

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS  
IN CHRISTCHURCH**

**TE MAHERE Ā-ROHE I TŪTOHUA MŌ TE TĀONE O ŌTAUTAHI**

**IN THE MATTER OF** Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of the hearing of submissions on Plan Change 14  
(Housing and Business Choice) to the Christchurch  
District Plan

---

**JOINT STATEMENT OF EXPERTS –**

**URBAN DESIGN (HENDERSONS BASIN – EAST)**

6 October 2023

---

## INTRODUCTION

1. This joint witness statement relates to expert conferencing on the topic of the district plan provisions relating design of new development in Hendersons Basin (East).
2. The expert conferencing was held on 3 October 2023.
3. Attendees at the conference were:
  - (a) David Hattam, for Christchurch City Council.
  - (b) Jade McFarlane for Cashmere Park Limited, Hartward Investment Trust and Robert Brown (Submitter 593)

## CODE OF CONDUCT

4. This joint statement is prepared in accordance with sections 9.4 to 9.6 of the Environment Court Practice Note 2023.
5. We confirm that we have read the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and agree to abide by it.

## PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF CONFERENCING

6. The purpose of conferencing was to identify, discuss, and highlight points of agreement and disagreement on design issues relating to the submission on the Hendersons Basin ODP, relevant to Plan Change 14.
7. All attendees reviewed relevant evidence in advance of the conferencing.
8. **Annexure A** records the agreed issues, areas of disagreement and the reasons, along with any reservations.

Date: 6 October 2023



---

**David Hattam**



---

**Jade McFarlane**

**ANNEXURE A – EXPERT CONFERENCING ON [TOPIC]**

**Participants: [e.g. John Smith (JS)]**

Issue	Agreed Position	Disagreements or reservations, with reasons
<p>The Proposed Outline Development Plan</p>	<p>An ODP is necessary for the development of the area and if the area is rezoned, the existing ODP should be used as the starting point.</p> <p>The proposed Eliot Sinclair ODP provided in the submission (map and text except where noted below) would lead to appropriate urban design outcome, but is subject to further agreement on constraints work, such as flood &amp; stormwater modelling.</p> <p>In particular we agree that there would be a good level of connectivity for active transport modes and to existing public transport routes within an appropriate distance, and that the open space network would be visible and accessible. The roads connecting past the stormwater basin provide a high level of safety and amenity to the future proposed Hendersons Basin reserve. We expect that a high quality urban environment would result.</p> <p>Agree that rezoning the area would lead to a preferable urban design outcome compared to not rezoning the land. It will ensure that opportunities between the three significant landowners, who have collaborated to bring forward a comprehensive approach, are not missed with the development of the existing zoned land. These include connections between Cashmere Road through to Sparks Road as well as the future stormwater open space network, which would otherwise not be realised if left un-zoned.</p>	

<p>Clause 11 of the ODP</p>	<p>It was agreed that clause 11 of the proposed ODP should be amended to refer to the map as identifying an area suitable for higher density rather than a walking distance, and the text should be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>Medium density is anticipated in Area 4a, with any areas of higher intensification above 20hh's/ ha generally located adjacent stormwater management areas and reserves and, where possible, away from existing residential zone interfaces to the north and east.</i></p>	
<p>Density and Structure</p>	<p>Agree that the distribution of density is appropriate and support high density in the locations shown on the Eliot Sinclair ODP.</p> <p>Agree that the subdivision should provide for a suitable structure for a greenfield development. To achieve this, at least the following standards from the proposed FUZ should apply (from notified version):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.6.11 a, b, f, g, h, and i;</li> <li>• 8.8.9 where applicable.</li> </ul>	<p>JM put forward that MRZ should apply to align more with intensification goals of the NPS-UD as well as the creation of a more compact city due to the more enabling built form standards, however this zone type is only put forward alongside adopted proposed FUZ provisions agreed with DH (in addition to, and as an amendment to, the submitted ODP and ODP text). The outcome of which JM considered would allow for an appropriate Greenfields development.</p> <p>DH did not agree that MRZ should apply.</p>

--	--	--