

**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 LANDSCAPE EXPERTS
PŪTARIKAMOTU RICcarton BUSH INTERFACE AREA**

27 September 2023

INTRODUCTION

1. This joint witness statement relates to expert conferencing on the topic of **Riccarton Bush Interface Area**.
2. The expert conferencing was held on **25 September 2023**, in person and facilitated by **Philip Milne via a video conference**.
3. Attendees at the conference were:
 - (a) **Dr Wendy Hoddinott**, for Christchurch City Council. **Wendy** is the author of **Pūtaringamotu Riccarton Bush Heritage Landscape Review and Pūtaringamotu Riccarton Bush Heritage Landscape Review Addendum**, and of a statement of evidence dated 11 August 2023.
 - (b) **Sophie Strachan**, for **Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities**. **Sophie** is the author of a statement of evidence dated 20 September 2023.

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 **Pūtaringamotu Riccarton Bush Interface Area** issues relevant to Plan Change 14.
7. Conferencing proceeded in line with the agenda agreed to by all relevant parties and experts.
8. All attendees reviewed **relevant s32 reports, evidence, s42A reports, other reports]** in advance of the conferencing.
9. **Annexure A** records the agreed issues, areas of disagreement and the reasons, along with any reservations.

Date: 27 September 2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. Hoddinott' with a flourish at the end.

Wendy Hoddinott

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SS' followed by a long horizontal flourish.

Sophie Strachan

ANNEXURE A – EXPERT CONFERENCING ON RICCARTON BUSH INTERFACE AREA

Participants: Sophie Strachan (SS) and Wendy Hoddinott (WH)

Issue	Agreed Position	Disagreements or reservations, with reasons
Limit building height in the Riccarton Bush Interface Area (RBIA) to 8m to manage impacts of any future higher density development on the visual prominence of Riccarton Bush when viewed from adjacent streets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree that an 8m height limit should be applied to the RBIA identified in Appendix D of Wendy's Statement of Evidence. 	
Properties identified in Appendix A of Wendy's Statement of Evidence (including 34, 36, and 36A Kahu Road) should added to the RBIA (i.e., be exempt from rules enabling intensification.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree that these three additional sites should be included in the RBIA. 	
Provide additional controls within the RBIA reflective of the Operative District Plan (ODP). These controls address site density, setbacks of buildings, subdivision controls and height controls over St Teresa's School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outlined in points below 	
Site Coverage: Building coverage restricted to 35% of each site rather than 50% of the net site area (Rule 14.5.3.2.9).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed 35% coverage of each site is appropriate for current RSZ. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reason for restricting building coverage to 35% is to ensure viewshafts and visual connectivity between Pūtaringamotu and other planted elements in the setting. Sophie not in agreement that 35% appropriate for MDZ. Reasoning being that the ODP currently allows for greater coverage which is particularly appropriate along Riccarton Road where development is likely to occur.

<p>Minimum Building Setbacks: Side boundary setbacks of 3m and road boundary setbacks of 4.5m (Rule 14.5.3.2.8).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed there is a need to protect viewshafts, particularly for sites adjacent to Riccarton Bush. • Agreed 4.5m road boundary setback is appropriate. • Agreed detailed assessment/ modelling is required to determine effects of 1m side boundary setbacks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wendy’s recommendation aimed at retaining existing heritage landscape environment which includes viewshafts of Riccarton Bush along driveways. • Wendy recommended 3m internal side boundary setbacks, given the proposed MDRS min. building setback of 1m for side boundaries and no setback for common walls would have a significant impact on current viewshafts available of Pūtaringamotu. • Wendy’s reasoning is that viewsheds have historically been set by residential accessway widths. Replacing the 1m rule for 3m aligns with the existing min legal width for rear accessways from all internal side boundaries. • Sophie believes 3m is too restrictive and has the potential to further limit future development opportunities through controls that are more prescriptive than both the current ODP and the proposed PC14 residential zones. • Discussion regarding horizontal controls in some areas overly prescriptive despite height limits being relevant. Discussion whether a heritage overlay rather than planning rules could better address protection of viewshafts. Question: Could assessment be undertaken
---	---	--

		on a case-by-case basis as part of a consent process instead?
Allotment size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed 450m² minimum allotment size is appropriate (consistent with Operative District Plan RSZ). 	
Number of residential units per site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree in principle to limit number of residential units on a site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wendy's recommendation is to limit residential units on a site to two units. Sophie agrees with the principle of limiting residential units on a site but has some reservations about whether two is an appropriate number (ODP no limit for RMDZ). Given that site sizes can vary, some may be able to accommodate further units whilst still protecting viewshafts. Question: Could this also be assessed on a case-by-case basis as part of a consent process?
Special Purpose (School) Zone: Operative height controls of 8m applied to this zone. Views of Riccarton Bush are available from both within the school and as glimpses or viewshafts from surrounding streets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree to retain ODP height controls of 10m considering special needs of schools – e.g., increased height could potentially allow smaller building footprint and greater viewshafts. 	
Provide Medium Density Residential (MRZ) for the entire interface (with height restriction of 8m and controls); then 12m heights (transitional) for properties adjacent to the proposed interface sites on the eastern side of the RBIA, as shown in Wendy's evidence (Appendix D). These MRZ sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree that this transitional approach is appropriate. 	

adjacent to the RBIA would have no additional controls.		
---	--	--