

**BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL**

**UNDER** the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF** Plan Change 14 to the Christchurch District Plan

**IN THE MATTER OF** Submission 259 of Ara Poutama Aotearoa, the Department of Corrections

---

**PRIMARY EVIDENCE OF MAURICE DALE  
ON BEHALF OF  
ARA POUTAMA AOTEAROA THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
(Planning)**

20 September 2023

---

---

**GREENWOOD ROCHE**  
LAWYERS  
CHRISTCHURCH  
Solicitor: Rachel Murdoch  
(rmurdoch@greenwoodroche.com)

Submitter's Solicitor  
Kettlewell House  
Level 3, 680 Colombo Street  
P O Box 139  
Christchurch  
Phone: 03 353 0574

## 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections (**Ara Poutama**) made submissions on Plan Change 14 (**PC14**) relating to the residential activity definitions in the Christchurch District Plan (**CDP**).
- 1.2 The objectives and policies of PC14 and the higher order documents collectively seek to enable a variety of homes and housing types that meet the diverse and changing needs of people and communities, and to achieve a well-functioning urban environment that enables people to provide for their social wellbeing.
- 1.3 The existing CDP definitions of *residential activity* and *sheltered housing* constrain the ability of PC14 to achieve those objectives. Specifically the exclusions in those definitions for *accommodation where residents are detained on the site* creates uncertainty and inconsistency as to the kind of accommodation those exclusions are intended to capture. This poses a risk to the provision of housing necessary to service diverse needs within the communities, including housing with support and supervision provided by Ara Poutama.
- 1.4 I consider any increase in the supply of housing enabled under PC14 should be consistent with its stated objectives and seek to provide for those diverse needs. There is no meaningful effects basis for distinguishing residential activities which include varying degrees of support and supervision, such as that provided by Ara Poutama, from any other residential activity. Any adverse effects can be managed through existing performance standards.
- 1.5 Removing the exclusions from the definitions will have significant benefits in terms of supporting PC14 meet its objectives, in ensuring an increase supply of housing will meet diverse needs of the community. Removal will also result in improved plan administration, by providing clarity and certainty of interpretation, and therefore will be more efficient for the Council and for housing providers looking to meet those needs.
- 1.6 Overall, in my opinion, the amended definitions of *residential activity* and *sheltered housing* as sought by Ara Poutama will be a more efficient,

effective, and appropriate way of achieving the objectives of PC14 under s32(1)(b) of the RMA.

## **2 QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERTISE**

- 2.1 My name is Maurice Dale. I am a Senior Principal and Planner at Boffa Miskell Limited, a national firm of consulting planners, ecologists and landscape architects. I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Resource and Environmental Planning from Massey University (1998), and have completed the Ministry for the Environment Making Good Decisions programme. I am also a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute (NZPI). I have 25 years' experience in planning and resource management, gained at local authorities and consultancies in Aotearoa New Zealand and the United Kingdom.
- 2.2 As a consultant planner, I act for a wide range of clients around New Zealand, including central and local government authorities, land developers, and those in the social and electricity infrastructure sectors. My experience as a consultant includes planning policy preparation and advice, preparing Notices of Requirement for designations, resource consenting and non-statutory planning work, and providing expert evidence at Council hearings and the Environment Court. As a local government planner, my experience was in both policy preparation and resource consent processing.
- 2.3 I have assisted Ara Poutama as a planning consultant since 2015. I have reviewed and prepared submissions, and appeared at hearings on behalf of Ara Poutama for numerous Proposed District Plans and Plan Changes across New Zealand, including others in the Canterbury Region.

## **3 CODE OF CONDUCT**

- 3.1 I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the of the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this evidence and will continue to comply with it while giving oral evidence. Except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person, this written evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.

## **4 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

4.1 This evidence addresses matters raised in Ara Poutama's submission on PC14. To that end, my evidence:

- (a) briefly summarises the relief sought by Ara Poutama on PC14 (Section 5);
- (b) summarises the s42A report commentary and recommendations in relation that relief (Section 6);
- (c) provides a planning analysis of the relief sought by Ara Poutama in relation to the objectives of PC14 and the other relevant RMA documents, including the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (**NPS-UD**), Medium Density Residential Standards (**MDRS**), Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (**CRPS**) and the CDP (Section 7).

4.2 In preparing this evidence, I have reviewed:

- (a) The proposed provisions of PC14, and associated section 32 RMA reports.
- (b) The relevant higher order directions of the NPS-UD, MDRS, and CRPS.
- (c) The s42A reports of Ms Sarah Oliver, and Mr Ike Klyenbos, and recommended changes to the PC14 provisions.

## **5 RELIEF SOUGHT**

5.1 Ara Poutama lodged a submission on PC14 dated 8 May 2023 (submitter number 259).

5.2 As set out in that submission, Ara Poutama supports the overall intent of PC14. In particular it supports the proposed changes to the following objectives:

- (a) New strategic direction objective 3.3.7 (MDRS objective 1) seeking *a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future,*

*including by recognising and providing for development and change over time, including amenity values, in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities, and future generations.*

- (b) Amendment of residential objective 14.2.1 seeking *an increased supply of housing that will meet the diverse and changing needs of the community and future generations.*
- (c) New residential objective 14.2.3 (MDRS objective 2) seeking a *relevant residential zone provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to housing needs and demands, and the neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings.*

5.3 In that context, Ara Poutama's submission identifies elements of existing definitions within the CDP which it considers could constrain the ability of the CDP as amended by PC14 to achieve these objectives. Those elements are:

- (a) the exclusion of "supervised living accommodation where the residents are detained on site" from the existing CDP definition of *residential activity*;
- (b) the exclusion of accommodation "where residents are detained on site" from the definition of *sheltered housing*.

5.4 As identified in Ara Poutama's submission neither of the phrases "supervised living" nor "detained on site" are defined in the CDP, creating uncertainty as to the kind of accommodation that these exclusions are intended to cover. Importantly for the purposes of PC14, without further clarification/amendment, these exclusions may be interpreted so as to preclude those with diverse needs from being able to access the increased supply of housing delivered through PC14 as a *residential activity*. Examples of this are set out in the submission and are discussed further below in my evidence.

5.5 Ara Poutama considers, and for the reasons set out below I agree, that these elements need to be addressed in order for PC14 to achieve its stated objectives, and the relevant objectives of the higher order

documents including the NPS-UD. For that reason, Ara Poutama sought the following broad relief:

- (a) *Amend the residential definitions in the CDP to ensure housing which provides for diverse needs of the community are provided for.*

## **6 REPORTING PLANNER'S RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1 The Council's s42A report has made the following assessment in relation to the amendment of the residential definitions:<sup>1</sup>

*"Ara Poutama Aotearoa (Corrections NZ - #259) requested that greater housing choice was provided through permitting housing for that supports requirements under the Sentencing Act, Parole Act and Corrections Act.*

*I consider that the scope of the IPI is restricted, insofar as it cannot consider non-residential activities where MDRS solely applies and is limited through s77G to only implementing a response to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. I therefore recommend that the submission point is considered out of scope."*

- 6.2 The s42A report considers Ara Poutama's submission to be out of scope.
- 6.3 The s42A report commentary also highlights Council's position that housing provided by Ara Poutama is not a residential activity. As discussed further below, I disagree with this conclusion and consider that it illustrates the misconception that Ara Poutama is seeking to address through its requested relief.
- 6.4 The issue of scope will be addressed in legal submissions presented on behalf of Ara Poutama. The balance of my evidence sets out my planning analysis of the relief sought by Ara Poutama, and why, in my opinion, those amendments should be recommended for inclusion as part of PC14 in terms of the requirements of section 32 of the RMA.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraphs 10.1.415 – 10.1.416, Planning Officer's Report of Ike Kleynbos under Section 42A of the RMA, 11 August 2023.

## **7 PLANNING ANALYSIS OF ARA POUTAMA'S RELIEF**

- 7.1 The CDP as amended by PC14 must give effect to the relevant provisions of the NPS-UD and the CRPS.<sup>2</sup> In assessing the provisions of PC14, consideration must be given to whether those provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC14.<sup>3</sup> The existing objectives and policies of the CDP are also relevant to the overall assessment of PC14.<sup>4</sup>
- 7.2 The key provisions of those documents are included at Appendix A. In short, I consider the objectives and policies detailed therein collectively seek to enable a variety of homes and housing types that meet the diverse and changing needs of people and communities, and to achieve a well-functioning environment that enables people to provide for their social wellbeing. Recognising that, I consider that providing a variety of homes to meet diverse needs is an essential part of a well-functioning urban environment.
- 7.3 I note that the s42A Reports recommend the deletion of CDP PC14 Objective 3.3.7 and the amendment of Objective 3.3.1 to require *a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.*<sup>5</sup> Furthermore the s42A Report recommends the amendment of CDP PC14 Objective 3.3.8 (renumbered Objective 3.3.7) to *provide for development and change over time to address the diverse and changing needs of people and communities.*<sup>6</sup>
- 7.4 I consider these recommendations do not change the overall tenor of the objectives and policies.

### ***Residential activity definition***

- 7.5 As notified, PC14 does not propose any changes to the CDP definition of *residential activity* or *sheltered housing*. As such, those definitions would remain as follows:

<sup>2</sup> Resource Management Act 1991, section 75(3).

<sup>3</sup> Resource Management Act 1991, section 32(1)(b).

<sup>4</sup> Resource Management Act 1991, section 32(3).

<sup>5</sup> Paragraphs 9.7 – 9.9, Planning Officer's Report of Sarah Oliver under Section 42A of the RMA, 11 August 2023.

<sup>6</sup> Paragraphs 9.16 – 9.22, Planning Officer's Report of Sarah Oliver under Section 42A of the RMA, 11 August 2023.

*Residential activity means the use of land and/or buildings for the purpose of living accommodation. It includes:*

- (a) *a residential unit, boarding house, student hostel or a family flat (including accessory buildings);*
- (b) *emergency and refuge accommodation;*
- (c) *use of a residential unit as a holiday home where a payment in money, goods or services is not exchanged;*
- (d) *house-sitting and direct home exchanges where a tariff is not charged;*
- (e) *rented accommodation and serviced apartments not covered by clause (g) and where individual bookings are for a minimum of 28 consecutive days (except in the Specific Purpose (Golf Resort Zone) and*
- (f) *sheltered housing;*

*excludes:*

- (g) *visitor accommodation including hotels, resorts, motels, motor and tourist lodges, backpackers, hostels, farmstays, camping grounds, hosted visitor accommodation in a residential unit and unhosted visitor accommodation;*
- (h) *the use of land and/or buildings for custodial and/or supervised living accommodation where residents are detained on the site.*

*Sheltered housing means a residential unit or units used solely for the accommodation of persons for whom on-site professional emergency care, assistance or response is available, but not where residents are detained on the site.*

*(emphasis added)*

### ***Effectiveness***

- 7.6 As I have noted, key elements within those underlined exclusions are not defined in the CDP, which creates uncertainty and inconsistency as to the kind of accommodation to which those exclusions are intended to capture. The interpretation and application of these exclusions can also lead to lines of inquiry that local authorities are not well-placed to undertake, nor are they grounded in an effects-based approach.



- 7.7 For example, “detention” in the context of those exclusions could be interpreted as restrictions on a resident’s ability to come and go from a property. That would cover any person on home detention. However, it would also cover any household where a resident is subject to a curfew; for example, a household with children or teenagers or supported/supervised living accommodation for people with mental health needs or disabilities.
- 7.8 Both forms of accommodation are necessary in serving specific housing needs within communities. As such, any increase in the supply of housing enabled under PC14 should, consistent with its stated objectives, seek to provide for those needs. However, unless those definitions are amended, both forms of accommodation could nevertheless be subject to more onerous consenting requirements under the CDP compared to so-called “normal” *residential activity* because of the way in which exclusions could be interpreted.

### ***Efficiency***

- 7.9 In terms of housing provided by Ara Poutama, the inquiry into whether residents are “detained” has required Ara Poutama to provide detail on the nature of the conditions which may be imposed by the Parole Board or the Court on those residents, the security arrangements on the site, and whether support staff will be present 24/7 or whether the provision of support is more intermittent. In one instance the Council determined that, in view of these factors, residents of an Ara Poutama community home were captured by the “supervised living/detained” exclusion, while in another case, it determined that they were not.<sup>7</sup>
- 7.10 Ms Millar’s evidence describes how this approach has the effect of distinguishing Ara Poutama’s housing from other forms of residential activity (including where support services are provided), and how that perpetuates the notion that people within its care are not part of our communities. That stigma combined with the costs and challenges associated with the increased consenting requirements (compared to so-called “normal” *residential activity*) poses significant risk to the successful reintegration and rehabilitation of those in Ara Poutama’s care, and to the effective functioning of the Justice system.

---

<sup>7</sup> Decisions RMA2020173 and RMA20221365.

7.11 Furthermore, in my opinion, there is no meaningful effects basis for distinguishing residential activities which include varying degrees of support and supervision, such as those provided by Ara Poutama, from any other residential activity. As set out in the evidence of Ms Millar, those receiving housing support from Ara Poutama within the community carry out all the usual domestic activities undertaken in residential accommodation, such as cooking, cleaning, and sleeping. While some residents may be subject to Court or NZPB sentences or orders which may limit movement to and from the property, I do not consider that these features erode the inherent residential character of the housing nor do they give rise to any adverse effects that would distinguish such housing from any other in the community.

7.12 I also consider that the support provided to those residents by Ara Poutama (even on a 24/7 basis) would not generate adverse effects which distinguish its housing or require a bespoke approach to managing those effects. As Ms Millar notes, there are many examples of people within the community who receive in-home support. That activity would still be considered *residential*, with any adverse effects of that activity managed through existing performance standards (for example, relating to scale or noise). In my opinion, there is no basis for taking different approach to Ara Poutama's housing.

### ***Summary of Effectiveness and Efficiency***

7.13 In summary, I do not consider that there are any resource management-related costs associated with the removal of the "supervised living/detained" exclusions as part of PC14 (or at least clarification that it should be limited to custodial facilities). I consider that there is no effects basis for its retention, and any existing performance standards are appropriate for managing any adverse effects of that activity.

7.14 Critically, removing it will have significant benefits in supporting PC14 meet its objectives, in ensuring an increase supply of housing will meet diverse needs of the community, including in those zones where intensification is not proposed. Removal will also result in improved plan administration, by providing clarity and certainty of interpretation, and therefore will be more efficient for the Council and for housing providers looking to meet those needs.

7.15 Overall, removal of the exclusions will be a more efficient, effective, and appropriate way achieving the objectives under s32(1)(b) of the RMA.

7.16 I therefore consider the detained exclusions should be removed from the definitions as set out in the amendments in **Appendix B** to my evidence. Alternatively I consider the definitions could be amended to exclude "custodial facilities" (where persons are in custody) from the definition of "residential activity". This would clearly distinguish residents who are on custodial sentences from those who are on non-custodial community sentences or orders.

**Maurice Dale**

20 September 2023

**APPENDIX A****RELEVANT POLICY DIRECTION*****National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD)***

*Objective 1: New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.*

*Objective 4: New Zealand's urban environments, including their amenity values, develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities, and future generations.*

*Policy 1: Planning decisions contribute to well-functioning urban environments, which are urban environments that, as a minimum:*

- (a) have or enable a variety of homes that:
  - (i) meet the needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households; and*
  - (ii) enable Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms; and**
- (b) have or enable a variety of sites that are suitable for different business sectors in terms of location and site size; and*
- (c) have good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport; and*
- (d) support, and limit as much as possible adverse impacts on, the competitive operation of land and development markets; and*
- (e) support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and*
- (f) are resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change.*

### **Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS)**

*Objective 1: a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future:*

*Objective 2: a relevant residential zone provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to—*

- (i) housing needs and demand; and*
- (ii) the neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings.*

*Policy 1: enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments:*

### **Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS)**

*Objective 5.2.1 – Location, Design, and Function of Development (Entire Region)*

*Development is located and designed so that it functions in a way that:*

- 1. Achieves consolidated, well designed and sustainable growth in and around existing urban areas as the primary focus for accommodating the region's growth; and*
- 2. Enables people and communities, including future generations, to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and health and safety; and which:*
  - (a) maintains, and where appropriate, enhances the overall quality of the natural environment of the Canterbury region, including its coastal environment, outstanding natural features and landscapes, and natural values;*
  - (b) provides sufficient housing choice to meet the region's housing needs;*

- (c) *encourages sustainable economic development by enabling business activities in appropriate locations;*
- (d) *minimises energy use and/or improves energy efficiency;*
- (e) *enables rural activities that support the rural environment including primary production;*
- (f) *is compatible with, and will result in the continued safe, efficient and effective use of regionally significant infrastructure;*
- (g) *avoids adverse effects on significant natural and physical resources including regionally significant infrastructure, and where avoidance is impracticable, remedies or mitigates those effects on those resources and infrastructure;*
- (h) *facilitates the establishment of papakāinga and marae; and*
- (i) *avoids conflicts between incompatible activities.*

*Objective 6.2.2 - Urban form and settlement pattern*

*The urban form and settlement pattern in Greater Christchurch is managed to provide sufficient land for rebuilding and recovery needs and set a foundation for future growth, with an urban form that achieves consolidation and intensification of urban areas, and avoids unplanned expansion of urban areas, by:*

1. *aiming to achieve the following targets for intensification as a proportion of overall growth through the period of recovery:*
  - (a) *35% averaged over the period between 2013 and 2016*
  - (b) *45% averaged over the period between 2016 to 2021 c. 55% averaged over the period between 2022 and 2028;*
2. *providing higher density living environments including mixed use developments and a greater range of housing types, particularly in and around the Central City, in and around Key Activity Centres, and larger neighbourhood centres, and in greenfield priority areas, Future Development Areas and brownfield sites;*

3. *reinforcing the role of the Christchurch central business district within the Greater Christchurch area as identified in the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan;*
4. *providing for the development of greenfield priority areas, and of land within Future Development Areas where the circumstances set out in Policy 6.3.12 are met, on the periphery of Christchurch's urban area, and surrounding towns at a rate and in locations that meet anticipated demand and enables the efficient provision and use of network infrastructure;*
5. *encouraging sustainable and self-sufficient growth of the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Lincoln, Rolleston and Prebbleton and consolidation of the existing settlement of West Melton;*
6. *Managing rural residential development outside of existing urban and priority areas; and*
7. *Providing for development opportunities on Māori Reserves.*

*Policy 6.3.2 – Development form and urban design*

*Business development, residential development (including rural residential development) and the establishment of public space is to give effect to the principles of good urban design below, and those of the NZ Urban Design Protocol 2005, to the extent appropriate to the context:*

1. *Tūrangawaewae – the sense of place and belonging – recognition and incorporation of the identity of the place, the context and the core elements that comprise the Through context and site analysis, the following elements should be used to reflect the appropriateness of the development to its location: landmarks and features, historic heritage, the character and quality of the existing built and natural environment, historic and cultural markers and local stories.*
2. *Integration – recognition of the need for well-integrated places, infrastructure, movement routes and networks, spaces, land uses and the natural and built environment. These elements should be overlaid to provide an appropriate form and pattern of use and development.*

3. *Connectivity – the provision of efficient and safe high quality, barrier free, multimodal connections within a development, to surrounding areas, and to local facilities and services, with emphasis at a local level placed on walking, cycling and public transport as more sustainable forms of*
4. *Safety – recognition and incorporation of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles in the layout and design of developments, networks and spaces to ensure safe, comfortable and attractive places.*
5. *Choice and diversity – ensuring developments provide choice and diversity in their layout, built form, land use housing type and density, to adapt to the changing needs and circumstances of the population.*
6. *Environmentally sustainable design – ensuring that the process of design and development minimises water and resource use, restores ecosystems, safeguards mauri and maximises passive solar gain.*
7. *Creativity and innovation – supporting opportunities for exemplar approaches to infrastructure and urban form to lift the benchmark in the development of new urban areas in the Christchurch region.*

***Christchurch District Plan as amended by Plan Change 14 as notified***

*(proposed changes shown underlined and ~~crossed-out~~)*

***3.3.1 Objective - Enabling recovery and facilitating the future enhancement of the district***

- (g) *The expedited recovery and future enhancement of Christchurch as a dynamic, prosperous and internationally competitive city, in a manner that:*
  - (i) *Meets the community's immediate and longer term needs for housing, economic development, community facilities, infrastructure, transport, and social and cultural wellbeing; and*
  - (ii) *Fosters investment certainty; and*



- (iii) *Sustains the important qualities and values of the natural environment.*

#### 3.3.4 Objective - Housing bottom lines and choice

- (h) *For the period 2021-2051, at least sufficient development capacity for housing is enabled for the Ōtautahi Christchurch urban environment in accordance with the following housing bottom lines:*
  - (i) *short-medium term: 18,300 dwellings between 2021 and 2031; and*
  - (ii) *long term: 23,000 dwellings between 2031 and 2051; and*
  - (iii) *30 year total: 41,300 dwellings between 2021 and 2051; and*
- (i) *There is a range of housing opportunities available to meet the diverse and changing population and housing needs of Christchurch residents, including:*
  - (i) *a choice in housing, types, densities and locations; and*
  - (ii) *papakāinga/kāinga nohoanga housing, including within the urban area and on Māori land; and*
  - (iii) *affordable, community and social housing*

#### 3.3.7 Objective – Well-functioning urban environment

- (a) *A well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future; including by recognising and providing for:*
  - (i) *Within commercial and residential zones, a distinctive, legible urban form and strong sense of place, expressed through:*
    - A. *Contrasting building clusters within the cityscape and the wider perspective of the Te Poho-o-Tamatea/the Port Hills and Canterbury plains; and*

B. Appropriate scale, form and location of buildings when viewed in context of the city's natural environment and significant open spaces, providing for:

I. Larger scale development where it can be visually absorbed within the environment; and

II. Lower heights and design controls for development located in more sensitive environments;

C. The pre-eminence of the city centre built form, supported by enabling the highest buildings;

D. The clustering, scale and massing of development in and around commercial centres, commensurate with the role of the centre and the extent of commercial and community services provided;

E. The largest scale and density of development, outside of the city centre, provided within and around town centres, and lessening scale for centres lower in the hierarchy;

- (ii) Development and change over time, including amenity values, in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations;
- (iii) The cultural traditions and norms of Ngāi Tahu manawhenua; and
- (iv) The benefits of urban environments that support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and are resilient to the current and future effects of climate change.

#### 14.2.1 Objective - Housing supply

- (a) *An increased supply of housing that will:*
  - (i) *enable a wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities, in a manner consistent with Objectives 3.3.4(a) and 3.3.78;*

- (ii) *meet the diverse and changing needs of the community and future generations ~~in the immediate recovery period and longer term, including social housing options;~~ and*
- (iii) *assist in improving housing affordability.*

## APPENDIX B

### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CDP

Black Text – Original wording of the CDP.

Red Text – Additional changes proposed by Ara Poutama.

(Additions underlined, deletions ~~crossed-out~~.)

#### **Chapter 2 Abbreviations and Definitions**

##### *Residential activity*

*means the use of land and/or buildings for the purpose of living accommodation. It includes:*

- (b) *a residential unit, boarding house, student hostel or a family flat (including accessory buildings);*
- (c) *emergency and refuge accommodation;*
- (d) *use of a residential unit as a holiday home where a payment in money, goods or services is not exchanged;*
- (e) *house-sitting and direct home exchanges where a tariff is not charged;*
- (f) *rented accommodation and serviced apartments not covered by clause (g) and where individual bookings are for a minimum of 28 consecutive days (except in the Specific Purpose (Golf Resort Zone) and*
- (g) *sheltered housing;*

*excludes:*

- (h) *visitor accommodation including hotels, resorts, motels, motor and tourist lodges, backpackers, hostels, farmstays, camping grounds, hosted visitor accommodation in a residential unit and unhosted visitor accommodation;*

(i) ~~the use of land and/or buildings for custodial and/or supervised living accommodation where residents are detained on the site.~~

*Sheltered housing*

*means a residential unit or units used solely for the accommodation of persons for whom on-site professional emergency care, assistance or response is available, ~~but not where residents are detained on the site.~~*