

**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 PLANNING EXPERTS**

06 and 13 November

---

## INTRODUCTION

1. This joint witness statement relates to expert conferencing on the topic of **Planning – Mixed Use Zones only**. It includes related definitions in Chapter 2.
2. The expert conferencing was held on 6 and 13 November. Clare Piper only attended the second session, to discuss transport provisions applicable to the mixed use zone.
3. Attendees at the conference were:
  - (a) **Kirk Lightbody**, for Christchurch City Council. Kirk provided a [statement of evidence](#) dated 11 August 2023 on planning matters in response to submissions and a [rebuttal statement of evidence](#) dated 9 October 2023.
  - (b) **Clare Piper (13<sup>th</sup> November session only)**, for Christchurch City Council. Clare provided a [statement of evidence](#) dated 11 August 2023 on transport matters in response to submissions and a [rebuttal statement of evidence](#) dated 9 October 2023.
  - (c) **Adele Radburnd**, for ChristchurchNZ. Adele provided a [statement of evidence](#) dated 20 August 2023 on the provisions of the mixed use zone and other matters.

## 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 **Planning including transport** issues relevant to the Mixed Use Zone provisions of PC14 only.
7. All attendees reviewed **relevant s32 reports, evidence, s42A reports, other reports** in advance of the conferencing.
8. **Annexure A** records the agreed issues, areas of disagreement and the reasons, along with any reservations.
9. Where agreement has been reached on revised provisions, this statement includes a further evaluation pursuant to **s32AA** of the Act.

Date: 24 November 2023



---

**Kirk Lightbody**



---

**Clare Piper**



---

**Adele Radburn**

## ANNEXURE A – EXPERT CONFERENCING ON PLANNING PROVISIONS FOR THE MIXED USE ZONE

Participants: Kirk Lightbody, Adele Radburnd and Clare Piper (12<sup>th</sup> November only)

### Key to tracked changes

Black – Notified wording

Purple & purple strike-through – Section 42A report wording

Orange – Agreed position

Issue	Agreed Position	Disagreements or reservations, with reasons
Extent of Comprehensive Housing Precinct (and related policies and rules)	<p>Both <b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> agree:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) on the retention of the area agreed between urban design experts of Kainga Ora and CCC dated <a href="#">5<sup>th</sup> October</a> (page 6-8 of Annex A) (updated <a href="#">16<sup>th</sup> Oct</a>); and</li> <li>(b) that the area should also include the western-most area around Disraeli Street because it is continuous with housing, close to a major cycle way, Hagley Park and Addington Commercial Centre.</li> <li>(c) the area between Hawdon and Gasson Streets is also merited on the basis of its location within a walkable catchment and proximity to amenities.</li> </ul> <p>They also agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(d) the development market is likely to prioritize opportunities in areas of higher amenity (around the commercial centre, near to existing housing and close to parks).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Remaining matters of contention / reservation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Whether to include the Phillipstown area; and</b></li> <li>• <b>Whether changes are needed to the brownfield policies for any areas within the walkable catchments that are not rezoned to MUZ?</b></li> </ul> <p><b>AR</b> acknowledged the risk that any areas within the walkable catchments that did not have the precinct (and related provisions) applied, would leave them without sufficient policy direction to guide consent applications for brownfield development (because the brownfield policies are not directive enough and do not seek sufficient quality outcomes).</p>

	<p>(e) that current commercial feasibilities mean that it will be some time before the market widely responds to opportunity in the broader area, providing more time for planning and investment decisions to support the change.</p> <p>(f) retaining the IG zone over the whole walkable catchment area (with or without the precinct) would be less appropriate for giving effect to the NPSUD and the purpose of the plan change – particularly because the zone / transition outcomes would be less obvious/clear, an underlying IG zone would likely be less appealing to the market (developers and buyers) resulting in lower uptake and an industrial zone is less likely to be prioritized by council for complementary infrastructure investment (e.g. streetscape upgrades, local parks and urban greening).</p> <p><b>In summary:</b></p> <p><b>AR</b> supports the comprehensive housing precinct (and provisions) being applied as notified with or without the area between Gasson and Waltham Roads.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> <i>She has not had the opportunity to consider the appropriateness of the Phillipstown area in the same detail as the notified extent so has insufficient information to understand the costs and benefits (and risks) – on matters such as the ability to support changes to the street, the need for greenways / connections to support walkability and whether there is a need to retain some IG land in this location.</i></p>	<p>There is a risk that this will result in lower density, lower quality outcomes than would otherwise occur if the comprehensive housing precinct provisions were applied.</p> <p>She considers that this risk could be alleviated by amending the brownfield provisions<sup>1</sup> to require any brownfield development proposal in these locations to be undertaken in a way consistent with the MUZ provisions (Comprehensive Housing Precinct) that would still apply at Sydenham, Lancaster and Mandeville St (as proposed). i.e., adopt the same approach used for brownfield overlays in suburban locations that reference the appropriate zone framework which applies to the consideration of brownfield development proposals.</p> <p>Both <b>AR</b> and <b>KL</b> agree that if this approach was adopted, the MUZ (Precinct) provisions should apply, not the High Density Residential Zone provisions because the former are more appropriate for the location (more likely to achieve the density, typology and perimeter block outcomes desired, manage reverse sensitivity effects and reduce car dependency).</p>
--	---	---

<sup>1</sup> Objective 16.2.2 Brownfield redevelopment, Policy 16.2.2.2 – Brownfield redevelopment, Rule 16.4.1.3 (new RD9 needed) and 16.7.2.6 (new matter of assessment required).

	<p><b>KL</b> supports it over the entire area within the walkable catchment extents of the City Centre and Sydenham Local Centre zones (as shown on the s42a zoning map here:  <a href="https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/912be292edc64680945c33e14c1fbd3f/">https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/912be292edc64680945c33e14c1fbd3f/</a>)</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> <i>He considers that for efficiency and effectiveness reasons, the same approach should apply to all areas within the walkable catchment extents.</i></p>	
<p>Range of activities enabled in the Mixed Use Zone</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p>Both <b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> agree that no change to the notified provisions is necessary or appropriate at this time to enable more commercial activities.</p> <p><b>Reasons:</b></p> <p>(a) <i>The area already has good access to commercial and community activities given its location within the walkable catchments of centres.</i></p> <p>(b) <i>The further enablement of commercial activity would not give effect to operative Mixed Use zone objectives and policies which recognize <u>existing</u> commercial activity in these zones but <u>limit their growth</u> to ensure commercial activity is focused in centres (obj. 15.2.3(a) and pol. 15.2.3.2(a)).</i></p> <p>(c) <i>Any further enablement could be considered by a future plan change. That plan change could consider whether it is appropriate to limit the scale, type and / or location of any permitted commercial and community activity.</i></p> <p>(d) <i>That strict adherence to the activities listed in the National Planning Standard Mixed Use Zone description is not</i></p>	<p><b>AR</b> noted also:</p> <p>(a) That a more targeted approach to enablement may be more appropriate – focused on key active transport routes and locations where ground floor commercial activity is more appropriate than residential (e.g. south sides of east-west streets).</p> <p>(b) That widely enabling commercial activity may have opportunity costs for housing and may result in the area becoming a destination for trips by car; conflicting with the zone objectives.</p> <p>(c) That the stated objective for the zone is to transition to a predominantly high density <i>residential neighbourhood</i> over time i.e. the mixed use character reflects the <i>current</i> and <i>medium term state</i> but not the long-term intended outcome.</p>

	<p><i>necessary. Not all activities in the zone description need to be enabled and, in any event, CCC is not required to give effect to the national planning standards in this plan change (and is not doing so in respect to the mixed use zones).</i></p> <p>(e) <i>That limits on activities that are currently enabled by the status quo (as sought by the submission of CNZ), whilst merited, may be limited by the Waikanae decision (e.g. new high trip generating activities, service stations and maximum car parking rates for permitted retail-type activities).</i></p>	
<p>Objective 15.2.3 – Office parks and mixed use zones</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p>Both <b>AR</b> and <b>KL</b> agree with the revised s42A wording for the reasons cited in that report.</p>	
<p>Objective 15.2.4 – Urban form, scale and design outcomes</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p>Both <b>AR</b> and <b>KL</b> agree with the revised s42A wording for the reasons cited in that report.</p> <p><i>[in response to a question from Commissioner Matheson] they also agreed that there was potential to delete reference to ‘zoning’ in the policy re: supporting greenhouse gas emissions so that the zoning component is a matter for Chapter 3 and reference to the development framework impacts of GHG emissions continues to sit in this chapter.</i></p>	<p><b>KL</b> noted that in panel questioning (Commissioner Matheson 24/10/2023 at 1.30pm) he agreed that it might be more appropriate for any references to greenhouse gas emissions at a zoning level to sit in Chapter 3.</p> <p><b>AR’s</b> position is that reference to supporting GHG emissions remains appropriate in the Commercial Chapter (as notified) because it supports not only urban form (a strategic matter) but also <i>zone rules</i> that implement the policy (e.g. maximum car parking rules, mandatory tree planting, provisions around walkability (built form, new connections, energy efficient and low impact design etc). She</p>

		<p>agrees that the zoning reference could be elevated to Chapter 3.</p>
<p>Policy 15.2.3.2(b) – Mixed use areas outside the central city</p>	<p><b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> both agree with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amending (b) to specifically list the parts of the zone that are enabled to transition into high quality walkable residential neighbourhoods <i>Reason: it provides more clarity for plan users.</i></li> <li>Amending (b) to include the word ‘walkable’ i.e. “to transition into high quality <b>walkable</b> residential neighbourhoods by...”. <i>Reason: the reference to walkable is consistent with the implementing objective and better reflects rules that contribute to that outcome, such as provision of active street interfaces and trees and the introduction of new connections to improve block permeability.</i></li> <li>Amending (iv) so it reads ‘encouraging” rather than “encourage”. <i>Reason: minor issue but improves drafting.</i></li> <li>Amending (c) so that it reads more positively. i.e. “Enable... if”, rather than “restrict.. unless”. The revised wording would read: “(c) <b>Enable restrict</b> Comprehensive Residential Development of sites <del>within the Comprehensive Housing Precinct</del> that are identified in Appendix 15.15.12 and 15.15.13 <b>unless if</b> the relevant shared pedestrian / cycleway, greenway or road connection is provided”.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Remaining matter of contention:</b></p> <p><b>Whether to include reference to Phillipstown.</b></p> <p>The only remaining matter of dispute between <b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> is whether or not to include Phillipstown as a listed area in (b). <b>AR</b> considers it appropriate to include Phillipstown only if the Panel recommends the inclusion of this area. [see discussion on this matter above].</p> <p>On <b>merit</b>: both <b>AR</b> and <b>KL</b> support limits on activities that are inconsistent with precinct outcomes of a high quality high density residential neighbourhood (high vehicular trip generators, service stations and retail with large car parks) but consider it might fall foul of Waikanae principles.</p> <p>However, in the interests of avoiding conflict with the Waikanae decision, <b>AR</b> is no longer supporting CNZ submission points seeking these changes. She strongly supports consideration of this and other complementary changes in a future plan change.</p>



	<p>Having regard to <b>s32AA</b>, those changes together will more appropriately provide for future development that contributes to a well-functioning urban environment (Policy 1) and proposed zone objectives for the area to transition into high quality walkable residential neighbourhoods (Objective 15.2.3). The revised wording would also better achieve the plan drafting clarity sought by Strategic Objective 3.3.2, making the plan easier to understand, and use.</p>	
<p>Policy 15.2.4.1(b) (iv) – Scale and form of development</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p><b>KL and AR agree:</b></p> <p>(a) That this clause is needed to guide to development in the mixed use zone.</p> <p>(b) If any confusion arises as to whether it applies to the central city mixed use zones, the wording could be amended to make the distinction between mixed use zones within and outside the central city.</p>	
<p>Greenways / pedestrian and cycle connections</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p><b>KL and AR agree:</b></p> <p>(a) With the need for the operative greenway provisions, relying on the evidence of <a href="#">Shaun Hardcastle</a> (para 2.3) and <a href="#">Nicola Williams</a> (para 81-82) that said that the large blocks would benefit from greater permeability to support walkable neighbourhood objectives.</p>	

	<p>(b) With the proposed additional connection at Kent Street being shown on Appendix 15.15.12 – Sydenham, for the reasons cited in <a href="#">Adele Radburnd's evidence</a> (para 47).</p> <p>Having regard to <b>S32AA</b>, making provision for the additional connection would more effectively implement proposed policies seeking walkable neighbourhoods and pedestrian friendly street environments (Policy 15.2.4.2(a)(i)) (Policy 15.2.3.2 (b)(d)), as well as Policy 1(c) and (e) of the NPSUD which promotes good active transport accessibility and a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. In efficiency terms, there would be no costs associated with including the additional link unless the site is developed for housing. Those costs will be most felt by the existing landowners who were directly advised of CNZ's submission seeking the additional linkage provision but did not object to it. The cost of the linkage itself would be funded by development contributions.</p>	
<p>Comprehensive Housing Precinct Built Form Standards (except cycle and car parking)</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p><b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> agree to amend the following built form standards and in doing so reflect the <a href="#">agreement reached</a> by design experts Simon Johnson (CNZ) and Nicola Williams (CCC).</p> <p>(a) Amend the ratio requirement for communal green space from 1:3 to 1:4.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> <i>Provides greater flexibility and improved greenspace outcomes, particularly for large sites<sup>2</sup>.</i></p>	

<sup>2</sup> See also the [evidence](#) of Simon Johnson para 10.

	<p>(b) Remove the restriction on ground floor outdoor living space facing the street for sites located on the south side of streets;</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> <i>Provides more opportunity for sunny outdoor living space for these sites and more yield whilst maintaining an appropriate street interface/level of privacy<sup>3</sup>.</i></p> <p>(c) Amend the standard limiting the extent of ground floor space dedicated to 'living area' so it reads 'living space' instead; and</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> <i>This provides more flexibility to accommodate the predominant apartment typology<sup>4</sup>.</i></p> <p>(d) Minor amendments to (e) and (h) so that the glazing standards would also apply to development that fronts a greenway or other public open space, as well as a road.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> <i>To promote active frontages to public spaces and support CPTED principles.</i></p> <p><i>Having regard to s32AA of the Act, the above proposed changes would better achieve the high quality built form outcomes sought by Policy 15.2.3.2 for development in the Comprehensive Housing Precinct, for the reasons given above. Because they have been modelled and demonstrated to be more workable than the notified proposal, they will also reduce transaction costs, consistent with the outcomes sought by Strategic Objective 3.3.2.</i></p>	
--	---	--

<sup>3</sup> See also [Evidence](#) of Simon Johnson, paragraph 12.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, paragraph 13.

<p>Comprehensive Housing Precinct Built Form Standards – car and cycle parking standards</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p><b>CP, AR and KL</b> agree:</p> <p>(a) Amend to include requirements for charging of e-bikes, cargo bike storage and visitor cycle parking. Charging points to be provided in communal cycle parking facilities, and private cycle parking facilities, at a rate of 1 charge point for every cycle park.</p> <p><b>Reasons:</b> <i>Bespoke standards for cycle parking in the MUZ area appropriate given the greater role that active modes will need to play in the zone to achieve the objectives of a walkable neighbourhood that helps reduce greenhouse gases.</i></p> <p>(b) Amend to remove maximum two space limit on parking.</p> <p><b>Reasons:</b> <i>the notified limit is unjustifiably low – refer to <a href="#">Shaun Hardcastle</a> evidence para 4.8.</i></p> <p>(c) To retain the rules in chapter 15, as notified, with cross references in both chapters 7 and 15<sup>5</sup>.</p> <p><b>Reasons:</b> <i>Enables early consideration of cycle parking needs early in the design stage as an integrated and integral component of the built form considerations for comprehensive residential development<sup>6</sup>.</i></p> <p>Having regard to <b>S32AA</b>, the proposed changes are more appropriate for implementing Policy 15.2.3.2(b) which promotes a high-quality walkable neighbourhood that supports a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. The revised provisions better</p>	<p><b>AR</b> is no longer supporting the CNZ submission that the cycle parking be located within a fully enclosed and lockable storage facility integrated within the building and accessed via a shared path.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> <i>whilst it likely to be the most desirable outcome in most circumstances, it might unnecessarily limit options for developers.</i></p>
--	---	---

<sup>5</sup> Refer to the Transport Hearing Summary Statement of Clare Piper.

<sup>6</sup> Refer also to [Evidence](#) of Adele Radburnd, para 56.

	<p>respond to the outcome of reducing onsite car parking to help reduce emissions, promote other forms of mobility and improve site yield and layout without unduly restricting car parking (over and above the 0.1 space limit already proposed).</p>	
<p>Definition: greenway</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p><b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> agree that the definition is needed and appropriate.</p> <p>“For the purposes of the Mixed Use Zone (Comprehensive Housing Precinct), means: a high amenity corridor for the use of pedestrians, people on bikes and other active transport modes, in addition to the provision of landscaping, trees, stormwater management and informal recreation space. Greenways are not open to general traffic, except authorized maintenance vehicles”.</p> <p>In respect to <b>S32AA</b>, the inclusion of a definition for this term is more effective than without, because it helps with plan interpretation of the provisions, consistent with the plan drafting clarity sought by Strategic Objective 3.3.2.</p>	
<p>Definition: shared/pedestrian /cycleway</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p><b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> agree that the definition is needed and appropriate.</p> <p>“For the purposes of the Mixed Use Zone (Comprehensive Housing Precinct), means:</p> <p>A publicly accessible corridor for the use of pedestrians, people on bikes and other active transport modes that is not open to general traffic, except authorized maintenance vehicles”.</p> <p>In respect to <b>S32AA</b>, the inclusion of a definition for this term is more effective than without, because it helps with plan</p>	

	interpretation of the provisions, consistent with the plan drafting clarity sought by Strategic Objective 3.3.2.	
Definition: accessible residential unit	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p><b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> agree that the definition is needed and appropriate.</p> <p>“For the purposes of the Mixed Use Zone (Comprehensive Housing Precinct), means:</p> <p>A residential unit that is located, constructed, and configured to allow for people of all ages and abilities to move freely and independently, and meet their functional requirements, to and within the unit”.</p> <p>In respect to <b>S32AA</b>, the inclusion of a definition for this term is more effective than without, because it helps with plan interpretation of the provisions, consistent with the plan drafting clarity sought by Strategic Objective 3.3.2.</p>	
Definition: apartment building	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p><b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> agree that definition is not required as there is already a definition of apartment.</p>	
Definition: perimeter block development	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p><b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> agree that the minor amendment is appropriate.</p> <p>“Perimeter block development means an urban form that concentrates building development along the public edges of a city block, with a public face to the street, and private or communal open space to the rear in the interior of the block or individual site. Buildings on individual sites are characteristically joined, <b><u>with those on adjacent sites</u></b>, or are in close proximity to each other, to create a continuous street wall”.</p>	

	<p>In respect to <b>S32AA</b>, the amended definition is more appropriate for implementing the policies of the mixed use zone making the plan easier to understand and use, consistent with the plan clarity sought by Strategic Objective 3.3.2.</p>	
<p>Definition: Pedestrian access</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p><b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> agree to amend the definition as per the CNZ submission.</p> <p><del>A dedicated pathway that provides access for pedestrians from the street to a residential unit and to any parking area for that residential unit.</del> <b><u>A pathway dedicated to the provision of access for pedestrians.</u></b></p> <p><b>Reasons:</b> <i>the revised definition is more concise.</i></p> <p>In respect to <b>S32AA</b>, the amended definition is more appropriate for implementing the policies of the plan, by using concise, clear language that clearly states the outcomes intended (consistent with the plan clarity sought by Strategic Objective 3.3.2).</p>	
<p>Definition: Comprehensive Residential Development</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p><b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> agree that amendment to the definition is appropriate so that it applies to the Mixed Use Zone (Comprehensive Housing Precinct) not just the Future Urban Zone.</p> <p><del>Comprehensive residential development in relation to the Residential New Neighbourhood Zone Future Urban Zone,</del> means a development of three or more residential units which have been, or will be, designed, consented and constructed in an integrated manner (staged development <u>may</u> is not be precluded). It may include a concurrent or subsequent subdivision component</p> <p><b>Reasons:</b></p>	<p>The wording is slightly different between the relief sought by the CCC and CNZ submissions. Both <b>KL</b> and <b>AR</b> prefer the wording in the CCC submission.</p>

	<p>(a) As notified it limits its application to the Future Urban Zone.</p> <p>(b) Both CNZ and CCC made a submission seeking the same.</p> <p>(c) A definition is required to aid administration of the plan provisions.</p> <p>(d) The MUZ (Comprehensive Housing Precinct) rules as notified, show this as a defined term (green), intending for this definition to apply to the MUZ.</p> <p>In respect to <b>S32AA</b>, the amended definition is more appropriate for implementing the policies of the mixed use zone making the plan easier to understand and use, consistent with the plan clarity sought by Strategic Objective 3.3.2.</p>	
Appendix 15.15.10 – Mixed Use Zones	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p>Needs to be updated but once the geographical scope is confirmed.</p> <p>In respect to <b>S32AA</b>, an updated map showing the location and name of the mixed use zones would more appropriately implement the policies of the mixed use zone making the plan easier to understand and use, consistent with the plan clarity sought by Strategic Objective 3.3.2.</p>	
Appendix 15.15.12 - Sydenham	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p>Both agree that a connection in the location sought by CNZ is merited.</p>	<p><b>AR</b> noted that the owners of the land affected were notified and advised of the ability to make a further submission but chose not to.</p>



	<p><b>S32AA</b> evaluation – refer to the further evaluation on page 7 in respect to the greenway provisions.</p>	
<p>Appendix 15.15.14 – Bulk and Built Form standard</p>	<p><b>No remaining matters of contention.</b></p> <p>Both supported bringing into this Appendix into the built form rules as per expert urban design conferencing statement of CCC and Kainga Ora.</p> <p><b>S32AA</b> – relocation of the diagram into built form standards aids understanding of the plan provisions consistent with the outcomes sought by Strategic Objective 3.3.2.</p>	
<p>Other matters</p> <p>Policy 15.2.4.2(d) – Design of new development</p>	<p><b>New matter – not in contention.</b></p> <p><b>AR</b> noted an issue with the proposed drafting of Policy 15.2.4.2(d) that ought to be addressed. CNZ submitted in support of Policy 15.2.4.2 in its entirety – not realising the issue with clause (d).</p> <p>Policy 15.2.4.2 as notified included a new clause to provide policy support for the new small buildings rules in the City Centre and Central City Mixed Use (South Frame) zones<sup>7</sup>.</p> <p>Policy 15.2.4.2 is relevant to <u>all</u> commercial and mixed use zones and so as it is drafted, provides policy support for small buildings on mid-block sites (with no other controls) in the Mixed Use Zone (Comprehensive Housing Precinct).</p> <p>Both <b>AR</b> and <b>KL</b> agree that clause is inconsistent with the objectives for the comprehensive housing precinct. Both agree that the wording should be amended to reference the two zones that the clause was intended to apply to as follows:</p>	

<sup>7</sup> Refer to [notified rules](#) 15.11.1.1(P18) and 15.13.1.1 (P16)

**Enable high quality small buildings on mid-block sites in the City Centre and Central City Mixed Use (South Frame) Zones, because they have minimal adverse effects on people and the environment.**

**KL** has discussed the matter with council planner Holly Gardiner (author of the central city s42a report) who also agrees.

The submission of Kainga Ora that sought workable provisions for the MUZ (CRP) can be relied upon to make this change.

Having regard to **s32AA**, both agree that the proposed amendment is more appropriate than the notified policy for achieving the intended built form outcomes for the Mixed Use Zone (CHP) sought by Objectives 15.2.4 and articulated in Policy 15.2.3.2(b) and the implementing rules. Those outcomes seek a high density perimeter block outcome which are likely to be compromised by the enablement of small buildings (with no design controls).