



**Additional responses to questions asked after presentation to IHP
Marjorie Manthei (#237) on 14 November 2023**

I answered questions too quickly without seeking clarification because I was aware of the queue of presenters behind me and the late finish time the panel faced. In case the panel is asking others the same questions—for an overview of opinion—I'm now supplying more considered responses.

Question 1: Which is preferable: tall buildings with recesses at the top (to let some sunlight through) or squatter ones that could block some sun on some streets?

My response:

- (i) The question suggests buy-in to the argument that we must enable greater heights than the min 6-storeys required by legislation. But, capacity in Christchurch is not an issue, and there is no rapid transit system in place or even likely within the legislated 10-30 year time period. So, why are these two scenarios even being considered?
- (ii) I do not want tall buildings, i.e., more than 32m (8 storeys) in the CBD—similar to the 28m max now. But, I fell into the same trap and recommended max 45m Permitted / 60m Discretionary, north to Kilmore Street. Even that is too tall, especially with the benefits of “low-rise” builds described by Andrew Willis and Alistair Ray in their evidence. Buildings the height of the Crowne Plaza (71m) cause significant wind tunnels, especially with the relatively narrow streets and footpaths compared with high-rise cities such as Chicago. They also loom over us and go against the overwhelming support for low-rise since the EQs.
- (iii) I should have asked “how squat is squat” and “how would the panel and/or CCC planners ensure loss of sunlight would only be on some streets”? And if they could, which streets and how many? However, if “squat” is less than 45m, then I prefer that over the taller building scenario., although the above questions are still relevant.

Question 2: When walking up Durham St to the supermarket, what did I notice about ‘accessibility’?

My response:

- (i) I misinterpreted this, assuming it related to “accessible” footpaths etc for people with mobility or other issues. I now think it related to “accessible services”.
- (ii) There is no “collection of services” (required under “20-Minute City” and walkable catchment) between my departure point—Gracefield Avenue/Durham Street—and Cashel Mall, the nearest services mecca (banks/ATMs, pharmacy, dry cleaners, full post office services, variety of retail shops).
- (iii) There is more info re this in my full submission of 2 May 2023.
- (iv) Also note that my departure point for trip to supermarket was Gracefield Ave/Durham St, the approximate mid-point of the HDRZ north of Salisbury St. From further south (Peacock/Montreal St), it is much further to “services” (1.6km or 22 minutes minimum) and the supermarket (2.1km or 30 minutes minimum).
- (v) The Density Enabler Scores support the above and the conclusion that Salisbury St to Bealey Ave should not be considered within the walkable catchment.