, areas zoned rural or rural production with LUC 1-3 soils that are not within an identified future urban development area should be treated as highly productive land. Clause 1.3 (4) states that zones referred to are those detailed in National Planning Standards, or nearest equivalent if not implemented. The District Plan has yet to implement National Planning Standards and therefore an equivalent must be derived from applicable zone objectives, policies, and rules. With this in mind, the RuUF zone provides for the same land use activities similar to other productive rural zones, such as Rural Banks Peninsula, albeit at a smaller scale. It is therefore considered that the nearest equivalent to RuUF is General Rural Zone. However, as detailed above, Map A of the CRPS does include part of the subject area and there may be grounds to consider a wider area as also forming a greenfield priority area, subject to the airport noise contour changing. This means that Clause 3.5 (7)(b)(i) either applies to some or all of the area, being identified as an area for future urban development.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the request is accepted in-part on its merit, zoning 123 and 141 Gardiners</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				Road and 388 and 384 Sawyers Arms Road to FUZ, and split zoning 420, 424, and 426 Sawyers Arms Road to apply FUZ over areas unaffected by the contour. This recommendation is subject to the Panel agreeing that those parts of the site outside the airport noise contour can be considered as a greenfield priority area. However, if the Panel does not support this view, it is recommended that the request is accepted in-part on merit, only re-zoning those areas unaffected by airport noise contours as FUZ.		
593 – Cashmere Park Limited, Hartwell Investment Trust and Robert Brown ⁵⁸ S42A author: Ian Bayliss	126 Sparks Road / 17 Northaw Street / 36 Leistrella Road / 240, 236, 200 Cashmere Road	Operative – RuUF (Rural Urban Fringe Zone) / RNN (Residential New Neighbourhood Zone) Notified – RuUF / FUZ Requested – MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone)	Reject insofar as it relates to rezoning the RuUF Zone – PC14 proposes no change from the Operative District Plan. This land is not a Policy 3 area nor a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test. Also see paragraphs 6.2 to 6.6 of Council's legal submissions on residential zones dated 26 October 2023 (here).	Reject – see pages 78 to 82 of the s42A of Ian Bayliss ⁵⁹ .	Reject	Reject rezoning to rural fringe for the reasons recommended by Council but the Panel recommends to accept the request for MRZ for the reasons in Part 4 and 5 of the Report

⁵⁸ S42A report of Ian Bayliss – paras 8.8.15 to 8.8.18 (pages 78 to 82 of PDF) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/12-Ian-Bayliss-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

⁵⁹ Ibid.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			Also refer to cross-examination of Bryan McGillan (Week 6).			
<p>826 – LMM Investments 2012 Limited⁶⁰</p> <p>S42A author: Ike Kleynbos</p>	<p>144, 165 Turners Road / 240 Spencerville Road</p>	<p>Operative – Specific Purpose (Golf Resort) Zone / Open Space Water and Margins Zone</p> <p>Notified – Specific Purpose (Golf Resort) Zone / Open Space Water and Margins Zone</p> <p>Requested – Medium Density Residential Zone</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 proposes no change from the Operative District Plan. Not a Policy 3 area nor a relevant residential zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test. Also see paragraphs 6.2 to 6.6 of Council's legal submissions on residential zones dated 26 October 2023 (here).</p> <p>Also refer to cross-examination of Jonathan Clease (Week 6)</p>	<p>Reject⁶¹ – The Whisper Creek Golf course lies on 132ha of Specific Purpose (Golf Course) zoned land, located some 6km from the nearest substantive commercial centre, being Belfast (Northwood). The site is surrounded by rural and open space zones. The nearest residential area is the Spencerville township, located approximately 1.4km east of the site and has a population of some 500 people (Stats NZ 2018 Census).</p> <p>Relevant operative district plan overlays include: the Flood Management Area; Flood Ponding Management Area; and High Flood Hazard Management Area – the sum of which cover the majority of the site. The only parts of the site unaffected are areas which front 144 and 165 Turners Road, estimated to total some 25ha.</p> <p>LUC Class 2 soils cover approximately 80% of the site, leaving some 27ha unaffected (the majority of which is also unaffected by flood hazards). Despite this, Clause 3.5 (7) of NPS-HPL states that prior to an RPS being updated, areas zoned rural or rural</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for the reasons in Part 7 of the Report</p>

⁶⁰ S42A report of Ike Kleynbos – page 1 of Appendix D (page 537 of PDF): <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

⁶¹ No merits discussion was included in the s42A report as the request was considered out of scope. See Ibid reference and para 6.1.112 (page 58).

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>production with LUC 1-3 soils that are not within an identified future urban development area should be treated as highly productive land and urban development is avoided (Policy 5). The Specific Purpose (Golf Resort) zoning is not considered to be an equivalent to rural or general rural under national planning standards and therefore the NPS-HPL is not considered relevant. In addition, the CPRS does not identify the site as being within a future growth area.</p> <p>Considering the remaining zoning alternatives in national planning standards, it is considered that the nearest equivalent is considered to either be a bespoke 'Special Purpose zone', or a 'Sport and active recreation zone', the latter is defined as: <i>Areas used predominantly for a range of indoor and outdoor sport and active recreational activities and associated facilities and structures.</i></p> <p>The appropriateness of re-zoning the site to Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) through the IPI process is directed through s77G, being that Council must apply MDRS to all relevant residential zones. This is defined in s2 of the Act to apply to all residential zones, with some exclusions. Being that the site is not residentially zoned, it is not considered that MDRS or MRZ is an appropriate re-zoning. Furthermore, the site fails to</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>meet the definition of being within an 'urban environment' under s77F, being that it is not current, or intends to be, predominately urban in character, or part of a housing or labour market of at least 10,000 people.</p> <p>In conclusion, in consideration of the above it is recommended that the zoning request is rejected on merit.</p>		
<p>443 – Summerset Group Holdings Limited</p> <p>S42A author: Ian Bayliss</p>	<p>147 Cavendish Road, Casebook</p>	<p>Operative – Residential New Neighbourhood Notified – Medium Residential Zone / Future Urban Zone Requested – Medium Density Residential Zone</p>	<p>Potentially in scope. PC14 proposes part of the operative RNN zone to be rezoned as MRZ. Potentially an "extension of a zoning change" per <i>Motor Machinists</i>, with potential low likelihood of prejudice to neighbours due to granting and implementation of resource consent for retirement village on RNN zoned part of the site.</p>	<p>Accept – Integrated development issues are substantially resolved through granting of resource consent (RMA-2018-1769) for development of FUZ portion of the site such that FUZ is not required and MDRZ will better achieve the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD consistent with the intent of PC14⁶².</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>Accept MRZ for RNN as set out in the reasons in Part 4 and 7 of the Report.</p>
<p>508 – Michael Case</p> <p>S42A author: Ian Bayliss</p>	<p>60 Croziers Road and 340 Cranford Street, Mairehau</p>	<p>Operative – Residential New Neighbourhood Notified – Medium Residential Zone / Future Urban Zone</p>	<p>Potentially out of scope. PC14 proposes part of the operative RNN zone to be rezoned as</p>	<p>Reject – Delineation of proposed boundary is not clear. Lack of clarity that the Pedestrian Cycle link will be located in this location is substantially resolved such that the East Papanui</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>RNN goes to MRZ for the reasons outlined in Part 4 and Part 7 of the Report.</p>

⁶² Page 29 – Appendix 2 - S42A Report – Ian Bayliss <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/12-Ian-Bayliss-Section-42A-Appendix-264165384.1.pdf>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
R.J Crozier S42A author: Ian Bayliss		Requested – Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ. Unclear if an "extension of a zoning change" per <i>Motor Machinists</i> , as delineation of proposed boundary is unclear, potential prejudice to neighbours of different activity mix remains likely. Unlikely to have been addressed by direct engagement with potentially affected persons.	Outline Development Plan and FUZ provisions can be dispensed with ⁶³ .		
728 – Sutherlands Estates Limited S42A author: Ian Bayliss	All of the residential properties that front Storr Close, Glendore Drive, James Mackenzie Drive and Sutherlands Road.	Operative – Residential New Neighbourhood Notified – Medium Residential Zone Requested – Future Urban Zone	In scope to request FUZ as an effective reversion to the status quo RNN zone.	Reject – Land can be upzoned as development planning has proceeded such that MDRZ can be applied. Land is not subject to Low Public Transport Accessibility Area zoning response ⁶⁴ .	Reject	Accept within Scope in accordance with Part 1 of the Report. Reject on merit Part 4 and Part 7 of the Report. RNN goes to MRZ as notified.
729 – Andrew Mactier for Independent Producers Limited S42A author: Ian Bayliss	330, 250 and 232 Styx Mill Road, Styx	Operative – Rural Urban Fringe Notified – Rural Urban Fringe Requested – Future Urban Zone	Reject – PC14 proposes no change from the Operative District Plan. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test.	Reject ⁶⁵ – Land outside of the Air Noise Contour should retain its FUZ. Inside the Air Noise Contour the land is zoned RuUF. It is outside of the scope of PC14 and the implementation of s77G and schedule 3A to rezone rural land to FUZ.	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council.

⁶³ Page 30 – Appendix 2 - S42A Report – Ian Bayliss <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/12-Ian-Bayliss-Section-42A-Appendix-264165384.1.pdf>

⁶⁴ Page 31 – Appendix 2 - S42A Report – Ian Bayliss <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/12-Ian-Bayliss-Section-42A-Appendix-264165384.1.pdf>

⁶⁵ S42A report of Ian Bayliss (para 8.9) – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/12-Ian-Bayliss-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
819 – Benrogen Estates S42A author: Ian Bayliss	376 Sparks Road, Halswell	Operative – Rural Urban Fringe / RNN (Residential New Neighbourhood) Notified – Rural Urban Fringe / MRZ Requested – Future Urban Zone	Reject – PC14 proposes no change of the Rural Urban Fringe zoned part of the site from the Operative District Plan. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test. There is scope to request that MRZ zoned part of the site be FUZ as an effective reversion to the status quo RNN zone.	Reject ⁶⁶ – Land is considered outside of the urban environment and therefore out of scope of this plan change. On its merits, the majority of the site is covered by the Flood Ponding Management Area. This is considered a section s(h) natural hazard feature and re-zoning these rural areas as Future Urban Zone is inappropriate. The proportion of the land mostly unaffected by this hazard has been proposed to be re-zoned from RNN to MRZ, as an Outline Development Plan is not relevant to this site. This therefore meets the criteria to re-zone the site from RNN to MRZ.	Reject	Reject request for FUZ because RNN goes to MRZ and RUF stays as notified for the reasons recommended by Council and as set out in Part 4 and Part 7 of the Report.
884 - Troy Lange S42A author: Ian Bayliss	120, 100, 88, 76, 68, 66, 60, 46, 44, 42, 40 and 38 Hawthornden Road, Avonhead	Operative – Rural Urban Fringe / RS (Residential Suburban Zone) Notified – Rural Urban Fringe / RS Requested – Future Urban Zone or MRZ	Reject – PC14 proposes no change of the Rural Urban Fringe zoned part of the site from the Operative District Plan. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test. There is scope to request upzoning of RS zoned part of the site.	Reject ⁶⁷ – Land is considered outside of the urban environment and therefore out of scope of this plan change (there is a small proportion that is RS zone, which is within scope). On its merits, the entirety of this area is covered by the updated Airport Noise Influence Area. Density beyond operative controls is considered inappropriate in this area.	Reject	Reject request for Rural Urban Fringe, but in relation to the Residential Suburban Zone, to the extent that the zone is within the 50dB, Ldn see Part 4 of the Report
4 - Ngāi Tahu Property S42A author: Ian Bayliss	35 Steadman Road, Karamū (Riccarton Park)	Operative – RNN (Residential New Neighbourhood) Notified – MRZ Requested – FUZ	In scope to request FUZ as an effective reversion to the status quo RNN zone.	Reject – see discussion on pages 71 to 74 of the s42A report of Ian Bayliss.	Reject	Note that Commissioner Coutts and McMahon recused themselves due to conflict of interest.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / # / s42A author	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
						Reject for the reasons recommended by Council and for the reasons in Part 4 RNN goes to MRZ.
916 – Milns Park Limited S42A author: Ian Bayliss	Kearns Drive and land west along Milns Road (25-51 Milns Road)	Operative – RNN (Residential New Neighbourhood) Notified – FUZ / MRZ (High density residential zone) Requested – FUZ	In scope to request FUZ of the whole land (Lot 500 DP 5795877 in Kearns Drive, and (Lot 600 DP 579587 in Milns Road) as an effective reversion to the status quo RNN zone.	Accept retention of notified FUZ (for Milns Road), but reject request to rezone Kearns Drive from MRZ to FUZ – see discussion on pages 74-76 of the 42A report of Ian Bayliss.	Accept retention of notified FUZ (for Milns Road), but reject request to rezone Kearns Drive from MRZ to FUZ.	Reject submission because all RNN goes to MRZ for the reasons in part 4 and Part 7 of the Report
704 – WDL Enterprises S42A author: Ian Bayliss	109 Prestons Road, Highfield Park	Operative – RNN (Residential New Neighbourhood) / RS Notified – FUZ / MRZ (Medium density residential zone) Requested – FUZ (entirely)	In scope to request FUZ as an effective reversion to the status quo RNN zone.	Reject – see discussion on pages 76-78 of the 42A report of Ian Bayliss.	Reject	Reject sufor reaons that RNN goes to MRZ for the reasons in Part 4 at and Part 7 of the Report
820 – Knights Stream Estates S42A author: Ian Bayliss	11 Kahurangi Road, Halswell	Operative – RNN (Residential New Neighbourhood) Notified – MRZ Requested – FUZ	In scope to request FUZ as an effective reversion to the status quo RNN zone.	Reject – see discussion on pages 85-86 of the 42A report of Ian Bayliss.	Reject	Reject submission and all RNN goes to MRZ for the reasons in Part 4 and part 7 of the Report

RESIDENTIAL TO NON-RESIDENTIAL REQUESTS

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
705 - Foodstuffs (Stanmore)	304 Stanmore Road	Operative – Residential Suburban Zone	Reject – PC14 proposes upzoning of Residential	Accept – With regard to the request to rezone the land at 304	Reject	Reject on the basis of scope as set out

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	Planning Map 32	Notified - Medium Density Residential Zone Requested – Local Centre Zone	Suburban Zone land to Medium Density Zone. <i>Motor Machinists</i> principle applies – potential prejudice to neighbours of different activity mix, unlikely to have been addressed by direct engagement with potentially affected persons. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of nearby Commercial Core Zone – Neighbourhood Centre, just a renaming of the zone to match the National Planning Standards (to Local Centre Zone). Not an "extension of a zoning change" per <i>Motor Machinists</i> .	Stanmore Road to Local Centre Zone, the vacant site adjoins the existing supermarket with housing to the immediate north. The rezoning of 897 m2 of land to commercial is unlikely to change the function of the centre, nor impact on other centres. It would also enable any future extension with existing rules managing the interface with the adjoining residential zone. On this basis, I consider an extension of the Local Centre Zone to be appropriate in achieving Objective 15.2.2 of the District Plan. ⁶⁸		in Part 1 of the Report and in Part 7 of the Report
705 - Foodstuffs (Wainoni) S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	172 Wainoni Road, Avondale Planning Map 26	Operative - Residential Suburban Zone Notified – Medium Density Residential Zone Requested – Local Centre Zone	Reject – PC14 proposes upzoning of Residential Suburban Zone land to Medium Density Zone. <i>Motor Machinists</i> principle applies – potential prejudice to neighbours of different activity mix, unlikely to have been addressed by direct engagement with potentially affected persons. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of nearby Commercial Core Zone – Neighbourhood Centre, just a	Accept – The site that the supermarket building is on (Sec 2 SO 552969) includes an access leg to Breezes Road with an established access for those visiting the supermarket. Reflecting the width of the access (15m), it is unlikely to be developed in the future for commercial activities and would therefore not impact on the coherence of the residential activities along Breezes Road any more than the current activity. However, to manage the potential effects of the rezoning, it is	Reject	Reject on the basis of scope as set out in Part 1 and Part 7 of the Report

⁶⁸ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 157-162 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			renaming of the zone to match the National Planning Standards (to Local Centre Zone). Not an "extension of a zoning change" per <i>Motor Machinists</i> .	recommended that a rule is introduced that limits the use of the access for this purpose only. On this basis, I recommend the rezoning is accepted. ⁶⁹ With regard to Lot 2 DP25816 (204 Breezes Road), the site appears to be vacant with no consent for development. The majority of the site is proposed to be zoned as Local Centre zone except the access leg, which is MRZ. It adjoins the supermarket site to the north and any development of 204 Breezes Road for commercial activity is anticipated to be integrated with the balance of the commercial zone. Notwithstanding this, the access leg is only 6m in width and like the access to the supermarket site, it is unlikely to be developed for commercial use beyond providing access. I therefore recommend the rezoning is also accepted. ⁷⁰		
705 - Foodstuffs (Lincoln Road) S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	92 Lincoln Road, Spreydon Planning Map 38	Operative - Residential Suburban Zone Notified – Medium Density Residential Zone	Reject – PC14 proposes upzoning of Residential Suburban Zone land to Medium Density Zone. <i>Motor Machinists</i> principle applies – potential prejudice to	Accept – The submission seeks that the site described as Lot 1 DP 51902 (92 Lincoln Road) is rezoned Local Centre zone, consistent with the balance of the site as defined in the submission.	Reject	Reject on the basis of scope as set out in Part 1 and Part 7 of the Report

⁶⁹ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 157-162 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

⁷⁰ S42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody Appendix 1 pg 157-162 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
		Requested – Local Centre Zone	<p>neighbours of different activity mix, unlikely to have been addressed by direct engagement with potentially affected persons.</p> <p>PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of nearby Commercial Core Zone – Neighbourhood Centre, just a renaming of the zone to match the National Planning Standards (to Local Centre Zone). Not an "extension of a zoning change" per <i>Motor Machinists</i>.</p>	<p>A resource consent exists for development of a supermarket on the site and this includes Lot 1 DP51902. A 2-year extension was granted on the consent, which now lapses in November 2024. While there is uncertainty of whether the consent will be implemented, the inclusion of Lot 1 DP 51902 as part of the commercial zone is not anticipated to change the role and function of the centre. There is not anticipated to be effects of enabling commercial activity on other centres that have not otherwise been considered through the consenting process. It is therefore considered appropriate that the site is treated as a whole and the zoning of 92 Lincoln Road is accepted.⁷¹</p>		
705 - Foodstuffs (Head Office/Papanui) S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	159 Main North Road, Papanui Planning Map 24	Operative – Industrial General Zone Notified – High Density Residential Requested – Industrial General Zone	Accept – Reversion to operative zoning is within scope.	Accept – The submitter seeks to rezone 159 Main North Road from High Density Residential Zone to Industrial General Zone to better reflect the current activities on site (car parking). This is consistent with the decision on Plan Change 5 and I therefore recommend this correction is made. ⁷²	Accept	Accept for the reasons recommended by the Council.

⁷¹ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 157-162 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

⁷² s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 157-162 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
<p>705 - Foodstuffs (New World Ilam)</p> <p>S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>55 Peer Street, Upper Riccarton</p> <p>Planning Map 30</p>	<p>Operative – Residential Suburban</p> <p>Notified – Medium Density Residential Zone</p> <p>Requested – Local Centre Zone</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 proposes upzoning of Residential Suburban Zone land to Medium Density Zone. <i>Motor Machinists</i> principle applies – potential prejudice to neighbours of different activity mix, unlikely to have been addressed by direct engagement with potentially affected persons.</p> <p>PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of nearby Commercial Core Zone – Neighbourhood Centre, just a renaming of the zone to match the National Planning Standards (to Local Centre Zone). Not an “extension of a zoning change” per <i>Motor Machinists</i>.</p>	<p>Accept – 55 Peer Street is sought for rezoning by Foodstuffs, the submission noting that it “would better reflect the activities and future activities for the site”. The site appears to be used for residential activity at the current time and there has been no consent granted for use of the site for commercial activity. While rezoning the site in a similar manner to 304 Stanmore Road would enable expansion of the supermarket and associated car parking, the site of the supermarket (57 Peer Street) has an access leg to the south of 51 Peer Street. Between this access leg and 55 Peer Street, there are two residential zoned properties, being 51 and 53 Peer Street. There is a potential effect on the anticipated amenity for these properties of rezoning 55 Peer Street to commercial, particularly if the access leg to the south of 51 Peer Street had an increase in vehicle movements as access to the supermarket.</p> <p>Foodstuffs no longer seek the rezoning of the access-legs. It is my view that no distributional effects would arise in relation to KAC’s, or significant adverse effects on the function and vitality of other Local Centres, therefore I am satisfied the</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject on the basis of scope as set out in Part 1 and Part 7 of the Report</p>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				rezoning request has merit and can be accepted. ⁷³		
<p>917 – Belfast Village Centre Limited</p> <p>S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>755 Main Road, Belfast</p> <p>Planning Map 11 & 12</p>	<p>Operative – Partly Residential New Neighbourhood Zone (RNN Zone) and partly Commercial Core Zone</p> <p>Notified – Partly Future Urban Zone (FUZ) and partly Town Centre Zone (TCZ)</p> <p>Requested – Town Centre Zone (for the whole site)</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 proposes renaming of RNN Zone land to FUZ. <i>Motor Machinists</i> principle applies – potential prejudice to neighbours of different activity mix, unlikely to have been addressed by direct engagement with potentially affected persons.</p> <p>PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of Commercial Core Zone land adjacent to RNN/FUZ land, just a renaming of the zone to match the National Planning Standards (should be Local Centre Zone). Not an "extension of a zoning change" per <i>Motor Machinists</i>.</p> <p>There is scope to retain notified TCZ zone, or rezone that land as LCZ as an effective reversion to the equivalent Commercial Core zone.</p>	<p>Reject in-part – Submitter 917 Belfast Village Centre Limited has sought to rezone all of the above-mentioned sites to Town Centre Zone, being an extension of the adjacent Town Centre zoning. The rezoning request would add 1ha to the commercial zoning of the centre.</p> <p>I note the site is incorrectly zoned Town Centre Zone and should have been zoned as Local Centre zone consistent with Policy 15.2.2.1, Table 15.1 and the PC 14 s32. Also as noted on page 8 of the submission, the changes decided through Plan Change 5B have not carried over to PC 14 and this is an oversight, noting a Consent Order was issued by the Environment Court on 1 February 2023 prior to notification of Plan Change 14 on 17 March 2023.</p> <p>Mr Kleynbos in his evidence considers North West Belfast is a 'well-serviced' Local Centre and thus has proposed a height limit of 14m by way of the Local Centre Intensification Precinct around the centre for at least 200m. I note the Local Centre Zone also</p>	<p>Reject rezoning of notified FUZ to TCZ. Rezone notified TCZ to LCZ (to correct error).</p>	<p>Reject on the basis of scope as set out in Part 1 and Part 7 of the Report. Accept the Reply correction to LCZ and commensurate response as set out in Part 3 of the Report.</p> <p>Reject notified FUZ, as RNN goes to MRZ as set out in Part 4 and Part 7 of the Report.</p>

⁷³ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 157-162 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>permits 14m, and as such the heights and density regardless of residential or commercial zoning will achieve the direction of Policy 3(d) to enable heights and density that are commensurate to the level of commercial activity and community services.</p> <p>The following evaluation considers the appropriateness of the relief for extending the commercial zoning of the North West Belfast centre beyond that decided through Plan Change 5.</p> <p>Objective 15.2.2 anticipates commercial activity being focussed in centres in a way and at a rate that supports the function of Town Centres as a major focal point (clause (ii)), gives primacy to Key Activity Centres (clause (iv)) and that is consistent with the role of each centre as defined in Policy 15.2.2.1 (Clause v). This gives effect to the CRPS. The intended role of North West Belfast centre is that of a Local Centre, and a key consideration is the potential for the North West Belfast centre to develop to a level greater than anticipated for a Local Centre. There is the potential for negative impacts on the Northwood/ Belfast centre, which is a</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>kilometre to the south and is identified as a KAC.</p> <p>In my primary evidence I noted that extending the North West Belfast centre without a comprehensive analysis of distributional and urban form effects on the Northwood KAC does not demonstrate or address objectives of the District Plan and CRPS. Mr Heath has reviewed the potential distributional effects since the publication of my primary evidence and considers there would be no adverse effect on the function or vitality of the Northwood KAC which is now a half-constructed Ryman retirement village. I do not consider the extension would produce significant adverse effects on other centres.^{74 75}</p>		
<p>915 - 25 KBR Limited</p> <p>S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>432 Sparks Road, Halswell</p> <p>Planning Map 50</p>	<p>Operative – Residential New Neighbourhood Zone</p> <p>Notified – Future Urban Zone Requested – Neighbourhood Centre Zone</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 proposes renaming of RNN Zone land to FUZ. <i>Motor Machinists</i> principle applies – potential prejudice to neighbours of different activity mix, unlikely to have been addressed by direct engagement with potentially affected persons.</p>	<p>Accept – Submitter 915 25 KBR Limited has sought that part of the site at 432 Sparks Road is rezoned from Future Urban Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone. The submitters evidence states that the site is intended to be developed for commercial purposes more commensurate with the Neighbourhood Centre</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Accept, rezone RNN to MRZ not FUZ as set out in Part 4 of Report and for the reasons set out in Part 7 of Report rezone part of the site NCZ.</p>

⁷⁴ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 154-156 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

⁷⁵ Summary Statement of Kirk Joseph Lightbody pg 4 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Summary-Statement-Commercial-Hierarchy-Hearing-24-October-2023.pdf>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			<p>Refer to cross-examination of Patricia Harte (Week 5).</p>	<p>Zone. The site is 1km from the Halswell centre and I consider it is not reasonable to assume the walkable catchment could be extended to include the site, having regard to the walkable catchments assumed around the largest Town Centres. In any case, I have considered the merits below. The key outcomes sought in the CDP (Objective 15.2.2), and CRPS (Objective 6.2.6(3)) are that commercial activity is to be focused within centres, and any expansion of commercial activity outside centres is to not give rise to significant adverse distributional and urban form effects (Objective 3.3.10).</p> <p>The site is located on Sparks Road and is within a short walking distance of Halswell Road, where an existing neighbourhood centre is located (Corner Sparks and Halswell Road). The effects arising from the rezoning of the site to commercial have been assessed in a report accompanying the submission, prepared by Property Economics, which supports a proposed convenience centre at 432 Sparks Road from an economic perspective. Their report states “The proposed centre GFA of 2,250 sqm and the proposed extent of land uses are considered an appropriate scale</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>that would not undermine the market and future growth of the existing centres under the context of RMA”.</p> <p>In the absence of alternative economic advice, I rely on that evidence. I note that the report prepared by Property Economics was for a resource consent application for a specific proposal rather than to support the zoning request. In this context, I would add that the area sought for rezoning could support a greater amount of floorspace than has been assessed by Property Economics (2,250 sqm of the site which is 7,124m², being 31% of the site, assuming the floorspace is all at ground floor).</p> <p>Consideration may need to be given to a floorspace limit to manage the potential effects. The rezoning of the subject land provides an opportunity for meeting the day to day needs of residents in the surrounding area, having regard to the significant growth experienced through greenfield subdivision.</p> <p>It is my opinion based on the provided information and how that information aligns with the objectives and policies of the CDP and CRPS that rezoning the sites</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				commercial would be appropriate. ⁷⁶		
249 - City Salvage S42A author: Kirk Lightbody	544 Tuam Street, 100-104 Mathesons Road, Phillipstown Planning Map 39 and Central City (CC)	Operative – Commercial Local Zone / Residential Medium Density Zone Notified – Neighbourhood Centre Zone / Medium Density Residential Zone Requested – Neighbourhood Centre Zone	Reject – PC14 proposes Residential Medium Density Zone land to be Medium Density Residential Zone. <i>Motor Machinists</i> principle applies – potential prejudice to neighbours of different activity mix, unlikely to have been addressed by direct engagement with potentially affected persons. PC14 does not propose any substantive rezoning of nearby Commercial Local Zone, just a renaming of the zone to match the National Planning Standards (to Neighbourhood Centre Zone). Not an "extension of a zoning change" per <i>Motor Machinists</i> .	Reject – Submitter 249 City Salvage has sought rezoning of Residential Medium Density Zoned land at 544 Tuam Street, 100-104 Mathesons Road, Phillipstown to Neighbourhood Centre Zone. The key messages conveyed in the CDP (Objective 15.2.2), and CRPS (Objective 6.2.6(3)) are that commercial activity is to be focused within centres, and any expansion of commercial activity outside centres is to not give rise to significant adverse distributional and urban form effects (Objective 3.3.10). The subject land is directly adjoining an existing commercial centre on the corner of Tuam Street and Mathesons Road. The rezoning sought by this submission could therefore be considered as an extension of the Neighbourhood centre. Policy 15.2.2.4 provides policy direction for consideration of proposals for the outward expansion of a centre and can assist in determining the appropriateness of the expansion sought. This reinforces objective 15.2.2 by	Reject	Accept Scope as set out in Part 1 of the Report but reject on merit on the basis that we did not receive any evidence to support s32/32AA and for the reasons given by Mr Lightbody.

⁷⁶ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 143 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>seeking to ensure the expanded centre remains commensurate with the centre's role while not having significant adverse effects including distributional effects on the wider hierarchy.</p> <p>The potential commercial distribution effects arising from the rezoning of the sites to commercial are not included in the submission and the submitter may provide this when evidence is filed. With regard to the centre's role, the extension of the existing Neighbourhood zone by 2,029m² would increase its capacity with the total zoned area being 8,093 m². While this is constrained by the location of the Pumphouse building that is heritage listed, there is the potential for effects on centres in the vicinity. The site is near to the Linwood KAC and Central City with Neighbourhood centres in proximity on Ferry Road and the corner of Stanmore Road and Worcester Street. Policy 15.2.2.4 also requires consideration of whether the proposal is integrated with the provision of infrastructure, that adverse effects are managed at the interface with adjoining zones and the centre is coherent in its form. The centre would still be coherent in shape with the</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>rezoning, and the submission notes the existing rules for the commercial zone will provide appropriate protection for adjoining residential properties. I agree with this.</p> <p>Any expansion is also to be response to growth in the surrounding catchment. The land in the surrounding area is zoned MRZ and there will therefore be additional demand for floorspace. However, as noted above, the question is the extent to which this impacts on other centres. Until there is additional information available, I recommend the request for rezoning is rejected.⁷⁷</p>		
<p>2 - Greg Olive S42A author: Kirk Lightbody</p>	<p>419 Halswell Junction Road, Halswell Planning Map 44</p>	<p>Operative – Residential New Neighbourhood Zone Notified – Medium Density Residential Zone Requested – Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 proposes Residential New Neighbourhood Zone land to be Medium Density Residential Zone. <i>Motor Machinists</i> principle applies – potential prejudice to neighbours of different activity mix, unlikely to have been addressed by direct engagement with potentially affected persons.</p> <p>Not an "extension of a zoning change" per <i>Motor Machinists</i>.</p>	<p>Reject – Submitter 2 Greg Olive has sought the rezoning of land at 419 Halswell Junction Road from MRZ to Mixed Use. With regard to the merits, Objective 15.2.3 (a) is to "Recognise the existing nature, scale and extent of commercial activity within the Commercial Office and Mixed Use Zones...". The site is currently used for residential activity and it is understood the rezoning is sought as an alternative to enable the establishment of structures as a</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Reject for the reasons recommended by Council. Further discussion in Part 7 of the Report</p>

⁷⁷ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 147 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>buffer to the adjoining residential lots.</p> <p>The Mixed use zone enables a range of activities including industrial, entertainment, recreation, community activities (including education, health care, spiritual) and residential amongst other activities. A number of these activities and their associated employment can generate vehicle trips and while rules enable an assessment of high-trip generating activities, the appropriateness of the location for these activities should be considered as part of the request for rezoning. The site is within 400m of the end of the Orange line and therefore within walking distance of a bus route. It is also in close proximity to the southern motorway and there is a potential for reliance on private vehicle to access the site.</p> <p>The land to the west is zoned rural and land to the south east has been developed for housing since the earthquakes of 2010-11. Therefore, the opportunities for intensification of land use in close proximity are limited and the catchment for activities/ services on the site may therefore be wider, drawing people from further afield. In terms of the uses</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>enabled, there is not evidence of a shortfall to justify land being zoned Mixed-use, particularly in terms of industrial land supply.</p> <p>Having regard to the information provided in the submission, I do not consider the rezoning appropriate for the reasons described above. The alternative is the consideration of bespoke rules for the site to enable structures for the purpose of mitigating noise or a consenting process.⁷⁸</p>		
<p>817 – Wigram Lodge (2001) Limited</p> <p>S42A author: Holly Gardiner</p>	<p>850-862 Colombo Street and 139 Salisbury Street, Central City</p> <p>Planning Map Central City (CC)</p>	<p>Operative – Residential Central City Zone</p> <p>Notified – High Density Residential Zone</p> <p>Requested – Central City Mixed Use</p>	<p>Reject – Outside of scope where non-Mixed Use Zones in the Central City (e.g. residential or commercial zones) are sought to be rezoned to a Mixed Use Zone. Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test. See paragraph 5.1 to 5.6 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here).</p> <p>Also refer to cross-examination of Anita Collie (Week 4).</p>	<p>Reject – Below is a summary of the merits of the rezoning requests in the context of the surrounding land use and pattern of development which have been discussed in both Appendix B⁷⁹ of Ms. Gardiner's evidence and rebuttal⁸⁰.</p> <p>As set out in Appendix B and rebuttal, it is considered that the requested zoning change would dilute the residential coherence of the existing residential area, particularly for those to the north of the site who are surrounded by Special Purpose School zoning.</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Accept within scope as set out in Part 1 of the Report.</p> <p>Within a walkable catchment of CCZ as set out in Part 3 of the Report.</p> <p>Reject on merit for the reasons set out in Part 7 of the Report.</p>

⁷⁸ s42A of Kirk Joseph Lightbody – Appendix 1 pg 152 - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/04-Kirk-Lightbody-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

⁷⁹ S42a Report – Holly Elizabeth Gardiner – Appendix B – Page 139 - 141 <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/03-Holly-Gardiner-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

⁸⁰ Rebuttal Evidence – Holly Elizabeth Gardiner – from paragraph 57 <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Rebuttal-Council/03.-Rebuttal-evidence-Holly-Gardiner.pdf>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				Further, whilst there is a mix of activity in the immediate area, notably the Maryland Retirement Village, the Salvation Army community facility, motels and a medical practice, all of these activities are anticipated within the HRZ as permitted activities, albeit with limits on the scale of these activities e.g. community facilities up to 40m ² are permitted, because such activities are considered to be generally compatible within a typical residential neighbourhood. For these reasons this re-zoning request should be rejected.		
2077 – Christchurch Casinos Limited S42A author: Holly Gardiner	56-72 Salisbury Street & 373 Durham Street North, Central City Planning Map Central City (CC)	Operative – Residential Central City Notified – High Density Residential Zone Requested – City Centre Zone	Reject – Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test. See paragraph 5.1 to 5.6 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here). Also refer to cross-examination of Anita Collie (Week 4).	Reject – Below is a summary of the merits of the rezoning requests in the context of the surrounding land use and pattern of development which have been discussed in both Appendix B ⁸¹ of Ms. Gardiner's evidence and rebuttal ⁸² . The submitter notes that the mixture of commercial business and residential zoning has made development on the site challenging to the point that it has not been advanced with the land currently being used for car parking.	Reject	Accept within scope as set out in Part 1 of report at [171]. Within a walkable catchment of CCZ. As set out in Part 3 of the Report. Reject on merit as set out in Part 7 of the Report.

⁸¹ S42a Report – Holly Elizabeth Gardiner – Appendix B – Page 148 - 150 <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/03-Holly-Gardiner-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

⁸² Rebuttal Evidence – Holly Elizabeth Gardiner – from paragraph 57 <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Rebuttal-Council/03-Rebuttal-evidence-Holly-Gardiner.pdf>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>When looking at the wider zoning context and land use in the surrounding area, the split zoning on the subject site provides a transition between the areas of City Centre zoned land in the area and those areas zoned for residential activity (to the north, north-east, and east of the block). In relation to Salisbury Street, the residential zoning on this part of the street reflects the residential zone to the north of the street. Similarly, the City Centre zoning on the southern portion of the subject site reflects the same zoning across the street on Peterborough Street, and on adjacent land on Victoria Street.</p> <p>Whilst I agree that there is some merit in providing a logical extension to the CCZ in this area from a 'contiguous block' perspective, and that the substantially large site would enable a comprehensive development, I do not consider that a rezoning is appropriate in this case. As noted above, an internal boundary transition between zones is generally preferable as this allows for mitigating measures at the zone interface such as boundary setbacks to separate buildings, landscaping, and noise insulation.</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>Further, I am of the view that the well-established activities to the north and east of the site are of a strong residential character, with the motel and church being non-residential activities that are permitted in the HRZ, albeit with limitations on scale. Rezoning the site to CCZ would impose upon the existing and future residential coherence of this area. I note that the land to the west of the site is zoned CCZ and the commercial land uses in this area are anticipated in that area.</p> <p>In conclusion, it is my recommendation that this rezoning request be rejected on merit.</p>		
<p>706 – NHL Properties Ltd</p> <p>S42A author: Holly Gardiner</p>	<p>132 – 136 Peterborough Street (informally known as Forté Health site), Central City</p> <p>Planning Map Central City (CC)</p>	<p>Operative – Residential Central City Zone</p> <p>Notified – High Density Residential Zone</p> <p>Requested – Central City Mixed Use</p>	<p>Reject – Fails <i>Clearwater</i> test. See paragraph 5.1 to 5.6 of Council's legal submissions for Central City and Commercial Zones (here).</p> <p>Refer to cross-examination of Anita Collie (Week 4).</p>	<p>Reject – Below is summary of the merits of the rezoning requests in the context of the surrounding land use and pattern of development which have been discussed in both Appendix B⁸³ of Ms. Gardiner's evidence and rebuttal⁸⁴.</p> <p>The subject sites are currently in a transitory phase of development, consisting of surface level carparking on the NHL Properties Ltd site, and the Wigram Lodge</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Accept within scope as set out in Part 1 of the Report.</p> <p>Within a walkable catchment as set out in Part 3 of the Report.</p> <p>Reject on merit as set out in Part 7 of the Report.</p>

⁸³ s42a Report – Holly Elizabeth Gardiner – Appendix B – Page 136 - 138 and 142 - 144 <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/03-Holly-Gardiner-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

⁸⁴ Rebuttal Evidence – Holly Elizabeth Gardiner – from paragraph 44 <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Rebuttal-Council/03.-Rebuttal-evidence-Holly-Gardiner.pdf>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
<p>817 – Wigram Lodge (2001) Limited</p> <p>S42A author: Holly Gardiner</p>	<p>152-158 Peterborough Street and 327-333 Manchester Street (informally known as Forté Health site), Central City</p> <p>Planning Map Central City (CC)</p>			<p>(2001) Limited site is currently a vacant site on which a community garden has previously operated. Land to the east and north of the subject site is zoned for, and developed for, residential purposes. Land to the west is wholly within the Central City Mixed Use Zone and appears to be in a transitory phase of development, consisting of surface level carparking areas and some commercial activity.</p> <p>When looking at the wider zoning context and land use in the surrounding area, the split zoning on the subject sites provides a transition between the areas of Central City Mixed Use land in the area and those areas zoned for residential activity. In relation to Peterborough Street, the residential zoning on this part of the street reflects the residential zone to the north. Whilst rezoning the site to CCMU would provide a contiguous area for redevelopment with the whole block zoned CCMU, in my view such a rezoning would interrupt the existing and future neighbourhood coherence that the HRZ zoning currently provides, particularly for the existing well-established residential activity in both Peterborough and Manchester</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Accept within scope as set out in Part 1 Of the Report.</p> <p>Within a walkable catchment as set out in Part 3 of the Report.</p> <p>Reject on merit as set out in Part 7 of the Report.</p>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>Streets where intensive residential development exists on the opposite side of each road.</p> <p>Whilst the effects of different activities can be managed by the existing provisions at the zone interface, I agree with the comments made by Ms Williams that managing zone interface effects is generally easier to design for on internal site boundaries where mitigating measures such as boundary setbacks, landscaping and noise insulation can be provided. In addition, such a change may reduce opportunities for residential coherence in this mid-block section of Peterborough Street.</p> <p>Further, as articulated in Strategic Direction 3.3.7(iv), the NPS-UD requires a future-looking perspective and consideration of the changing amenity values over time. Therefore, I consider it is short-sighted to rezone a site based on the activity that currently exists on the site particularly when the residential activity in the immediate area is reflective of the existing zoning, and capacity modelling for the central city demonstrates that there is no need for further commercial development</p>		

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				capacity to be enabled via rezoning. In conclusion, it is my recommendation that these submission points be rejected.		
699 – Christs College S42A author: Clare Piper	21 Gloucester Street, Central City Planning Map Central City (CC)	Operative – Residential Central City Zone (RCCZ) ⁸⁵ Notified – MRZ ⁸⁶ Requested – Specific Purpose (School) Zone (SPSZ) with HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) alternative zone.	Reject in part – PC14 proposes to change a relevant residential zone (RCCZ) to a medium density residential zone (MRZ), being the zone implementing MDRS). Changes to a different urban non-residential zone (e.g. SPSZ) is outside scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i> . Refer to cross-examination of Catherine Boulton (Week 5). There is scope to the extent the submission requests HRZ as a policy 3 response.	Accept – Subsequent rebuttal evidence was provided by the submitter (Ms. Boulton ⁸⁷) on this matter. On merits alone, the recommendation would be to accept the submission for rezoning to SPSZ (with a HRZ alternative zone) given it relates to only one site and the shape of SPSZ sites in this location ⁸⁸ .	Reject	Accept within scope as set out in Part 1 of the Report. Accept in part to rezone as HRZ not SPZ on merit for reasons in Part 7 of the Report.
823 - Catholic Diocese of Christchurch	89, 87, 85, 83A, 83B Sparks Road, and 164, 166, 168, 3/170 Hoon Hay Road, Hoon Hay	Operative – Residential Suburban Zone Notified – MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) ⁸⁹	Reject – Changes from residential zoning to a different urban non-residential zone (e.g. SPSZ) is outside scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor</i>	Accept – ⁹⁰ . Subsequent rebuttal evidence was provided by the submitter (Mr. Phillips ⁹¹) on this matter.	Reject	Reject for reasons of scope as set out in Part 1 of the Report and in Part 7 of the Report.

⁸⁵ [CC_Zoning.jpg \(ccc.govt.nz\)](#)

⁸⁶ [PlanChange14Recommendation \(arcgis.com\)](#)

⁸⁷ Submitter Evidence – Ms. Boulton - [Christs-College-699-Evidence-Catherine-Boulton-Planning.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

⁸⁸ Rebuttal Evidence – Clare Joan Piper – paras 12-15: [10.-Rebuttal-Evidence-Claire-Piper-SP-Zone.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

⁸⁹ Mapping changes – Notified to s.42A recommendations - [PlanChange14Recommendation \(arcgis.com\)](#)

⁹⁰ s42A report – Clare Joan Piper – Section 7.5: Out-of-Scope Submissions: [10B-Clare-Piper-section-42A-report-final.PDF \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

⁹¹ Submitter Evidence – Mr. Phillips – paras 32-38: [Catholic-Diocese-of-Christchurch-823-2044-Evidence-of-Jeremy-Phillips-Planning.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
	Planning Map 45	Requested – SPSZ (Specific Purpose School Zone).	<i>Machinist</i> . See also paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 of Council's legal submissions for Other Zones, Subdivision, and Other Matters (here) .	Given the reduction in properties sought to be rezoned (from 9 properties to 4), the recommendation on merit would be to accept the amended submission ⁹²		
121 – Cameron Mathews ⁹³ s42A author: Ike Kleynbos	Area surrounding Addington commercial centre Planning Map 38	Operative – CMU (Commercial Mixed Use Zone), RMD (Residential Medium Density Zone) Notified – MUZ (Mixed Use Zone), MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) Requested – HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) / MRZ w LCIP (Local Centre Intensification Precinct)	Reject in part, to the extent the submission seeks to rezone MUZ to a residential zone – Policy 3 (d) directs that building heights and density is increased, rather than changing use.	Reject – Intensification of commercial centres is directed by Policy 3 (d) of the NPS-UD and requires a proportionate response to the scale of each centre. This centre is not at a scale that warrants greater than MRZ intensification in its surrounds. Further, changing occupied MUZ area to a full residential zone does not adequately manage the transition in use, therefore retaining MUZ with greater residential controls is more appropriate.	Reject	Accept that within scope as set out in Part 1 of the Report. Reject on merit as no evidence to support s32 evaluation.
121 – Cameron Mathews ⁹⁴ S42A Author: Ike Kleynbos	Area surrounding Addington commercial centre (291 Lincoln Road & surrounds) Planning Map 38	Operative – CMU (Commercial Mixed Use Zone), RMD (Residential Medium Density Zone) Notified – MUZ (Mixed Use Zone), MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone)	Reject in part, to the extent the submission seeks to rezone MUZ to a residential zone – Policy 3 (d) directs that building heights and density is increased, rather than changing use.	Reject – Intensification of commercial centres is directed by Policy 3 (d) of the NPS-UD and requires a proportionate response to the scale of each centre. This centre is not at a scale that warrants greater than MRZ intensification in its surrounds. Further, changing occupied MUZ	Reject	Accept that within scope as set out in Part 1 of the Report. Reject on merit as no evidence to support s32 evaluation.

⁹² Rebuttal Evidence – Clare Joan Piper – paras 12-16: [10.-Rebuttal-Evidence-Claire-Piper-SP-Zone.pdf \(ihp.govt.nz\)](#)

⁹³ s42A reporting of Ike Kleynbos – Attachment D, page 38 (page 574 of PDF) and discussion from section 6.1.133 (page 61 of PDF): <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF>

⁹⁴ Ibid – also addressed in Attachment D, page 89 (page 625 of PDF).

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
		Requested – HRZ (High Density Residential Zone)		<p>area to a full residential zone does not adequately manage the transition in use, therefore retaining MUZ with greater residential controls is more appropriate.</p> <p>Request should be rejected on merit.</p>		
<p>740 – Woolworths</p> <p>S42A Author: Ian Bayliss</p>	<p>North Halswell commercial centre – 193 Halswell road & surrounds</p> <p>Planning Maps 44 & 45</p>	<p>Operative – FUZ (Future Urban Zone)</p> <p>Notified – HRZ (High Density Residential Zone)</p> <p>Requested – TCZ (Town Centre Zone)</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 proposes to change this FUZ to HRZ. Changes to a commercial zone (e.g. TCZ) does not address the proposed change to the status quo and is outside scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i>.</p>	<p>Accept⁹⁵ – A consent order was issued by the Environment Court on 7 September 2021 for a comprehensive commercial and residential land use activity, inclusive of a supermarket to be managed by Woolworths (see <i>Woolworths New Zealand Limited v Christchurch City Council</i> [2021] NZEnvC 133). The buildings of consented commercial development extend outside the operative zone extent of Commercial Core.</p> <p>Rule 15.4.5.2.3(a) outlines the maximum amount of gross leasable floor retail area for the North Halswell Centre is 25,000m² and 5000m² for office activity. Changing the zone spatial extent to match the approved land use consent would not change the operative retail or office limits, no further evidence was presented by the applicant to</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Accept that within scope as set out in Part 1 of the Report.</p> <p>Accept on merit for the reasons recommended by Council and the evidence of Mr Bonis for Woolworths.</p>

⁹⁵ s42A reporting of Ian Bayliss – pages 60-63 – <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/12-Ian-Bayliss-Section-42A-Final.PDF>

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>justify changing the retail limit. Overall, it would be appropriate for the site to have a consistent zoning approach and as such there is merit to the rezoning request.</p> <p>It is recommended that this request is accepted on its merits.</p>		
814 – Carter Group Limited ⁹⁶	<p>322 Oxford Street [presumed as 332 Oxford Terrace]</p> <p>Planning Map Central City (CC)</p>	<p>Operative – RCC (Residential Central City Zone)</p> <p>Notified – HRZ (High Density Residential Zone)</p> <p>Requested – CCMU (Central City Mixed Use Zone)</p>	<p>Reject – PC14 proposes to change this RCC to HRZ. Changes to a mixed use zone (e.g. CCMU) does not address the proposed change to the status quo and is outside scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i>.</p>	<p>Reject – Assuming the submission request was for 332 Oxford Terrace: this is a large inner-city site of some 3,500 sqm, fronting Barbadoes Street to the west, Oxford Terrace to the north with the Avon River beyond, and a small local cul-de-sac to the south with residential zoning along the eastern internal boundaries. The residential zoning has been recommended to be HRZ and is mostly occupied and front Hurley Street. The northern side of Hurley Street is where a six-storey retirement village complex has been consented, which is being developed by submitter #556 – Winton Land Limited and is zoned Residential Guest (Visitor) Accommodation.</p> <p>The site is geographically isolated from the city centre, being some 1.1km from the nearest CCZ. Some isolated CCMU sites are</p>	Reject	<p>Accept that within scope as set out in Part 1 the Report.</p> <p>Reject on merit submitter did not provide any evidence in support of the request. for the reasons given by Council.</p> <p>The submitter did not provide any evidence in support of the request to support a s32/32AA evaluation.</p>

⁹⁶ This submission point was not captured in an s42A report. An assessment of the submission request has been provided here by Ike Kleynbos (merits only) for completeness.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
				<p>located nearby on Madras / Peterborough streets intersection and further north along Barbadoes Street near Bealey Ave. The site is also near a number of NCZ zoned areas, being at the Barbadoes / Kilmore streets intersection, Barbadoes / Armagh streets intersection, and Fitzgerald Avenue and Kilmore Street intersection.</p> <p>The recommended HRZ residential zoning, together with the commercial zoning in the wider area, is anticipated to provide vastly increased residential and commercial capacity, when compared to possible operative yields, with both nearby residential areas (Central City Residential Precinct – 39m enabled) and CCZ (90m enabled) increasing the enabled building heights some threefold.</p> <p>For these reasons, is it recommended that the submission request is rejected on its merits.</p>		
444 – Joseph Corbett-Davies ⁹⁷	Beckenham commercial centre and surrounds [Strickland / Somerfield /	Operative – RSDT (Residential Suburban Density Transition zone) / RMD	Reject to the extent submission seeks rezoning to something other than a residential zone – PC14 proposes to rezone residential	Reject – The centre has been evaluated and is not considered at a sufficient scale where either an expansion of the commercial footprint nor a greater level of	Reject	Accept that within scope as set out in Part 1 of the Report

⁹⁷ This submission point was not captured in an s42A report. An assessment of the submission request has been provided here by Ike Kleynbos (merits only) for completeness.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
	Columbo streets area] Planning Maps 39 & 46	(Residential Medium Density zone) Notified – MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) Requested – Either LCIP (Local Centre Intensification Precinct) over MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) or greater LCZ (Local Centre zone).	land to MRZ. Changes to a non-residential zone is outside scope under <i>Clearwater</i> and <i>Motor Machinist</i> .	residential development is supported. It is recommended that the submission request is rejected on merits.		Reject on merits as no evidence to support s32/32AA evaluation.
809 – Scenic Hotel Group Limited ⁹⁸ S42A Author: Ike Kleynbos	88 Papanui Road 96 Papanui Road 19 Holly Road Planning Map 31	Operative – 88 Papanui Road - RMD with ACF Overlay (Accommodation and Community Facilities) 96 Papanui Road - RMD with ACF Overlay 19 Holly Road - RSDT Notified – MRZ Requested – An alternative zone that provides for visitor accommodation and commercial activities	Reject to the extent the submission requests extension of the ACF Overlay onto 19 Holly Road and/or an alternative zone for the entire site to provide for commercial activities – The site is a relevant residential zone and HRZ has been applied, being within a Policy 3 (c) catchment. The Accommodation and Community Facilities (ACF) Overlay was mistakenly removed from the Papanui Road sites and should be reinstated. However, introducing the ACF Overlay on 19 Holly Road and/or providing for commercial activities throughout the site is outside scope.	Please refer to the rebuttal evidence of Ike Kleynbos, 16 October 2023. To reiterate: There is merit in extending the ACF Overlay over 19 Holly Road due to the efficiencies gained. Accommodation activities are well established and front a core public transport route for multiple bus routes. It is not anticipated that adverse effects on residential coherence and amenity would be anticipated on Holly Road, given both the established nature of the activity and the large scale HRZ response in the area that would ultimately redefine residential occupation and amenity throughout the area.	Reject	Reject for the reasons recommended by Council and the reasons in Part 7 of the Report.

⁹⁸ Addressed in the s42A report of Ike Kleynbos – Attachment D, page 1 (page 537 of PDF) - <https://chch2023.ihp.govt.nz/assets/Council-Evidence-11-August-2023/05-Ike-Kleynbos-Section-42A-Report-final.PDF> and para 6.1.113 of the report.

PC 14 Rezoning Requests – IHP Recommendations

Submitter / #	Location	Zone	Scope Recommendation	Merits Recommendation	Overall Recommendation	Panel Recommendation and reasons
			Refer to cross-examination of Samantha Kealey (Week 5).			