

PC14 presentation to IHP

Nov 7, 2023

Robert Manthei

Resident: Victoria Neighbourhood Area

[Comments in blue are mine]

Consultation Document based on two untruths:

Untruth #1:

“Over the next 30 years...we will need more than 40,000 new houses...” (p5, Consultation Doc)

However:

CCC’s own figures project a surplus of 60,700 new houses over same time frame (Table 4, Greater Cch Hous Devel Capacity Assess, 30/7/21)

“A ‘needs’ driven response is not required for PC14...options based on accessibility and achieving the most appropriate urban form” (Sec 32: Eval, 2.7.3, p12)

[The city is being put through this for nothing?]

Untruth #2:

“Planning is underway...to cater for a population of one million people over the long term...” (Sec32: Part 2: App 45, Transport doc)

However:

1. Projections suggest Greater Chch will have 621,000 in 2038, 653,000 in 2048. (Canterbury Well-Being Index)

2. No certainty Chch will ever reach 1m given variables like epidemics, aging population, natural disasters, dropping fertility rates worldwide, other climate change variables...



Why this purposely misleading approach?

CCC has never explained why they chose to misrepresent housing needs and pop growth.

Result:

An unprofessional, unethical and irretrievably flawed consultation process:

- * many submissions are invalid**
- * feedback not reliable**
- * poor basis for PC14 decision-making**



What can be done at this point?

(1) Unrealistic to stop the Hearing process.

(2) Need to consider alternatives that:

a. accept the process we are stuck with

b. construct a plan for the city that increases densification in ways that are reasonable and environmentally sound.



An alternative rationale for a new PC14:

1. Do the absolute minimum required by the NPS-UD (A minimum approach will still achieve a large excess of housing and business capacity over the projected time frame) (see Option 4:Policy 34-City Centre Zone intensification)

2. Since any plan must be reviewed every 10 years anyway (DisPlanTextAmendments, Chap 3), CCC can use these 'pauses' to review what is working, what is not.

[Proceeding with the current PC14 runs the risk of damaging developments becoming permanent.]



3 Principles underlying a new PC14:

1. Every PC14 decision driven by environmental + climate change considerations. **(Paramount)**

2. Acknowledge densification is already happening. MDRS “...will become enabled in the majority of the cities residential areas, creating an estimated ‘plan enabled’ capacity of 222,478 medium density dwellings”. (New MedDensityResidenStandards Asees of Housing Enabled, Jan 2022);

3. PC14 must still take into account the now-revoked “directions of the CCRP under s74(2)(b)(i) of the RMA (Sec32; Eval, Housing and Business Choice). E.g.,

Greener, more accessible, compact core, greater density, lower buildings as a defining central city feature



What I want in a PC14 (some apply to the inner city):

1. **STOP** housing developments on greenfields land. **City densification and simultaneous development of greenfields is contradictory/self-defeating.**
2. **The real housing crisis is affordable housing. Current PC14 provides no assurance of additional affordable housing.**

In fact, (from Sec32: Part 4, App9, p19), “when looking at what to build, stand alone homes are still what are being predominantly sought out with good garaging options high on the list of required features. The challenge will be to provide these properties at a price point that is considered affordable.”




3. 50% reduction for all proposed heights:

- * 90m to 45m in the Central City;**
- * Victoria St (45m to 22m);**
- * Special Hospital zone (32m to 16m);**
- * all HDZ zones within the 4Aves (14m to 11m).**

4. The recession plane for Chch properties should allow solar gains equal to Auckland's.

Passive solar energy is important to well-being and home heating; Chch residents should not be penalised.



5. Height for Chch Women's Hospital site is 32m at 4m from the southern boundary (maximises shadowing effects on south boundary residences) and 20m at 4m from the northern boundary.

Must be a mistake! Solution: Reduce and reverse allowable heights by 50%, (10m south boundary and 16m north boundary).

6. Maximum 11m in HDZs within the 4Aves (not 14m without consent and up to 32m with consent).

HDZs (e.g., Vic Neighbourhood) consist of small sections, and are already some of the most densely populated areas in the City. Why ruin what is already working well?

7. Increasing tree canopy cover by changing the 20% landscaping area per building site to a 'hard' 25% *tree cover* target.

8. Significant increase in the financial contribution levied on developers.



9. Restore the 'Shuttle' bus service immediately.

The \$50m spent on 5000 extra seats in Te Kaha could have funded the 'Shuttle' for almost 28 years (est \$1.8m per year).

10. Make Chch a 'sponge city', like Auckland.

Mandate 'water sensitive urban design', green roofs, rain gardens, permeable paving, more and better catchment systems for rainwater, planting more trees and greenery (see Muerk's paper in Sec32, part7, App2).

Two more things to consider:

#1: Residents vs Developers

Life in Christchurch survey (2023) asked what aspects of housing people consider.... Privacy, private outdoor space, sunlight access and on-site parking were the primary considerations in choosing higher density typologies (Oliver, Housing and Business choice, Aug 2023, p51)

VS

Conversely, some developers have objected to the level of development control proposed. They requested removal of what they perceive as barriers to development (Ibid, p51)

[Which view will hold sway?]

**#2 Sarah-Jane Oliver, Planning Officer, PC14:
“Strategic overview...Update with Corrections”, 10/10/23**

10.31 Concluding points on housing demand:

- i. The MDRS and NPS-UD Policy 3 response is not required to resolve a housing demand issue and the Operative District Plan already provides a level of enablement to meet long term housing demand projections. (∴ PC14 not needed)**
- ii. The MDRS and NPS-UD Policy 3 directs a level of enablement that is likely to meet 80-100 years of growth, based on unchanged immigration policy and/or other significant world and natural hazard events. (NPS-UD’s long term view is 30 years!)**

[So, tell me again why the CCC wants PC14?]



Finally,

Why this ‘extreme’ densification plan when there is no need for it and there are so many future housing + population uncertainties?

Instead, why not adopt a ‘do-the-least-possible’ and ‘review it every 10 years’ approach?

And, as we do this, might we listen to and take greater heed of residents’ input, not just developers’ and ‘experts’?

