

**BEFORE AN INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL
IN CHRISTCHURCH**

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

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 (the **RMA**)

AND

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

**STATEMENT OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE OF AMANDA FRANCES MACKAY
ON BEHALF OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

**URBAN DESIGN:
SPECIFIC PURPOSE (SCHOOLS) ZONE**

Dated: 9 October 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	1
SCOPE OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE	1
AMENDMENT TO MAXIMUM BUILDING LENGTH	2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. I have considered the evidence of submitters and attended expert conferencing in relation to the Special Purpose School Zone (**SPSZ**) 'Minimum building setback from internal boundaries and maximum building length' Rule (Rule 13.6.4.2.4. iv), as recommended by Ms Clare Piper in her Section 42A Report.
2. I agree that amendments to Rule 13.6.4.2.4. iv (as discussed by Ms Piper in her rebuttal evidence) are warranted, for the reasons I discuss below.

INTRODUCTION

3. My name is **Amanda Frances Mackay**. I am employed as an Urban Designer at the Christchurch City Council (**Council**).
4. I prepared a statement of primary evidence on behalf of the Council dated 11 August 2023. My primary evidence addressed: Chapter 13.6 Specific Purpose (Schools) Zones (**SPSZ**).
5. I have the qualifications and experience set out at paragraphs 15 to 18 of my primary evidence and repeat the confirmation that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023, and have prepared my evidence in compliance with that Code.

SCOPE OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE

6. In preparing this rebuttal statement, I have read and considered the evidence filed on behalf of submitters in relation to my primary evidence, including of:
 - (a) Mr David Compton-Moen for Carter Group Limited; and
 - (b) Mr Jeremy Phillips for Carter Group Limited.
7. My rebuttal evidence considers amendments sought to the SPSZ 'Minimum building setback from internal boundaries and maximum building length' Rule (13.6.4.2.4.iv) as recommended by Ms Piper in her Section 42A Report, which provides as follows:

Minimum building setback from internal boundaries and maximum building length (13.6.4.2.4)

School sites where the additional activities and standards are from the zones listed in the Appendices 13.6.6.1, 13.6.6.2 or 13.6.6.3: High Density Residential (HRZ), Central City (CC), Central City Mixed Use (CCMU), or Future Urban Zones (FUZ).

a. The building shall either:

i. Not exceed 30m in continuous building length, or

ii. Provide a recess for every additional 30 m of building length or part thereof, with a minimum dimension of 4 metres in length, and 2 metres deep, for the full height of the building including the roof.

AMENDMENT TO MAXIMUM BUILDING LENGTH

8. In his planning evidence Mr Phillips suggests amending the wording of Rule 13.6.4.2.4.iv to provide further clarification on its application.
9. I reiterate that I support this rule because it:
 - (a) potentially mitigates adverse visual dominance of bulk or long and continuous building facades adjacent to High Density Residential Zone (**HRZ**); and
 - (b) helps ensure there is a degree of modulation and a scale compatible with the residential zone adjacent (which typically have a finer grain of architectural detail).
10. That said, I agree an amendment can provide clarification and still achieve an appropriate built form outcome relative to the adjacent residential boundaries.
11. In my opinion, Rule 13.6.4.2.4.iv as proposed by Ms Piper could be amended to include all buildings within 15 metres of an internal boundary with HRZ to enable greater management of potential adverse effects of large-scale buildings within the school site on high-density residential adjacent properties.
12. The proposed 15m distance would include buildings designed to the maximum building height and minimum internal setback (notified as part of PC14 for the SPSZ in sub-chapter 13.6 of the District Plan), which enables

greater height closer to the boundary than the status quo, to support a commensurate scale, form, and massing of buildings adjacent to HRZ.

Amanda Mackay

9 October 2023