

Christchurch Central Recovery Plan

Residential Chapter

Public comments on the draft *A Liveable City*

Contents

<u>BUILDING HEIGHTS.....</u>	<u>8</u>
BUILDING HEIGHTS - DISLIKE MARKET OR DEVELOPER APPROACH	8
BUILDING HEIGHTS – IMPACT ON EXISTING NEIGHBOURHOODS.....	9
BUILDING HEIGHTS – NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSULTATION CONCERNS	12
BUILDING HEIGHTS - RETAIN EXISTING.....	13
BUILDING HEIGHTS – SUNLIGHT CONCERNS.....	20
BUILDING HEIGHTS – FULL SUPPORT	21
BUILDING HEIGHTS – GENERAL SUPPORT	22
BUILDING HEIGHTS – SPECIFIC.....	23
BUILDING HEIGHTS - SUGGESTIONS.....	24
BUILDING HEIGHTS - OTHER CONCERNS	26
BUILDING HEIGHTS - OTHER	31
<u>CAR PARKS</u>	<u>32</u>
CAR PARKS – DISAGREE WITH RATIONALE	32
CAR PARKS – KEEP EXISTING	34
CAR PARKS – NEED MAXIMUM	35
CAR PARKS – PUBLIC TRANSPORT, CYCLES INADEQUATE ALTERNATIVES.....	35
CAR PARKS – STREET CONGESTION AND PARKING PROBLEMS	37
CAR PARKS – FULL SUPPORT	39
CAR PARKS – GENERAL SUPPORT.....	40
CAR PARKS – OTHER.....	42
CAR PARKS – OTHER SUGGESTIONS	44
<u>NON-RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY</u>	<u>46</u>
NON-RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY – LOCAL SERVICES OK.....	46
NON-RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY – MIXED USE PREFERENCE	47
NON-RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY – RETAIN EXISTING.....	50
NON-RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY – FULL SUPPORT	50
NON-RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY – GENERAL SUPPORT.....	53
NON-RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY – SPECIFIC	54

NON-RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY – OTHER	54
NON-RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY – OTHER SUGGESTIONS	55
<u>OTHER</u>	<u>56</u>
OTHER – ACTIVITY STATUS	56
OTHER – BUILT FORM AND AMENITY AND ROLE OF CCLZ	58
OTHER – CATEGORIES OF ACTIVITIES	61
OTHER – COMMUNITY	63
OTHER – CONCERNS ABOUT METHODS TO ACHIEVE VISION	64
OTHER – CONSULTATION, RIGHT TO COMMENT, EXISTING RESIDENT CONCERNS	69
OTHER - CRITICAL STANDARDS	73
OTHER – DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (4.A.2)	74
OTHER – DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (2.2-2.4)	82
OTHER - ENVIRONMENT, SUSTAINABILITY	85
OTHER – HOUSING AND RENT AFFORDABILITY	90
OTHER – TRANSPORT	91
OTHER – URBAN DESIGN CONCERNS	92
OTHER – OTHER	95
OTHER – SUGGESTIONS, ADVICE	106
OTHER – DEVELOPER ORIENTED CONCERNS	111
OTHER – SPECIFIC	113
OTHER – FULL SUPPORT	114
OTHER – GENERAL SUPPORT	114
OTHER – DISAGREE, GENERAL	117
<u>OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE</u>	<u>120</u>
OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE – FLEXIBILITY NEEDED	120
OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE –PRIVATE SPACE	121
OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE – PROPOSAL IS UNCLEAR	122
OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE – SUGGESTIONS	122
OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE –SHARED SPACE	124
OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE – SPECIFIC	125
OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE – FULL SUPPORT	125

OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE – GENERAL SUPPORT	127
OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE – DISAGREE.....	127
OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE – OTHER.....	129
<u>RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS</u>	129
RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS – SUGGESTIONS	129
RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS – NEIGHBOUR CONSULTATION CONCERNS	131
RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS – RETAIN EXISTING	133
RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS – RECESSION PLANE COMMENTS	136
RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS – SETBACK COMMENTS	137
RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS – DISAGREE WILL IMPACT ON SUN AND PRIVACY.....	138
RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS – SPECIFIC.....	140
RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS – FULL SUPPORT	141
RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS – GENERAL SUPPORT	142
RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS – OTHER.....	143
RECESSION PLANES AND SETBACKS – OTHER CONCERNS.....	143
<u>RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY.....</u>	144
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY – CONCERN ABOUT DEVELOPER CONTROL	144
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY – CONCERN ABOUT RESULTING QUALITY, SLUMS ETC.....	145
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY – MINIMUM DENSITY	146
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY – NEIGHBOUR CONSULTATION CONCERNS.....	147
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY - QUALITY CONTROL IN PLACE.....	147
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY – RETAIN PROVISION	147
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY – FULL SUPPORT	149
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY – GENERAL SUPPORT.....	150
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY – DISAGREE WITH RATIONALE.....	150
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY – SUGGESTIONS.....	151
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY – OTHER	152
RESIDENTIAL SITE DENSITY – OTHER CONCERNS	152
<u>TRAVELLERS ACCOMMODATION.....</u>	153
TRAVELLERS ACCOMMODATION – SPECIFIC.....	153

TRAVELLERS ACCOMMODATION – SUGGESTIONS	154
TRAVELLERS ACCOMMODATION – CONTROL IMPACTS.....	155
TRAVELLERS ACCOMMODATION – FULL SUPPORT.....	155
TRAVELLERS ACCOMMODATION – GENERAL SUPPORT	156
TRAVELLERS ACCOMMODATION – GENERAL NOT SUPPORT – SUPPORT EXISTING	158
TRAVELLERS ACCOMMODATION – OPPOSE COMMERCIAL USE OF LAND	159
TRAVELLERS ACCOMMODATION – OTHER.....	160
<u>URBAN DESIGN</u>	<u>161</u>
URBAN DESIGN –CONSENT AND RIGHT TO COMMENT.....	161
URBAN DESIGN – INCONSISTENCIES	163
URBAN DESIGN – RETAIN EXISTING AND REINSTATE	165
URBAN DESIGN – SPECIFIC	168
URBAN DESIGN – SUGGESTIONS.....	169
URBAN DESIGN – FULL SUPPORT.....	171
URBAN DESIGN – GENERAL SUPPORT.....	172
URBAN DESIGN – COMMENTS DISAGREEING WITH REMOVAL OR ADVOCATING RETAINING.....	172
URBAN DESIGN –DISAGREE WITH REMOVAL	181
URBAN DESIGN – DISAGREE WITH RATIONALE – REMOVING WILL RESULT IN POOR QUALITY, UGLY BUILDINGS ETC, NOT INCREASE ATTRACTIVENESS.....	186
URBAN DESIGN – DISAGREE WITH RATIONALE – LEAVING TO MARKET AND DEVELOPERS.....	190
URBAN DESIGN – OTHER CONCERNS	196
URBAN DESIGN – OTHER	202
<u>EAST FRAME CENTRAL PARK</u>	<u>204</u>
EAST FRAME – CENTRAL PARK – CAFES.....	204
EAST FRAME - CENTRAL PARK – BBQ, PICNIC, SEATING SPACES.....	204
EAST FRAME - CENTRAL PARK – COMMUNITY GARDENS AND SIMILAR, RAIN GARDEN	205
EAST FRAME - CENTRAL PARK – CYCLE, SKATE, WALKING PATHS, DOGS	207
EAST FRAME– CENTRAL PARK – DISAGREE OR COMMENTS ON SIZE OF PARK	207
EAST FRAME - CENTRAL PARK – EVENTS, FESTIVALS, ART, MUSIC.....	208
EAST FRAME – CENTRAL PARK - EXERCISE EQUIPMENT	209
EAST FRAME - CENTRAL PARK – MARKETS	210

EAST FRAME - CENTRAL PARK – PLAYGROUNDS	210
EAST FRAME - CENTRAL PARK – SAFETY, GOOD DESIGN	211
EAST FRAME– CENTRAL PARK – SPORTS, RECREATION	212
EAST FRAME - CENTRAL PARK – TREES, GRASS, PLANTS, LANDSCAPED, SHELTER	213
EAST FRAME– CENTRAL PARK – OTHER	214
<u>EAST FRAME AMENITIES</u>	<u>215</u>
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – AESTHETICS	215
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – CYCLE WAYS.....	216
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – EDUCATION, CULTURE	216
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – ENTERTAINMENT	216
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – HEALTHCARE	217
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – HOSPITALITY.....	217
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – MARKETS, FOOD SHOPS	218
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – NATURE, ENVIRONMENT.....	219
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – PARKING.....	219
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – PUBLIC FACILITIES	220
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – PUBLIC TRANSPORT	220
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – PROFESSIONAL SERVICES.....	221
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – RETAIL.....	221
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – SAFETY	221
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – SERVICES	222
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – SPORTING, EXERCISE	222
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – SPECIFIC	222
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – TRANSPORT.....	223
EAST FRAME AMENITIES – OTHER	223
<u>EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY.....</u>	<u>224</u>
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY –ACCESS OR TRANSPORT RELATED.....	224
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – AFFORDABILITY.....	225
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – AMENITIES, FACILITIES AND SERVICES	226
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – BUILDING DESIGN	228
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – BUILDING HEIGHT	229

EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – DENSITY.....	230
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – DIVERSITY.....	231
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – ENVIRO-FRIENDLY	232
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	233
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – PRIVACY.....	234
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – SAFE, WELL LIT, SECURITY	235
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – GENERAL.....	235
EAST FRAME LIVING DENSITY – OTHER.....	236

Building Heights

Building Heights - Dislike Market or Developer Approach

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

This change would be disastrous as so called developers would seek only to maximise profit without concern for present coherence. Again, the 'market' would work to undermine existing successful inner city residential areas.

Reference 2

stupid idea producing nasty results with shading and dank urban living. Who would want to live thus? I hope the designers of this plan have disclosed all personal interests in potential property development ventures and companies?

Reference 3

Limiting heights would also encourage developers to build to maximum, meaning a consistent height between buildings, which is advantageous. / / We aren't designing with a completely blank slate either: there are existing buildings which should be considered. I think there are dangers with just a blanket 14m rule without any Urban Design assistance to consider the surrounding context.

Reference 4

Also the limited grounds to be considered in such applications should be deleted as this skews the hearing unfairly in favour of developers.

Reference 5

All developers will wish to maximum their investment return on their land investment and will build to the 14 metre height level. All existing properties will be dwarfed by these new structures and will have their existing value severely diminished due to the shadows that will be cast.

Reference 6

"the market" hasn't yet delivered a range of dwellings, and it's concerning this seems to be supported by developers trying to make the most cash by allowing more space to be built on in a denser way. All planning theory seems to be out the window, it's absent in the LCP rules which focus on benefits to developers. As a prospective home owner I'd be put off from investing my life savings in such an unregulated environment

Reference 7

Secondly, the limited grounds to be considered in such applications skews hearings unfairly in favour of developers.

Reference 8

Secondly, the limited grounds to be considered in such applications should be deleted as this skews the hearing unfairly in favour of developers.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 9

It would seem that it is no longer about people but the almighty dollar!

Building Heights – Impact on Existing Neighbourhoods

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

In areas that I live such as Chester St East, a four story house would be completely out of character for the area. I would support a height restriction of 11 metres from Kilmore St north and Madras St East, leaving the inner CBD with a 14 metre height allowance. / / Currently the Chester St East area has a Special Amenity Area, which requires buildings to have a certain character. To remove this character would diminish the feeling and style of the area and therefore I would not support the allowance of different roof styles and an increased building height. The altered building height will greatly diminish the character of the working mens cottages throughout the area. / / Special Amenity areas to protect the character of zones within the 4 Aves need to be retained.

Reference 2

This is not acceptable. This will allow four and five storey flat roofed blocks anywhere. It ignores the typical heights of one and two storeys in many existing residential areas, including some such as Gracefield Avenue which have many low rise character buildings. Where sites are amalgamated, very large bulky buildings could result. At the same time there may be sites where higher buildings are perfectly acceptable - it is all about context.

Reference 3

I am concerned that the 14 metre height will disadvantage those with houses lower than this, particularly in areas with attractive historic buildings - they risk being dwarfed and shadowed. I understand the need for simplicity but I think a one-size fits all plan will rob the council of a valuable aesthetic criterion.

Reference 4

The height must take account of the height of existing residential housing. It would be unreasonable to build a 14 metre high building beside a one storey historical cottage.

Reference 5

The current range of building heights including the additional 3.5m for a pitched roof design are what help to retain what little character can be retained following the earthquakes of the inner city suburbs they apply to. / / CCC has little enough power regarding development to retain the character of existing inner city residential zones. Don't take this away so that developers can drive higher rise development. We've seen in the past that given the chance developers will build and people will buy, but that doesn't mean the development enhances the character of the suburb. This will destroy the current character of the inner city residential suburbs, There are enough new mixed use areas that do not have height restrictions that will be available for new higher rise development.

Reference 6

14 metres, plus no requirements for pitched roof, is too high in existing neighbourhoods that consist mainly of one to two (or 2.5) dwellings, with maximum of 8m +3.5m roof line. Given the relatively small sections in areas such as the Victoria Neighbourhood where I live (eg Salisbury St, Conference, Peacock, Beveridge, Gracefield Ave), allowing new dwellings of 14 metres, with provisions for going even higher without even consulting with those who already live there, will make it very unpleasant.

Reference 7

It's a different situation in areas that are being almost completely rebuilt, as in the city core itself. But, in neighbourhoods such as mine, where residential dwellings are still largely intact, the above suggestions could easily destroy---rather than enhance---a thriving, densely populated area. / / However, IF the statement in the document that "compatibility with the scale of other buildings in surrounding areas..." will be taken into account and IF it becomes almost impossible to go outside those parameters, then the proposal does have some merit.

Reference 8

Allowing 4 storey development on very small inner city sections (such as exist in Victoria and Moa Neighbourhoods) will ruin already existing, coherent, pleasant areas. Also, would 4 storeys actually become five storeys will the extra allowable 3.5m if pitched roofs are used? This height and density will ruin these small, historic districts for no good effect. The existing inner city neighbourhoods are already highly dense living areas that will not be improved by adopting a height of 14 metres. Who says the "distinctions are less relevant today"? Relevant to what/whom? The comment is meaningless. Ask the residents if their areas' distinctiveness is irrelevant. People choose to live in these small areas for their charm, existing restrictions, and a sense of neighbourliness. Please do not compromise them in any way.

Reference 9

they have existing communities and character which will be ruined by unscrupulous developers, with all existing rights to oppose developments taken away from those that have already been committed to the central city for the long term - before the earthquakes happened.

Reference 10

Generally support this in the central city. However it is sad to see that the "Character" Living Zone will end up being the same as elsewhere. Either these properties will be redeveloped, losing further character buildings than we have lost already, or they will be in the shadow of 4-storey buildings and less "liveable".

Reference 11

Its also removes the protections for areas to be in tone and scale with each other. It will result in poor quality design, ugly buildings and unhappy residents.

Reference 12

The LCP also deletes all 11 Special Amenity Areas which protect local features in the different central city neighbourhoods.

Reference 13

The CSHWP opposes the standardisation of height to 14m on the basis that it eliminates the opportunity for the creation and/or maintenance of distinctive, diverse and attractive central city residential communities. A uniform height limit does not take into account the existing built context, the relationship with significant open spaces, such as Hagley Park, and the effect of change on existing residents. This seems contrary to the creating diversity and the intentions of the vision.

Reference 14

Rather than having a blanket provision, building heights should reflect the nature of the existing communities

Reference 15

I support 14 metres in general but in Chester Street East forming part of the SAM 30 zone, that it should be a reduced height, in line with existing homes.

Reference 16

This one size fits all approach does not cater to the different needs of different neighbourhoods. I am against it

Reference 17

A uniform height limit does not take into account the existing built context, the relationship with significant open spaces, such as Hagley Park, and the effect of change on existing residents. This seems contrary to the creating diversity and the intentions of the vision.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 18

Imposing one height limit of 14m across the whole Central City Living Zone does not take into account the existing character of our established inner city suburbs.

Parts of our central city have largely survived the earthquakes and represent important examples of our built heritage. It is important to ensure that future development in these areas are sympathetic in scale and 'texture' to the existing buildings to ensure the character of these areas is maintained.

For example the Conference St, Beverage St and Peacock St area contains a number of early workers cottages along with a number of more contemporary houses that are of a similar scale. Imposing a 14m height limit in this area does not recognise and will potentially destroy the existing character of this inner city suburb.

Reference 19

4.8 ***Standard buildable height*** The proposal to have a standard buildable height across the whole of the Central City is extremely unfortunate.

4.8.1 As noted earlier this would be a great nonsense in areas of existing residential housing including the present SAMs.

To allow 14 metre buildings in these neighbourhoods would mean any amenity would be lost by neighbours as these tall buildings would destroy privacy, cut of light and sun light and create dark, cold canyons in the often narrow residential streets.

Reference 20

A blanket height limit does not recognise the different characteristics of different parts of the central city. There are many areas of single and two-storey properties where four storey buildings would be completely incongruous and have an unacceptable impact on the privacy and outlook of neighbours. Furthermore five storey flat roofed buildings will be possible within this height limit, which the information presented to the public does not make clear. While recession planes will restrict height to below 14 metres on narrower sites, in many areas amalgamation of sites will allow building to the maximum height.

Reference 21

Diversity of building height (and design) across the Living 4 Zone is needed to ensure that existing urban character is maintained; for example to maintain the difference between the Dorset St /Park Terrace neighbourhood and that of Montreal/Durham Streets. Diversity is also needed to provide the different types of urban living amenity shown in the illustrations on pages 10 and 11.

Reference 22

HPC supports some simplification of height limits and considers that the proposed height of 14 metres is generally satisfactory. However, we are strongly opposed to raising the existing 8 metre height restrictions to 14 metres. These have been put in place in areas which contain strong heritage character (for example the area from Worcester Boulevard to Kilmore Street which includes Cramner Square and faces onto key heritage sites: The Arts Centre, the Museum and Christ's College) Other existing 8 metre restricted areas have been defined around neighbourhoods which still retain many character buildings but also have narrow streets where a 14 metre height would be overwhelming and destroy the amenity of existing properties. Defining two sets of height limit clearly on a map does not create unnecessary complexity but would go a long way towards helping protect the amenity of those areas.

Reference 23

Reducing the permissible height to the subject property to 14 metres does not give the flexibility in the way we can design and deliver a range of housing.

Building Heights – Neighbourhood Consultation Concerns

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

allowing new dwellings of 14 metres, with provisions for going even higher without even consulting with those who already live there, will make it very unpleasant.

Reference 2

no requirement for potentially affected neighbours agreement is quite simply wrong, one mans economic advantage is often anothers disadvantage and this lack will be counter-productive to the aim of central city residential development /

Reference 3

Agree so longs as affected neighbours by such structures are consulted and can challenge projects based on the affect of their surrounds.

Reference 4

That affected neighbours need not be consulted is reprehensible to me. In my view, existing neighbourhood residents should always be allowed power of veto (if in a democratic majority) on any proposal that deviates from the City Plan.

Reference 5

This is frankly abusive to current residents, removes the protections of the RMA for neighbours to be consulted and privileges developers over existing residents

Reference 6

According to my information, developers will have the right to decide on the height of buildings, without reference to objections from existing residents who would have their sunlight excluded by the new building. Current residents, whom one would hope to be encouraged to stay in the inner city, would under the new LCP, not have any right to object. This goes against the whole meaning of the Resource Consents Act

Reference 7

Neighbours and community must be consulted

Reference 8

A 14 metre apartment should not be allowed to be built right next to, for example, a single storey house, particularly without consultation.

Reference 9

What about th existing neighbours who live in a one-storey home?

Reference 10

Do they get to have a say in the height of the house next door? /

Reference 11

This fails to recognise existing neighbourhoods.

References 12

While I do not object to a uniform height limit I do want you to please drop the proposed rule blocking affected residents from commenting on consent applications. Also the limited grounds to be considered in such applications should be deleted as this skews the hearing unfairly in favour of developers.

Reference 13

The LCP doesn't protect existing neighbourhoods or privacy than protecting existing neighbourhoods. The main changes attack the rights of existing residents and homeowners. by specifically blocking neighbours from being consulted, this seems to go against the entire philosophy of the Resource Management Act.

Reference 14

Cera must not block affected residents from commenting on consent applications.

Reference 15

Cera should drop the rule blocking affected residents from commenting on consent applications.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 16

I was appalled to read that the neighbours of new buildings are not allowed a say in how tall these buildings will be!

When did this law change and when were the CCC going to let residents in neighbouring sections know about this change?

It would seem that it is no longer about people but the almighty dollar!

Shame on you CCC.

Reference 17

<p>Statement at 4a.1 regarding non notification .</p>	<p>The Council’s approach to notification in the DPR is to make explicit statements on each rule as to the notification requirements. The general rationale being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that ‘public good’ rules (rules that affect the public realm) be non publicly notified. • That rules that affect the amenity of neighbours require written approval or limited notification only. <p>Under this system there will a significant reduction in interpretation debates on notification requirements.</p> <p>Central City Living zones should be consisted with this approach.</p>	<p>The Council opposes non written approval or limited notification requirements for rules 4a.2.3 Building Height. 4a.2.5 Sunlight and outlook for neighbours, 4a.2.7 Separation from neighbours.</p> <p>The notification statement at the end of 4a.1 should be amended so that rules that directly protect the amenity of adjoining neighbours (4a.2.3 Building Height. 4a.2.5 Sunlight and outlook for neighbours, 4a.2.7 Separation from neighbours) require the affected adjoining land owners written approval or limited notification to that affected adjoining landowner where that written approval has not been obtained.</p>
---	--	---

Building Heights - Retain Existing

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Research by the Victoria Residents Association showed clearly that the existing heights could easily provide for the desired increased density

Reference 2

retain existing provision for multiple height as an automatic right to build to 14m could ruin many existing living environments in the central city. Would like to see the 30m limit removed entirely for living zones as it creates unfriendly spaces with little sense of community.

Reference 3

stick with existing provision. four storey development may price buildings out of reach for many considering inner-city residence. a city scape works best when it is not uniform. better to have a number of mixed-use buildings with business on lower floors and residential on higher floors.

Reference 4

Please retain the 8m height limit in the Park terrace, Chester Street, Cranmer Square / Kilmore Street area. We oppose the proposed 14m height limit

Reference 5

I say follow the community desire previously indicated in public consultations and retain the existing 8 metre limits in areas where character exists in the form of one and two storey buildings and give higher height limits in new areas that were not previously residential. That way developers won't ruin streetscapes with buildings unsuitably scaled compared to the existing residential neighbourhoods.

Reference 6

The various building heights should be retained in existing residential areas, especially L4C and L4A zones.

Reference 7

Should be 8m limit. My own house in Peacock St is 8m and is 3 storeys. /

Reference 8

I oppose the proposed provision. / The central city currently includes a number of residentially-dense neighbourhoods e.g. VNA, MOA, Peterborough, Avon Loop and Chester St East, whose interests will be better served by retention of their current height limits (and recession planes) while other areas such as the Eastern Frame housing can be developed with increased i.e. 14 metre height limits. Such differentiation will ensure that there is a variety of housing available within the Central City Living Zone.

Reference 9

Overall, good to set a limit of 14 metres but in SAMS areas and other parts with character height restrictions to two storey should apply because of shading neighbours blocking both light and sun.

Reference 10

Oppose. Existing limits should be retained. Otherwise will support tall cheap building.

Reference 11

I do not wish there to be allowance for a single taller maximum building height across the whole residential zone (present rules allow for 5 different heights depending upon the particular neighbourhood)

Reference 12

Existing areas should be protected as they are,

Reference 13

I disagree - the distinctions between different parts of the inner city are still relevant. The inner city residential areas that are SAMs (Victoria St area, Chester St etc) should retain their existing height limits. They are still special areas and even with these different height restrictions still achieve a decent density.

Reference 14

I think some areas should be left lower as they presently are, this would make some variety within the 4 avenues and protect those existing neighbourhood areas that only have the a few houses demolished due to the quakes..

Reference 15

I'm opposed to the establishment of a single height limit of 14 metres. There are good reasons for a range of heights in different areas and I think each area needs to be considered on its own merits.

Reference 16

It isn't clear to me that having 3 zones is prohibitively complex, or that having multiple different building heights is necessarily a bit problem. A single height limit seems like an over simplification. While saying this a 4 storey limit for most of the city is sensible and should achieve the sort of vibe and density asked for in early post - quake consultation.

Reference 17

I would like to keep the current variations in height. I live in the central city in a street of two storied houses and wouldn't want to see 14m height everywhere. Some areas could benefit from taller buildings - like closer in to the city centre, but not all.

Reference 18

The existing housing needs to be kept in relation to any new housing, so the old limits are preferable

Reference 19

Imposing a single taller maximum building height, and steeper set of recession planes, across the whole residential zone, sweeping away the five different heights tailored to local neighbourhoods will diminish the neighbourhood grain and variety.

Reference 20

I oppose the proposed provision of a single height limit throughout the Central City Living Zone (and I oppose the proposed provision for recession planes based on Diagram E - see later). I would prefer to retain existing maximum building heights, especially in the already established L4 living zones. Existing owners of homes which are not apartments should be able to retain "blue sky amenity" around their residences, and residential house type differentiation. If new projects are constructed, detrimental environmental quality for current residents should be mitigated. Sloping roofs to 11m above 8m external walls allow a greater feeling of "blue sky amenity" for neighbours. I would urge Objective 11.10 is altered to ensure that maximum heights are compatible with existing usual practises in each area. / / At the very least I propose that Map 2 on p38 is replaced with the CERA February 2014 Draft showing two height limits of 11m and 14m.

References 21

Keep the original building heights which were suggested to fit in relative to the kinds of buildings in the environment. A 14 metre apartment should not be allowed to be built right next to, for example, a single storey house, particularly without consultation.

Reference 22

I support the existing provision

Reference 23

I do not agree with the proposal. / / There will be places where 14 metres is not enough and other areas where that's too high. I also think it will lead to a dull uniformity to the cityscape as opposed to more interesting variety and choice in style and density. The existing provision allows for greater height if a pitched roof is used.

Reference 24

The different height zones allows some variation keep a version of it

Reference 25

I request you go back to the two different heights (11 and 14 m) in the February 2014 draft plan.

Reference 26

I think the existing smaller height limits should be kept in place to preserve the existing character of these areas, it also doesn't fit with your rationale as the community desires low rise development

Reference 27

Finally, the lower variable height limits should be reinstated to recognize existing inner city neighbourhoods, which are essential to supporting city businesses as the rebuild continues.

Reference 28

Finally, the lower variable height limits of the February 2014 draft should be reinstated to recognize existing valuable and high-density inner city neighbourhoods, which are essential to supporting city businesses as the rebuild develops.

Reference 29

the lower variable height limits of the February 2014 draft should be reinstated to recognize existing valuable and high-density inner city neighbourhoods, which are essential to supporting city businesses as the rebuild develops.

Reference 30

The current provisions of 8 and 11 should remain where an increase to 14 would affect the sunlight of existing housing,

Comments received via email and post

Reference 31

The Moa group further request that the varied maximum heights limits of **14 m and 11 m**, as outlined in the CERA February 2014 (unpublished) document to the Minister, be **retained**.

Reference 32

4. Keep varied maximum height limits with 11 m and 14 m areas.

Current housing developments on the Commerce Club site and the Squash Club site are two storeyed. This fits with the existing scale of development in our Avon Loop area, which is 1-2 storeys. This demonstrates that higher density can be efficiently developed within the current 8 m height zones.

The Avon River Precinct Project as well as the presence of red zoned land within our area means that the scale of residential housing needs to be maintained to give integrity to the Blue Print Anchor Project. The Living 5 zone is in a 50 year flood plain, where the effects of the additional height requirement to raise buildings needs to be accounted for.

We support keeping at least 2 different maximum height zones. We want to change Map 2 (page 38) to the one from CERA February 2014 draft showing two heights, 11 and 14 m.

Change required: Under Objective 11.10, Built Form and Amenity add to existing paragraph another sentence giving the objective that "Maximum building heights are compatible with the existing predominant uses in each area."

Reference 32

Retain Variation of Maximum Permitted Building Heights- as previously- of 11m and 14m.

Change the Draft chapter to accord with CERA February 2014 Draft, showing maximum permitted heights of 11m and 14m.

Reference 33

2. Allow for differing height limits appropriate to the existing context

Reference 34

In particular, we wish to register our opposition to:

The changes to height limits, which we believe should be restored to those of the February 2014 draft.

Reference 35

Height differentials reflecting the pattern proposed in the Council's Central City Living Zones Review.

Reference 36

Finally, the lower variable height limits of the February 2014 draft should be reinstated to recognize existing valuable and high-density inner city neighbourhoods, which are essential to supporting city businesses as the rebuild develops.

Reference 37

Retain existing regulations on building heights and on recession planes (these seem to be omitted from this version of the draft).

Reference 38

Retain existing height limits, recession planes and setbacks.

Reference 39

Rule 4a.2.3 – Building Height

We do not like this rule and think the previous height limits should remain.

The reason for our view concerns the maintenance of some currently identified central city “villages”, or hubs of well established residential homes. They have developed over time to a certain position and to have that now changed to such an extent will damage those environments. This works in tandem with recession planes, which must also remain as they are.

We need to enhance the living environments we currently have. They have been somewhat identified by the SAM areas. Better to add to what we have than start afresh. Bear in mind that people have lived in the centre of Christchurch for longer than they have lived anywhere else in Christchurch. This history and environment can be easily added to leading to a very positive outcome. If this history and environment is trampled then it is a waste and a backwards step. It would also knock confidence if people saw these areas trampled.

What is the benefit?

This proposed rule change, together with others, appear to be designed to allow more volume of residential space to be created in the central city, and therefore make residential development occur more quickly. We do not think that this will necessarily follow. The numbers adjust to the new rules and dynamics – creating more space does not make for better numbers and hence more development. There is already ample space in the city.

In our opinion the best way to encourage more residential development is to give people confidence. This is best done by completing with urgency the Breathe project, completing walkways, parks, reserves and other amenities, and bringing down direct costs such as fees, rates and development contributions.

Reference 40

Keep varied maximum height limits with 11 m and 14 m areas. It is preferable to us that the existing height limits be retained as outline in the existing CCC City Plan.

Reference 41

4. Keep varied maximum height limits with 11 m and 14 m areas.

The CERA proposal changes from a current mixture of heights, tailored to various neighbourhoods in relation to their section sizes, current building heights and density, to use a single taller height for everything. The VNA area is

currently all 8 m (but with a 3.5 m sloping roof allowed on top), with other areas mostly on 11 m. This proposal increases everything to 14 m.

The current proposal has lots of notes in the front section about recognizing neighbourhoods, but the actual rules at the back treat everywhere as homogenous. We request keeping at least 2 different maximum height zones, of 11m and 14 m. The 11 m limits should be on existing dense residential areas (broadly the core VNA, ICON, Moa, Peterborough, Avon Loop, and Chester St East areas). There was a draft map in the February 2014 draft of this LCP which showed two different heights and we agree with the selection of areas for the 11 m height in that draft map.

Keeping two height limits defends current neighbourhoods, and allows some differentiation in the type of housing. Having areas of lower predominantly 1-2 story tall houses provides an alternative for inner city living for people who don't like apartments. The apartments can be efficiently developed in the taller 14 m height zones.

Change required: Under Objective 11.10, Built Form and Amenity add to existing paragraph another sentence giving the objective that "Maximum building heights are compatible with the existing predominant uses in each area." Change Map 2 (page 38) to the one from CERA February 2014 draft showing two heights, 11 and 14 m.

Reference 42

The lower variable height limits of the February 2014 draft CCP be reinstated, recognizing existing valuable and high-density inner city businesses and residential developments.

Reference 43

The retention of varied maximum height limits (11m and 14m areas) is essential to mitigate against homogeneous, stark neighbourhoods. If "*Successful cities need attractive central city neighbourhoods with diverse communities to support business growth and development, and bring life to the city centre.*" is true, then varied height maximums are mandatory..

Reference 44

Keep varied maximum height limits with 11 m and 14 m areas

I support keeping at least 2 different maximum height zones. The current proposal has lots of notes in the front section about recognizing neighbourhoods, but the actual rules at the back treat everywhere as homogenous. Keeping two height limits defends current neighbourhoods, and allows some differentiation in the type of housing. Having areas of lower predominantly 1-2 story tall houses provides an alternative for inner city living for people who don't like apartments. The apartments can be efficiently developed in the 14 m height zones. See City Council Agenda document for more info on this.

Reference 45

The comments below should be read in conjunction with the submission made by the City Council on 13th August

Proposed change to the City Plan

"A Liveable City" Appendix 1 : Volume 3, Section 2, 4a.2.3 : Building Height

Discussion

The CCC Living Zones review identified height limits by balancing context (existing built environment) with recovery and residential intensification needs. The rationale for the 14m height limit in the consultation document is unclear.

Throughout the central city there will be opportunities for residential development that recognises and is influenced by the local context. (page 6)

This balance is not apparent in the consultation document – rules with a heavy emphasis on recovery and intensification, but not context.

Very little mention is made of the expectations and amenity of existing residents other than:

These standards will benefit new residents and protect the amenity of those residents who have already made their home in the central city. (page 8)

It is very unclear how the amenity of the existing residents is to be protected.

The District Plan review’s approach to intensification recognises that change to intensification can adversely affect existing communities. In this regard the DPR approach is to enable intensification but at a height limit that is commensurate with recognising the existing context. This approach should be taken with the Central City Living Zones.

An existing provision in the definition of height allows an additional 3.5m where the pitched roof begins from the stated height limit. Effectively the height limit provided the building has a pitched roof is 11.5m. The rule can be restructured so that this is clear.

Resolution

1. The Council opposes all proposed changes that raise height limits to a standard 14 m from the two bands of height limits shown as 8 and 11 as shown on Map 2 of Appendix 1 as shown in the Council resolution of 28 February 2013.

2. That the Council request that rule 4a.2.3 Building Height be replaced with the following:

The maximum height of any building shall be:

		<i>Standard</i>
1.	<i>In the 8 metre height limit area shown on planning maps 39B and 39D for buildings not listed in 2 below.</i>	<i>8m</i>
2.	<i>In the 8 metre height limit area shown on planning maps 39B and 39D for buildings with a pitched roof within an angle of 45⁰.</i>	<i>11.5 m</i>
3.	<i>In the 11 metre height limit area shown on planning maps 39B and 39D for buildings not listed in 4 below.</i>	<i>11m</i>
4.	<i>In the 11 metre height limit area shown on planning maps 39B and 39D for buildings with a pitched roof within an angle of 45⁰.</i>	<i>14.5m</i>
5.	<i>In the 14 metre height limit area shown on planning maps 39B and 39D for buildings not listed in 6 below.</i>	<i>14m</i>
6.	<i>In the 14 metre height limit area shown on planning maps 39B and 39D for buildings with a pitched roof within an angle of 45⁰.</i>	<i>17.5 m</i>

As highlighted in the main submission, the CCDU team are urged to work with Council staff to achieve a consistent and coherent planning framework to guide development within and outside of the central city. Accordingly, please do not hesitate to engage the city planning team in considering amendments to your published draft proposals.

Building Heights – Sunlight Concerns

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

We like sunlight getting in to our house and yard and not having a tall building almost at the boundary of our property blocking it out as well as peering directly into our windows.

Reference 2

The revised plan offers nothing to prevent total shading of adjacent and existing residences. / / Research by the Victoria Residents Association showed clearly that the existing heights could easily provide for the desired increased density

Reference 3

Being completely shaded by substantially taller buildings next door would be awful.

Reference 4

If the derelict cottage next door to me is replaced with a 14m block of flats it will block all my sun and views. / Tall buildings not only block the sun but also views of surrounding trees and sky.

Reference 5

Agree that this should be the absolute ,maximum but the plan also needs to ensure that this does not adversely affect neighbours sunlight and if it does then lower height should be enforced.

Reference 6

I think that setting the 14 metre height throughout the central city would be counter productive as it would potentially put people off if living in sun shadows. I think where large blocks or parts of city centre have been demolished then this 14 or potentially even higher would be fine but to do this universally will unfairly affect those who currently live there as well as deter people from moving there.

Reference 7

14 m seems quite high? What about existing neighbours with their views and sun rights?

Reference 8

I am worried about existing residents having their homes shaded

Reference 9

What about th existing neighbours who live in a one-storey home? Will they ever see th esun again?

Reference 10

stupid idea producing nasty results with shading and dank urban living. Who would want to live thus? I hope the designers of this plan have disclosed all personal interests in potential property development ventures and companies?

Reference 11

There must be no exceptions to the building height ruling. / / Buildings must not cast shade over, or otherwise impinge on, existing residents' enjoyment of their property.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 12

To allow 14 metre buildings in these neighbourhoods would mean any amenity would be lost by neighbours as these tall buildings would destroy privacy, cut of light and sun light and create dark, cold canyons in the often narrow residential streets.

Building Heights – Full Support

Comments received via online survey

Reference 1

I agree with the proposed provision- make a maximum building height. This will give the Central City Living Zone more cohesiveness and density (e.g. no 2 storey buildings juxtaposed with 8 floor buildings, like the old city).

Reference 2

Good proposal following people's views.

Reference 3

Totally agree, tall buildings block out sunlight from the CBD. / Many people no longer wish to work in tall buildings therefore they could be restricted on their employment if some buildings go above this limit

Reference 4

great

Reference 5

I think this is reasonable.

Reference 6

agree

Reference 7

I like this

Reference 8

I agree with the changes. I think it's good that it's more simple and that it's a fairly centralised limit rather than one of the extremes.

Reference 9

Agree. Four story development balances medium-high density while retaining a human scale.

Reference 10

OK

Comments received via email and post

Reference 11

Further consistent with that emphasis on recovery of communities, I support and commend the provisions of the Draft chapter which propose;

I. The objective of making Christchurch one of the best small cities in the world, and one with the best urban environment in New Zealand.

II. The simpler method of calculating the maximum permitted building height limit of 14m.

Building Heights – General Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

IF the statement in the document that "compatibility with the scale of other buildings in surrounding areas..." will be taken into account and IF it becomes almost impossible to go outside those parameters, then the proposal does have some merit.

Reference 2

Agree that this should be the absolute ,maximum but the plan also needs to ensure that this does not adversely affect neighbours sunlight and if it does then lower height should be enforced.

Reference 3

Overall, good to set a limit of 14 metres but in SAMS areas and other parts with character height restrictions to two storey should apply because of shading neighbours blocking both light and sun.

Reference 4

Agree so long as affected neighbours by such structures are consulted and can challenge projects based on the affect of their surrounds.

Reference 5

Generally support this in the central city. However it is sad to see that the "Character" Living Zone will end up being the same as elsewhere. Either these properties will be redeveloped, losing further character buildings than we have lost already, or they will be in the shadow of 4-storey buildings and less "liveable".

Reference 6

I support 14 metres in general but in Chester Street East forming part of the SAM 30 zone, that it should be a reduced height, in line with existing homes.

Reference 7

I think the proposed provision is good as long as it is applied to all and there are not exemptions that allow some developments to exceed it.

Reference 8

As long as this is not able to be over rid by developers under hidden regulations this is fine.

Reference 9

good idea, subject to recession plane considerations

Reference 10

I support a height limit of 14 meters on condition that such properties have at least two car parks on average per residence. I think that the 14 m height could allow small inner city sections to be better developed and enable cars, bikes etc to be housed off the street. This could then improve the street scape appearance and improve the feeling of a safe community. /

Reference 11

While I do not object to a uniform height limit I do want you to please drop the proposed rule blocking affected residents from commenting on consent applications. Also the limited grounds to be considered in such applications should be deleted as this skews the hearing unfairly in favour of developers.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 12

Combining the three living 4 Zones to create a single central city living zone with a blanket 14 metre height limit:

Fundamentally we have no issues with the amalgamation of these living zones and the introduction of a 14metre height limit. The existing central city zones being amalgamated currently have varying height limits of 8m, 11m, 14m and 20m. With the exception of a two small areas where the height limit is 20m the majority of the area already has a height limit of 14m or less. The concept of implementing a single homogenous height limit that does not recognise the existing character of our established inner city suburbs is a concern however

Reference 13

The additional allowance for a pitched roof design is a complication to the rules and its removal is supported. Recession planes will lead to pitched roofs, particularly on narrower sites.

Reference 14

However we might accept if all the following were adopted, keeping at least 2 different maximum height zones. The current proposal has lots of notes in the front section about recognizing neighbourhoods, but the actual rules at the back treat everywhere as homogenous. Keeping two height limits defends current neighbourhoods, and allows some differentiation in the type of housing. Having areas of lower predominantly 1-2 story tall houses provides an alternative for inner city living for people who don't like apartments. The apartments can be efficiently developed in the 14 m height zones. See City Council Agenda document for more info on this.

Reference 15

Rule 4a.2.3 (building height) is supported on the basis that it introduces a consistent and balanced height restriction across the Central City Living zone. This is particularly supported in the Living 5 (Avon) zone, where complex and variable height standards have proved to be onerous, impractical and uncertain for development planning of the Holiday Inn on Avon site.

Building Heights – Specific

Comments received through email and post

Reference 1

Change required: Under Objective 11.10, Built Form and Amenity add to existing paragraph another sentence giving the objective that "Maximum building heights are compatible with the existing predominant uses in each area."

Reference 2

5.2.3 SUNLIGHT AND OUTLOOK FOR NEIGHBOURS

(a) Buildings shall not project beyond a building envelope constructed by recession planes from points 2.3m above internal boundaries as shown in Part 2, Appendix 1 as follows: (...) • Diagram D – Peterborough • Diagram E – Avon, Peterborough, Latimer and Montreal,

Reference 3

5.4.3 BUILDING HEIGHT The maximum height of any building shall be: • Peterborough, Montreal, Latimer and Avon:

55% In accordance with planning maps 39B and 39D

Reference 4

Change Required:

Under Objective 11.10, Built Form and Amenity add to existing paragraph another sentence giving the objective that "Maximum building heights are compatible with the existing predominant uses in each area." Change Map 2 (page 38) to the one from CERA February 2014 draft showing two heights, 11 and 14 m.

Reference 5

Change required: Under Objective 11.10, Built Form and Amenity add to existing paragraph another sentence giving the objective that "Maximum building heights are compatible with the existing predominant uses in each area." Change Map 2 (page 38) to the one from CERA February 2014 draft showing two heights, 11 and 14 m.

Reference 6

The maximum height specified for this site in the Mixed Use Zone is 14m. It is submitted that this height maximum should be increased for the Site.

The Site, located on the corner of Moorhouse and Hagley Avenues, is in a unique setting and a gateway for the city. It is submitted that an exception to the height maximum should be provided for corner sites, like this one, to enable a better urban design outcome and accentuate corners.

Building Heights - Suggestions

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Some allowance for roof style should be included, or we will end up with a homogenous mass of flat roofs.

Reference 2

14 meters is too restrictive. Allowing taller structures e.g the former Victoria St apartments would be much better.

Reference 3

I would prefer a case by case consideration as a uniform height throughout the city may lack character. However if this would see the decision process extended significantly then I would support a standard limit of 14m.

Reference 4

I agree with streamlining the height in particular not allowing highrise - the height limit needs to be enforceable and strong and only be allowed to be breached if the design outcome is excellent and needs the extra height to be achieved. there should be some flexibility i.e +1.5m as a fully discretionary activity to allow for a variety of roof shapes and avoid the monotonous flat roof scenario - however any breach needs to show shading diagrams and proof that it is not shading other residential areas to an unacceptable level / / We should also allow for extra height to be achieved at corner sites to accentuate the inner city block structure , as a discretionary activity

Reference 5

Should be 8m limit. My own house in Peacock St is 8m and is 3 storeys. / If the derelict cottage next door to me is replaced with a 14m block of flats it will block all my sun and views. / Tall buildings not only block the sun but also views of surrounding trees and sky.

Reference 6

Fix 14.0m but allow a variable of say 3.5m based on architectural merit, streetscape form and relief. Qualified Architect/Urban Design panel should efficiently assess over-height and effect. Architectural merit/form is an essential ingredient to the success or failure of all proposed planning objectives.

Reference 7

If an area is currently high density and has no tall buildings in it, then a height limit of 11 m should apply - or alternatively a maximum of 3 levels. / / If an area has or prior to 2011 had a mixture of heights than the 14 m limit should apply.

Reference 8

The lower variable height limits of the February 2014 draft should be reinstated to recognise existing inner city neighbourhoods.

Reference 9

Again this is too simplistic. Building heights should be different in different zones. Heights should be lower everywhere to promote more consistency of building form. Can the locations of the planning zones be rationalised or is that too hard?

Reference 10

It should be low rise throughout, maximum of four stories and consents required with neighbour consultation on recession planes. housing should be interspersed with green space and walking and bike lanes, see Melbourne, Denmark, Colorado

Reference 11

Prefer limited heights around green areas (hagley park, green frame).

Reference 12

I think that there are many areas where 14m buildings would be unsuitable. I certainly wouldn't want one next to me.

Reference 13

Allowance for roof top features such as gardens or communal spaces should be encouraged as a way to accommodate more development on the land available, whilst still respecting these height limits

Reference 14

Where appropriate and where identified on previous planning documents, more stringent height limitations on new development should be enforced.

Comments received via email and post**Reference 15**

The 14 metre height limit essentially allows for 4-storey developments as a maximum. There should however be discretion to exceed the height limit in some instances in order to encourage design diversity with roof lines and streetscape. If a specific project has exceptional architectural merit and provides significant urban design amenity there should also be discretion to consider the provision of additional floor levels if it can be demonstrated that the development will not negatively impact neighbouring sites.

Will a single fixed height limit give developers the flexibility to be innovative and deliver a range of housing types in the inner city.?

Reference 16

In looking at this issue, the City Council's Central City Living Zones Review consolidated an array of heights ranging from 8m to 30m into an overlay with three heights of 8m, 11m and 14m with an allowance of a further 3.5m where the design used a pitched roof. This, in effect allowed 'with roof' heights of 11.5m, 14.5m and 17.5m. The council acknowledges that because of the complex structure of the existing City Plan (with some standards being "hidden" in definitions) this ultimate height limit may not be readily apparent.

"A Liveable City" does away with the pitch roof allowance meaning that the 14m height is the upper standard. The council understands the desire to simplify the standard and reduce complexity.

18. In applying the 3.5m pitched roof 'bonus' 11.5m and the 11m would become 14.5m.

19. Hence, the main point of difference is within the existing 8m height areas (i.e. collections of streets around Latimer Square, east of Victoria Street and in the north east corner of the central city - broadly delineated by Madras and Armagh Streets). The Council therefore recommends that the height limit that it has identified as 8m should be limited to a flat maximum height of 11.5m

Reference 17

We understood the varied height limits to the current inner city living zones were not controversial. We believe a more tailored approach to the central city living zone permissible building heights is a more rational, which will result in more certainty of outcome and make Councils management of the interface between new developments and existing neighbouring residents considerable easier. We recommend the whole of the block that the subject property is located in is retained at 20metres. Alternatively, property Lots with Cambridge Terrace street fronts can retain the 20metre building height, while property Lots with Cashel St street frontage have a 14 metre building height.

Reference 18

Changes required: When residential developments meet the given threshold, these must be subject to an urban design panel, as is the case in the business area and inner-city frames. This will be particularly important for retaining the quality and suitability to context of developments, when the SAMs are removed.

Building Heights - Other concerns

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

14 metres, plus no requirements for pitched roof, is too high in existing neighbourhoods that consist mainly of one to two (or 2.5) dwellings, with maximum of 8m +3.5m roof line.

Reference 2

I am particularly incensed at the proposal to allow developers to exceed even the newly increased heights by tightly limiting the matters that may be considered if a developer applies to exceed the limits, and in the statement that "economic efficiency" must always be considered.

Reference 3

14 m seems quite high?

Reference 4

variable heights are needed in neighbourhoods, as is mixed use

Reference 5

I find pitched roofs are often more aesthetically pleasing and am concerned that a 14 metre limit will mean flat roofs and, again, dull uniformity. /

Reference 6

no, please don't do this because we risk having a less diverse and appropriate city. in some areas, lower heights remain more appropriate, plus this puts some existing buildings at risk of having 'bad neighbours' in the future, who might steal their light/sunlight. are we wanting to drive existing residents out? i don't think so.

Reference 7

Beacon opposes the standardisation of height to a single uniform level on the basis that it eliminates the opportunity for the creation and/or maintenance of distinctive, diverse and attractive central city residential communities.

Reference 8

I believe these proposed changes will adversely affect any anticipated influx of residents into the City Centre. They will destroy any existing sense of community they hoped to foster in renewing the residential population in the city core. There will be reluctance from purchasers of new city dwellings as they will be unable to guarantee their amenity.

Reference 9

Really really disagree with this one. Our central city neighbourhood is currently is 8 m maximum (but with 3.5m sloping roof allowed). This proposal increases everything to 14m which is too high.

Reference 10

All developers will wish to maximum their investment return on their land investment and will build to the 14 metre height level. All existing properties will be dwarfed by these new structures and will have their existing value severely diminished due to the shadows that will be cast.

Reference 11

Im concerned the changes will facilitate the construction of really tall, cheap, ugly, small apartments, which is about the opposite of what is needed for a sustainable christchurch.

Reference 12

I don't think a one-size-fits all policy is adequate to the citizen's needs. They also need to have a possibility to control for their neighboring buildings to come up.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 13

most importantly, the fact that there will be no provision for parking nor, it seems, will there will be rules as to height and size of commercial buildings, size of dwellings etc

Reference 14

To allow 14 metre buildings in these neighbourhoods would mean any amenity would be lost by neighbours as these tall buildings would destroy privacy, cut of light and sun light and create dark, cold canyons in the often narrow residential streets.

4.8.2 As noted earlier the intensification of cars requiring parking would cause chaos in narrow streets or where several of these large structures were grouped closely. Indeed the East Frame and surrounding streets would be untenable

4.8.3 It has been suggested that the Council (i.e. the ratepaying citizens would have to address this parking lack by providing council built structures, a transfer of costs from the profit-oriented developers to the citizens.

Reference 15

Conversely there are some areas of the city, such as Bealey Avenue or Park Terrace where taller buildings are compatible with their context, and there appears to be little reason to preclude them.

Reference 16

It is not clear why different height limits for different neighbourhoods is undesirable or difficult for developers to work with. How does a 14 metre height limit "produce a variety of housing to suit the different needs of potential residents" ? Isn't is more likely to produce a similarity of design?

Reference 17

A final point to make is that experience suggests that landowners hold back on decisions to reinvest until they can achieve the maximum potential – i.e. redeveloping to 14m from 11.5m. Hence, building in this expectation that a greater height can be achieved might actually stifle redevelopment as site owners wait for the opportunities to deliver to the maximum.

Reference 18

<p>Building Height in Living 4C zones in the Central City – New rule (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.3.7)</p>	<p>Building heights as per current planning map39D</p> <p>Corner of Hagley Avenue and Moorhouse</p> <p>Avenue L4B - height limit was 30m;</p> <p>Height limits for L4C (Avon Loop) as per map</p> <p>39C (ranged from 6m to 12m);</p> <p>Area of L4B east of Latimer Sq – 20m</p> <p>Two areas of L4C north and south of Cranmer Sq – 11m</p> <p>Area of L4C between Rolleston Ave, Cambridge Terrace, Montreal & Hereford St – 20m</p>	<p>New rule refers to building heights as shown</p> <p>on the amended planning map 39D for Central</p> <p>City Living Zones Review. Some amended:</p> <p>Corner of Hagley Avenue and Moorhouse Avenue (now L4C) - new height of 14m;</p> <p>New height limit for Avon Loop area (now standard L4C) – 8m;</p> <p>· L4B replaced with L4C, new height – 14m</p> <p>Two areas of L4C north and south of Cranmer</p> <p>Sq – new limit - 14m</p> <p>Area of L4C between Rolleston Ave, Cambridge Terrace, Montreal & Hereford St – 14m.</p> <p>That height limits be as shown on Map 2 of Appendix 1 of the Council’s Central City Living Zones review.</p>	<p>All height limits standardised to 14m.</p>	<p>The Council strongly opposes the standardisation of building height limits to 14m.</p> <p><u>Note that the Council will be making a supplementary submission on this matter following the Earthquake Recovery Committee of the Whole meeting on 15 August where it is considering height limits in the residential zones outside of the central city.</u></p>
--	---	---	---	--

Reference 19

4a.2.3 BUILDING HEIGHT describes how non-compliance can be assessed against “The extent to which an increased height is necessary to enable more efficient, cost effective and/or practical use of the site, or the long term protection of significant trees or natural features on the site”. Who is going to determine this? Is the Council going to have to have a QS go through the costings. It would be easy to ramp up something like foundation type and cost to gain an increase in height and then drop back to something cheaper. This seems to me to highly subjective and complicated.

Reference 20

Building height We support CCDU's desire to see the rationalisation of the inner city living zones and simplification of the planning instruments and urban design rules to streamline the recovery of the Central city residential dwellings and population. However we believe the one size fits all approach for height of the Central city living zone is incorrect and the proposed 14 metre height limit to the subject property is insufficient. The reasons for this are:

- The current height of the retained buildings adjoining the subject property is greater than 14 metres. The current 20 metre permissible height limit to the subject property will not be out of context with the height and scale of the street - 4a.2.3 (a) of the proposed development standards for the Central City Living Zones.
- While a building great than 14 metres to the subject property may not result in residential neighbours loss of privacy, outlook, overshadowing or visual dominance, we are very concerned that Councils ruling on 4a.2.3 (b) of the proposed development standards for the Central City Living Zones will be more favourable to existing residents of the Central City than the applicant. We believe Council will not support breaching the proposed 14 metre limit unless the applicant obtains from any impacted neighbour their concurrence. This will result in uncertainties in the approvals process. We do not agree with CCDU's view that the neighbours will not be able to challenge Council rulings under of 4a.2.3 (b) in the Courts – over time they will. In summary retaining the current 20 metre permissible height will create more certainty in outcome in the redevelopment of the subject property.
- Due to the prohibitive cost of constructing inground car parks, on grade car parking is a more cost effective alternative in Christchurch. This lessens the amount of above ground floor apartment space available to sell, resulting in a less economically viable development. The additional density available with the current permissible building height of 20metres will make redevelopment of the subject property economically viable and more likely to proceed.
- The subject property is impacted by a 1.4metre floodpath level from the ground plane. Limiting the height to 14 metres further burdens the economic viability of the development of the subject property.

withheld under section 9(2)(a)

- The additional cost of inground structure since the increased New Building Standards post quakes requires additional sellable floor area to make projects economically viable. While 4a.2.3 (c) allows Council to take such economic requirements into consideration when approving additional height, the management of this will be untenable. Rarely have any Councils sided with a developers economic argument at the expense of a potential loss of amenity of a neighbour. Obtaining additional height via 4a.2.3 (c) creates uncertainty in the development approvals process and will limit the economic viability of recovering the population to the subject property.
- Retaining the current permissible 20metre height to the subject property will allow additional apartments to benefit from the view over the recently completed Avon River precinct.
- Retaining the current permissible 20 metre height to the subject property will generate more accommodation in close confines of the main hospital. Hospital staff are often shift workers and on call for accidents and emergencies. The more housing available in close proximity to the hospital, and also to the justice precinct, the better.
- The subject property is only two blocks from the new bus exchange public transport node, so the additional density derived from a permissible height of 20 metres, not 14 metres can be justified.

Reference 21

Reducing the permissible height to the subject property to 14 metres does not give certainty that we can have approved by Council apartment accommodation between 14metres and the current 20metre height limit.

Reference 22

The subject property is ready to be redeveloped thus bringing additional accommodation on line in the short term and delivering residents to help create a vibrant city centre.

Reducing the permissible height to the subject property will reduce the commercial benefits of investing in the subject property. The reduced permissible height will result in the properties value reducing and additional difficulty to fund the redevelopment of the property.

Reference 23

Where building heights have been increased from 8M and 11M to 14M.

The areas north of the arts centre (old university) and areas surrounding Cranmer Square should be not more than a maximum of 11M to the ridge (less recession planes); Or 8M plus 3.5M roof slope. These reduced heights are critical to good urban design for these very special historic areas.

Reference 24

Imposition of a uniform height limit:

The varied height limits of the current district plan are a direct reflection of the varied character of the inner city living zones discussed in (1). While we recognise the wisdom of stipulating a maximum building height of 14 metres in our view this height is inappropriate in a range of situations. These include areas such as Conference and Peacock Streets where streets are narrow and lot sizes small. A building height of 14 metres on the north side of a narrow street will impose a significant loss of amenity on neighbours on the south side of the street that would not occur in areas where street widths are of normal city dimensions. The lower height limit of the SAM recognises this specific circumstance and it should be retained. Where the preponderance of recent existing development is no more than two stories there is an implied duty to respect the investment of current residents by not allowing building heights to increase dramatically in such areas. There is also a need to respect areas of special urban character such as the areas of the Christchurch City Council's Cultural Precinct, especially Montreal Street to the west of the Christchurch Art Gallery, Worcester Street to the north of the Arts Centre and Rolleston Avenue to the east of the Canterbury Museum and Christ's College. These are among the most important amenity areas of the city and are highly valued by both local citizens and visitors to the city. The preservation of the character and scale of these areas is recognised by their current designation as a SAM and the associated height limit of eight metres. This recognition also needs to be reflected in the revised plan.

It is a widely acknowledged principle of good urban design that sympathetic and appropriate context is as important in creating desirable urban environments as well designed individual buildings or the preservation of heritage buildings. The outstanding appeal of the Arts Centre derives not just from the intrinsic qualities of the assembly of heritage buildings itself, but from its setting within an urban framework of medium-scale domestic architecture of diverse character. An increased height limit on Worcester Street to the north of the Arts Centre will immediately place pressure on the continued survival of existing buildings and erode the fundamental character and appeal of this outstanding area of the inner city environment.

The imposition of uniform height limits over large urban areas produces, over time, a situation where building heights tend to become uniform. Land prices gravitate to levels that reflect maximum development potential and building heights inevitably follow in order to produce an acceptable return on investment. This will result in blandness and monotony that is unlikely to prove attractive to potential residents who are more often drawn to inner city living by its inherent diversity and distinctiveness of character. The introduction to *A Liveable City* suggests that high quality design will provide these desirable qualities but the record of the private sector, with some notable exceptions, has not been remarkable in achieving such goals. With increased building costs in Christchurch as a result of new seismic codes and the requirements for piled foundations in many areas, there is already a strong tendency for structure to dominate over architecture in the design process. Without positive incentives to achieve distinctiveness of character and diversity of building height and scale the proposed plan is potentially a recipe for developers to aspire to meet minimum requirements only. This is a potential blueprint not for the outcomes desired but for monotonous, low-grade housing that will breed costly social problems for the future city.

Reference 25

There is confusion over actual height restrictions in the plan.

Reference 26

I wish to object to the following proposals and ask that they be cancelled:

1. allowing developers to exceed the maximum building height by limiting the matters which can be considered and saying 'economic efficiency' must always be considered.

Reference 26

The essential removal of height restriction and limited outside habitable space in very close proximity to "high rise" developments will reduce the desirability for families with children locating to the central city and thus restrict the demographic range. Consequently, the planned playground, if it is as fantastic as promoted, may likely only attract families from outside the central city rather than attract families to locate to the CCLZ.

Building Heights - Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

I am not sure about as I think most site would In fact be too small to allow a 14 Metre building in these areas and I see no problem with higher than 14 meters on larger sites with good engineering related to the ground conditions

Reference 2

I think 6 storey would be ok

Reference 3

I think mid rise 'human scale' is a good approach however greater flexibility should be provided for in terms of incentivising good design, amenity, pocket parks etc...as part of an RD assessment

Reference 4

Before the quakes, a new City Plan limited our height to 8m, effectively cutting the top off our house. (word). / / Earthquakes happened. / / Our house needs to be rebuilt. We are now dealing with an 8m height limit (word). / / We have done that by cutting the height of our home. / / Our permit was lodged with the Christchurch City Council FIVE MONTHS ago (word). / / We now find that ANOTHER plan is coming out and the limit is tagged at 14m (many words). / / So.....do I have my plans re-drawn and put in a new consent...which will take another...well, who knows as the permit could take six months or more. / / Or do I now object? / / I'm going to have to object. / / As the Council has reduced the height of my home they cannot, four years later, allow a 14m high building beside me. Can they. / /

Reference 5

Low rise will be boring and higher can be quake proof. Variety is the spice of life. Your plan makes for a boring bland city!

Reference 6

I was recently in surfers paradise and saw how high rise has destroyed the outlook and community. Horrible big malls and concrete canyons are not conducive to enjoying a city. Keep it human scaled.

Reference 7

stupid idea producing nasty results with shading and dank urban living. Who would want to live thus? I hope the designers of this plan have disclosed all personal interests in potential property development ventures and companies?

Reference 8

It should be low rise throughout, maximum of four stories and consents required with neighbour consultation on recession planes. housing should be interspersed with green space and walking and bike lanes, see Melbourne, Denmark, Colorado

Comments received via email and post

Reference 9

Our area (Victoria/Montreal/Durham Streets) already has high-density living. By clever architecture, our particular Peacock Street apartment had (and one day should again have) three stories within the old height limit, giving a good balance of high density some sunlight and an occasional view. Any greater height or shading would detract markedly from what is now a good compromise.

Car Parks

Car Parks – Disagree with Rationale

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

No. Market has been useless in sorting Christchurch housing to date. Using this rationale, market will decide all no need for rules. Most stupid rationale I have read ! / I believe we need clear directions to make sure the city is liveable. Market forces WILL NOT DO THIS!!

Reference 2

After a building is completed it is far too late to provide parking spaces should they be wanted by tenants or purchasers. / The state of the housing market in Chch means that no one can afford to say "no" to a property because of lack of car parking so the problem will continue

Reference 3

The market is driven by the developers, not by the buyers. With little choice to many people they are forced to buy what's available, and not what they would choose if they were building a property themselves. / Removing the provision of one garageable parking space will indeed reduce development costs but will just push up the level of inner city on-street parking which is undesirable in the Livable City. Christchurch is not big enough and does not have a well enough developed public transport system to alleviate the need for inner city residents to have cars.

Reference 4

The market won't decide. Developers will try and build as little as they can get away with, and prospective purchasers and especially tenants will have limited choice.

Reference 5

Removing and letting "the market decide" is nonsense; that approach will only throw the problem of parking onto everyone else. Streets will be crowded all the time, there will be no short term (ie, visitor) parking for residential units, and the city streets will be clogged 24 hours per day. The policy will not encourage people to abandon their cars in favour of alternative transportation. Chch does not have a public transport system capable of handling such a situation and the city is not of a sufficient size that people will happily forego owning (and parking) a private car.

Reference 6

It is likely that developers will build residential housing without taking cognisance of purchasers and tenants.

Reference 7

Disagree as developers will always seek to minimise their bottom line.

Reference 8

It is not OK to "let the market decide" as this completely ignores the existing community!

Reference 9

It is also incredibly ignorant to imagine that tenants will be able to sway the market in the foreseeable future given the paucity of accommodation. This facilitates a mass of cheap ugly low amenity apartments flooding the markets as developers make a quick killing due to shortage of accommodation. I can only see this change being of use in a stable market where there is no shortage which won't happen for a decade.

Reference 10

People do not know what they want re parking and often buy after the units have been built. Developers will build to the minimum requirements which will be no parking spaces giving the justification that people want to pay minimum prices and that therefore the car parks are dispensable. Nowadays most families have 2 cars which already exceeds the minimum requirement.

Reference 11

There is no guarantee that developers will make these parking spaces available to tenants or conveniently located for them otherwise.

Reference 12

Car Parking should be integrated into the building design and underground/at ground. The market never takes a healthy long term view but always goes for quick return on investment

Reference 13

Disagree with this proposal. As an inner city resident I believe you will find it difficult to attract people to live in the city if there is not parking available. I am unconvinced that the market will be able to decide.

Reference 14

I do not agree with removing the car parking provision for all areas of the inner city. To rely on market forces to create a lovely neighborhood would be a huge gamble and will turn the inner city into an unlivable and unfriendly place for families and children. Developers are influenced by return on investment and will not be developing friendly livable spaces for all socio economic groups. Developers are not concerned about long term safety and security. I own several properties within the inner city and most properties have a minimum of 2 cars. These cars end up clogging the streets and driveways and overall detract from the appeal of the neighborhood. Car break-ins have increased markedly over the last 10 years and our neighborhood no longer feels safe. For me a livable inner city is a safe and an aesthetically pleasing inner city. Cars on the street do not support either.

Reference 15

What market? A developer will do what he can get away with. What will be done will be what is best for the developer at the time. I think that the decision will take little account of the interests of others and little account of the long-term future.

Reference 16

The developers are dictating and the market has to put up with what's for sale in a market where there is a shortage of supply

Reference 17

I don't think that the minimum of 1 parking space per unit should be maintained in the city centre, as there simply will not be enough space and people should be encouraged to use other means of transport. That being said, leaving the market decide of the parking arrangements is definitely NOT an acceptable alternative. The decision needs to be in the hand of the council, and real alternatives to driving cars around the city/owning a car should be offered, such as: / -the development of the existing common transportation network / - free carparks (at least after hours) / - ...

Comments received via email and post

Reference 18

Parking provision: A second major concern we have is the failure to insist on provision of off-street parking and garaging.

This is a position that the former council also seemed to favour and the CCDU/Government plan suggests that *“The market will decide what the car parking arrangements will be.”*

In our view this is a great nonsense as the buyers and tenants will be stuck with what the CCDU/Government’s preferred developers set up.

The people who will actually have to live and work in the inner city will face an impossible situation, whilst the developers who have had the benefit of cheap confiscated land and relief from development contributions will never live in what they create – maybe not even in the same country.

4.4.1 From our extensive experience in inner city and apartment living, we know that the reality of demand for car parking is very different from the models known and used by traffic planners who may have advised the CCDU/Government in developing the traffic plan details in the plan.

4.4.2 We would describe it as “Euro-centric” and by that we mean that it is based on premises from European cities where the inner city is long established with narrow streets and mainly apartment living, and people walk to work or to shops or for their entertainment.

From our experience in Hong Kong we would find the same to be true.

Parking for cars is not an issue in such circumstances.

Car Parks – Keep Existing

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

The ability for residents to park cars near their own homes is currently very limited. At present some resident need to park their cars more than a city block away from their homes. Many central city residents do not work in the CBD and live here for social and recreational reasons. / / I would not support the removal of this provision, and encourage the continuation of AT LEAST (as a minimum) one offsite parking space for 1-2 bedroom units and at least 2 spaces for 3 bedrooms or more.

Reference 2

Keep it at one garage per unit- you want to encourage use of bikes and public transport (as presumably they will work in the central city and won't need a car day-to-day). However, it is nice to have space for a possible car (if the family gets bigger).

Reference 3

retain existing provision of one garageable carpark per unit

Reference 4

I think that one garageable parking space per unit should be retained. The parking space can be used for bicycles, cargo bikes, scooters, motorcycles.

Reference 5

The requirement that there be one parking space per unit should be retained.

Reference 6

Garageable parking space provides much needed storage for apartment residents even if they do not have a car. In a small unit this is highly desirable.

Reference 7

A minimum of one garageable carpark per residential unit should be retained. This is because Central Christchurch residents will still need their own car for many purposes because Christchurch's public transport will be insufficient for many years to come to provide for all transport needs of its inner-city residents.

Reference 8

1 car park must be retained as a requirements. You just need to look at overseas examples of parking congestion where no spaces are provided.

Reference 9

keep it o e carpark per unit(or more considering how many bedrooms?)

Reference 10

This will cut down on clear space between buildings and complexes leading to smaller apartments of likely lower quality. There are already enough of these around. A garage is a desirable amenity in the inner city and should be seen as a good design feature that can be incorporated.

Reference 11

I prefer the existing provision

Reference 12

Having one garageable parking space per unit keeps cars odd the road. This makes for much nicer looking city streets.

Reference 13

Keep one garageable parking space per unit because otherwise there will not be enough parking on the streets.

Reference 14

I support a minimum of one garageable parking space per unit.

Car Parks – Need maximum**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

maximum

Reference 2

maximum

Reference 3

maximum

Reference 4

maximum

Car Parks – Public Transport, cycles inadequate alternatives**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

support the proposed provision. until there is high quality, consistent public transport, chch will remain a car city. added to this is the fact that most households are two-income and therefore 2 workplace and will require 2 cars unless both work close to home. recreational activities and school dropoffs etc will require more than one car for most.

Reference 2

I agree would only agree with the removal of the requirement if the transit service was increased. By removing the requirement now, it is only providing another opportunity for those with money to set up more money making schemes for parking spots.

Reference 3

This is because Central Christchurch residents will still need their own car for many purposes because Christchurch's public transport will be insufficient for many years to come to provide for all transport needs of its inner-city residents.

Reference 4

Car parking is essential, Christchurch does not have the climate, accessibility to outlying areas or safe, high quality and cohesive public transport to dispense with car accommodation. Bicycles are a nice idea, but fundamentally flawed due to CHC climate and weather. Experience with other more developed cities and empirical evidence indicates occupiers will own and park vehicles in defiance of intentions or objectives. See Brisbane-Teneriffe for example, critical shortage of on-street parking after hours, affects neighboring areas. Private transport is a reality.

Reference 5

Proposed provision is okay, IF suitable public transport is provided and safe cycleways

Reference 6

Good, provided better public transport and cycle networks are provided.

Reference 7

Retain the car park until public transport links are strengthened.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 8

Of course it would great if the culture of car sharing will become a reality. But it is only possible where regular handy public transport is available and also changing people expectations.

Reference 9

From our extensive experience in inner city and apartment living, we know that the reality of demand for car parking is very different from the models known and used by traffic planners who may have advised the CCDU/Government in developing the traffic plan details in the plan.

4.4.2 We would describe it as "Euro-centric" and by that we mean that it is based on premises from European cities where the inner city is long established with narrow streets and mainly apartment living, and people walk to work or to shops or for their entertainment.

From our experience in Hong Kong we would find the same to be true. Parking for cars is not an issue in such circumstances.

4.4.3 However the other feature of these environments is that there are excellent public transport systems within, around and from the cities so that commuting, shopping, going to the theatre or the bar or clubs is easy and cheap but there is also a vast and cheap network of transport to other cities and towns or to key outdoor recreation areas and facilities.

4.4.4 Such networks do not exist in Christchurch at all. The inner city public transport was quite good at moving commuters from outside the city to the inner city and the circular bus was used quite a lot by inner city residents.

But transport across the city is not easy and by taxi, extremely expensive. In addition transport outside the city to other places, to recreational areas and sporting facilities is non-existent.

4.4.5 As a consequence, people who live in the inner city and may walk to work do own cars so that they can do the other things that are important in their lives.

Car Parks – Street Congestion and Parking Problems

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

We live in a 3 bedroom Central City town house on Peterborough Street and have done for almost 20 years. We own 2 cars, 1 motor scooter, 2 bikes and 3 kayaks, at times we've also had a company car too. We have a shared drive way that we can park up to 2 cars on if the get the angles right so as not to block off the other residents vehicles. The road outside our place was often completely full of non residents cars during the day before the quakes, as it was close to the CBD and the parking was free, this meant any guests visiting had to park in the drive or some way away. Most residences will have at least 2 vehicles because this in New Zealand not New York and these will need to go somewhere. Cars parked on the road at night in our neighbourhood tend to get broken in to or vandalised. It should also be noted that when our section of Peterborough Street was beautified, it was narrowed to approximately 4 car width, meaning the when lined on both sides with parked cars, two cars could drive in opposite directions and manage to squeeze past, while a truck meeting a car had a high potential of damaging a parked car (I was riding in the truck).

Reference 2

This is nonsense. / In the CERA document the overriding comment is "cost effective" Purchasers and tenants will come only after the buildings have been erected. / I remind the council of the chaos existing lack of parking has caused in the north east of the central city

Reference 3

In my street there is no access to foot paths as cars park across the footpath. Pedestrians must walk on the road. This will only get worse if there is no provision for parking for new developments.

Reference 4

this sound good in general as not every development does need 1 carpark per unit but considering the financial constraints and the fact that carparking takes a lot of valuable space developers will most likely not provide carparking putting a lot of pressure on the allocation of onstreetparking / this means tat a new on street parking scheme should be considered for local residents - this works successfully in other similar sized cities overseas. / no carparking also requires a well functioning public transport system. / As long as this issue is not looked at in isolation and other innovative parking solutions are being considered i.e. shared parking on commercial properties after business hours, onstreetparking for residents, dedicated parking buildings.

Reference 5

Oppose. Will create parking problems for residents and visitors.

Reference 6

You just need to look at overseas examples of parking congestion where no spaces are provided.

Reference 7

I believe this will create a central city with no on-street car parks day or night. These apartments or units will be tenanted due to location and the demand for housing, but will be undesirable and not particularly "liveable".

Reference 8

I oppose the proposal because there will be too many cars taking up too much roadside space without regulation. The proposed public transport networks are still fluid and undefined and there is no guarantee that new inner city residents are likely to reduce their need for cars as they meet their daily recreational, retail, employment and educational needs. /

Reference 9

This will lead to severe congestion and parking on streets.

Reference 10

I don't agree. The reality of the way we live in Chch is that we drive cars. If no parking residents will clog the streets with their cars.

Reference 11

Keep one garageable parking space per unit because otherwise there will not be enough parking on the streets.

Reference 12

I think there needs to be some restrictions - we do not want a central city full of car parks.

Reference 13

It is imperative that some off street car parking is mandated for each residential complex. As an inner city resident we already have issues with visitors not being able to park on the street as residents and inner city works have used all available parking. / / I have no confidence in the market deciding appropriate car parking arrangements. Developer will opt for maximum build space. All units should have at least one off street parking space available for residents and or visitors.

Comments received via email and post**Reference 14**

Until we see alternative parking management mechanisms put in place, then we will remain concerned about the on-street conflicts that occur within our neighbourhood and may compound with greater densities.

Reference 15

4.4.7 We are experienced in the issue of the presence of cars and the need for adequate parking and off street facility (garaging)

We have lived in inner city areas almost exclusively over the past 20 years, and earlier before that.

In Christchurch we have seen the impact of new developments on demand for car-parking under the existing rules.

In our experience, whilst developers hold buildings until they can be sold to private owners, the buildings are leased to many separate tenants on a room by room basis.

So a town house with the standard 3 bedrooms and a garage plus one space usually holds 6 occupants and most of them will have one car per bedroom and often 2.

This causes chaos in the narrow inner city residential streets.

However this concentration of cars does diminish once the townhouses / apartments are sold to individuals who, for the most part, rent to a single tenant, but two cars per town house or apartment are still common.

The CCDU/Government's plan does not seem to be aware of this fact.

To give an example of the impact of poor car usage and ownership planning we should refer to Doha, Qatar.

We lived in a new apartment block in an area of the city that was transitioning from large walled single home compounds to 5 storey apartment blocks with shopping on the street frontage.

No thought had been given to the need for parking of cars either for residents or the on-street businesses.

This was in a city where public transport was almost non-existent except for taxis but where work places and shopping malls and other facilities – clubs, sports fields, restaurants – were widely separated, rather similar to post-quake Christchurch.

In addition, the climate made walking or cycling impossible for much of the year. In our complex of twenty-five, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments there was parking space for 15 vehicles.

Residents of one apartment had 4 cars between the 5 inhabitants, our neighbours had two plus the need for the visiting husband calling on this particular wife every second night, and every other apartment had one or two cars.

In addition the shopkeepers from the 4 shops also wanted parking for them and their clients.

The street parking was taken up almost exclusively every day by the cars of two rental car companies located in the block and commuters.

Yet this traffic nightmare was better than some areas right in the city centre where similar and larger blocks had been built with the CCDU/Government's zero car parking option.

Car parks – Full Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Agree / One reason people move to a city centre is to reduce their dependancy on the car.

Reference 2

Agree with this approach

Reference 3

Approve, as inner city living should assume to rely on private transport as space is at a premium.

Reference 4

Agree

Reference 5

ok

Reference 6

I agree with the changes to this provision.

Reference 7

I think this is fantastic idea, and essential for promoting medium-high density living in the central city. I think the Plan should be leading the city of the path towards sustainable forms of transport, and this is a pragmatic first step.... it will allow the market to make a transition away from cars as personal choice and public transport options allow, and to evolve as the drivers evolve. / / It is much better than mandating that a significant portion of the central city get given over to asphalt.

Reference 8

I think this is a good example when market forces can lead the type of parking an amount. This part sounds good.

Reference 9

Let the market decide

Reference 10

I think this is a great idea

Reference 11

I agree that this is a good idea. Car parking should not be a requirement!

Reference 12

Perfect solution minimum parking requirements are outdated

Comments received via email and post

Reference 13

We very much support the removal of car parking minimums. However, we would like visitor cycle parking minimums for residential development, even when residential units have garages because visitors are unlikely to be able to use these facilities.

Car Parks – General Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

In principle this appears to be a good idea, from my experience not all tenants need or want a car park, so some flexibility would be desirable and may assist in maximizing some site to achieve higher density than the present rules allow

Reference 2

Seems ok but others might require larger garages for 2nd cars.

Reference 3

I agree that the market should decide what is required here, however some caution should be taken as parking spaces will need to be considered on any development however garageable space is a luxury that not all units may need.

Reference 4

this sound good in general as not every development does need 1 carpark per unit but considering the financial constraints and the fact that carparking takes a lot of valuable space developers will most likely not provide carparking putting a lot of pressure on the allocation of onstreetparking / this means tat a new on street parking scheme should be considered for local residents - this works successfully in other similar sized cities overseas. / no carparking also requires a well functioning public transport system. / As long as this issue is not looked at in isolation and other innovative parking solutions are being considered i.e. shared parking on commercial properties after business hours, onstreetparking for residents, dedicated parking buildings.

References 5-6

The Canterbury Sustainable Homes Working Party supports the removal of minium carparking requirements. Public transport and walkability of the city centre makes it likely that some residential occupants will choose not to own a car. Overseas inner city developments are finding a significantly reduced demand for carparking. However the

ongoing perceptions of the market desire for carparking gives rise to the concern that excessive carparking may still be constructed as part of developments – and that “design for car turning” could still be an outcome. Shared parking spaces rather than individual garaging should be considered for more efficient use of space. As a result the CSHWP recommends that maximum carparking standards be included in the District Plan.

Reference 7

one garageable parking unit for high density areas, this is city living and we should be encouraging bikes, walking etc, public transport

Reference 8

I agree with removing the strict one carpark per unit rule, although I imagine carparking will be still be a priority for people living in Christchurch. I am more concerned with the placement of carparking on sites: with the removal of Urban Design assessment I would like some assurance that carparking isn't placed at the front of sites along the road. With the majority of residential sites within the four aves having long, thin proportions, this is the easiest and most economical option, but isn't at all conducive to attractive street frontage, or a welcoming urban environment.

References 9-10

Beacon Pathway supports the removal of minimum carparking requirements and recommends that maximum carparking standards be included in the District Plan. Improved public transport alongside the provision of good quality walking and cycling infrastructure in the Central City Living Zone makes it likely that some residential occupants will choose not to own a car. This infrastructure must also include safe and accessible parking for cycles. / / Beacon raises concern that the ‘market’ may still lead excessive carparking construction as part of developments – and that “design for car turning” could still be an outcome. Shared parking spaces rather than individual garaging should be considered for more efficient use of space. This also has the benefit of providing opportunities for residents to meet each other casually (bump spaces). / / Overseas inner city developments are finding a significantly reduced demand for carparking. For example in Victoria parking requirements for medium density development were 1 carpark per apartment, however they quickly realised that carparks weren't being used and have reduced the requirement to 0.6 carpark per apartment. /

Reference 11

Good idea if adequate parking is available in the vicinity

References 12-13

It is good to remove the minimum, however there should be a maximum of two per unit and an upper limit per site (i.e. some units may have no space, some one, and others two).

Reference 14

I think it is a useful starting point to reducing the number of cars in the inner city. Many other cities do not offer car parks for every tenant in apartment blocks - where parking is necessary the tenant pays extra for that privilege. With a comprehensive public transport network & a walkable city many more people may feel more comfortable not having a car at all. Having some apartments without garages may also reduce the costs on those apartments thereby allowing a greater mix of incomes in the inner city.

Reference 15

I don't think that the minimum of 1 parking space per unit should be maintained in the city centre, as there simply will not be enough space and people should be encouraged to use other means of transport. That being said, leaving the market decide of the parking arrangements is definitely NOT an acceptable alternative. The decision needs to be in the hand of the council, and real alternatives to driving cars around the city/owning a car should be offered, such as: / -the development of the existing common transportation network / - free carparks (at least after hours) / - ...

Reference 16

One garage per unit is possibly unnecessary in the central city

Reference 17

In a world where the market has created huge global resource issues, we have to consider what a 'laissez faire' approach really means. This is an opportunity to curb the unnecessary presence of excess traffic. One garage space should be the maximum not minimum allowance.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 19

Interesting consent not requiring any parking and leaving it to the market, I strongly suspect most developers would still provide a minimum of one park.

Reference 20

Zero car parking requirements for residential developments:

The proposed removal of parking requirements is supported. This will allow a number of alternative residential units typologies to be incorporated, in particular higher unit densities on the same land area. Ultimately the market will determine what is required. Some developers will no doubt still provide dedicated parking as part of their sales package and their personal perceptions regarding what potential occupants may demand. The ability for inner city residents to choose how much parking they require, and to lease it separately, makes the actual cost of parking far more transparent. It is expected that car parking facilities will be provided within the Central City Living zone by both the CCC and private providers to service these developments.

This change places more pressure on the City to provide a safe, efficient and affordable public transport system to service the residents. Rules will also need to be put in place to prevent the inner city streets being cluttered with resident's vehicles.

Reference 21

Car parking Agree that car parking can be left to the market and suspect that most developers would wish to provide at least one car park per unit. However, whether or not it is possible to park nearby on the street should be able to be taken into account. In some situations some provision of on-site parking will be essential.

Car Parks – Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Keep on-street parking to a minimum- I would love to see more trees on the roadside!

Reference 2

has thought been given as to where all the cars will go though?

Reference 3

Do not assume that future residents will be carless or have no use of garage type storage facilities,

Reference 4

In existing areas such as Ely Street, Melrose Street and Otley street, there is already considerable parking space deficit caused by excessive development. / Given that there is now lots of spare land available in the city centre for more intensive development, the existing areas need to be protected and left as they are, since they have existing character and community. /

Reference 5

This needs to be carefully combined with other ideas. It is too simplistic

Reference 6

This would be reasonable. It is not clear how many dedicated car park buildings there will be but perhaps planning consideration should be given to having enough parking buildings that near by residents can lease a park in a nearby building for garaging. In it's place cycling storage rules are important and the provision of chargeable transport options like small motorised cycles and segways can be considered

Reference 7

i agree with minimising car parking but i don't believe this is the correct mechanism to do so. allow projects to go through urban design panel for decisions on where minimising car parking is appropriate, otherwise we run the risk of developers taking advantage. some sites will need to provide some car parking.

Reference 8

I agree with removing the strict one carpark per unit rule, although I imagine carparking will be still be a priority for people living in Christchurch. I am more concerned with the placement of carparking on sites: with the removal of Urban Design assessment I would like some assurance that carparking isn't placed at the front of sites along the road. With the majority of residential sites within the four aves having long, thin proportions, this is the easiest and most economical option, but isn't at all conducive to attractive street frontage, or a welcoming urban environment.

Reference 9

Beacon Pathway supports the removal of minimum carparking requirements and recommends that maximum carparking standards be included in the District Plan. Improved public transport alongside the provision of good quality walking and cycling infrastructure in the Central City Living Zone makes it likely that some residential occupants will choose not to own a car. This infrastructure must also include safe and accessible parking for cycles. / / Beacon raises concern that the 'market' may still lead excessive carparking construction as part of developments – and that “design for car turning” could still be an outcome. Shared parking spaces rather than individual garaging should be considered for more efficient use of space. This also has the benefit of providing opportunities for residents to meet each other casually (bump spaces). / / Overseas inner city developments are finding a significantly reduced demand for carparking. For example in Victoria parking requirements for medium density development were 1 carpark per apartment, however they quickly realised that carparks weren't being used and have reduced the requirement to 0.6 carpark per apartment. /

Reference 10

What guidance will be in place to ensure safety of pedestrians with driver and pedestrian (and cyclists on shared paths) visibility being restricted by fences? Will there be a requirement for no reversing across footpaths?

Reference 11

Also affects insurance to have cars out un garaged. What crime prevention measures will be put in place if cars aren't to be garaged to minimise theft.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 12

The surveys done by the transport planner groups for various council reports is very weak.

They did not survey any L4 or inner city residential areas (i.e. within the 4 avenues) but only Living 3 zones

They measured cars on only limited occasions at limited sites.

They did not take cognisance of the fact that in the areas where car density was measured, garaging and off-street parking requirements was high, and much, much higher than the zero proposals in the CCDU/Government's plan.

They did not recognise that many of the inner-city residential streets are significantly narrower than the streets in which such surveys were conducted.

They failed to recognise the importance of the use of cars by permanent residents of the inner city.

Car Parks – Other Suggestions

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

encourage the continuation of AT LEAST (as a minimum) one offsite parking space for 1-2 bedroom units and at least 2 spaces for 3 bedrooms or more.

Reference 2

Hi all, put the cars parking space's just out the central city, all of them there.. 4 or 5 big car parks,.. and interlope bus's and trains and trams into the city, so the people can get drop off to the shops and business, and free to walk around with out smog and fumes from cars and trucks ... just a easy way to get around the city using bus and little trains and trains will make the city look nice ,, and really easy to get around,.. less money to pay for parking in car parks in and round the city with the car parks on the side of street and spaces for them in big car park place's ... just have people walk and take a train and trams back to car parks on outside of city ,,... easy and that way in a better city for all,,, just one idea you may like to look at,,,,,Thanks

Reference 3

At least TWO garages per dwelling. Even if people ride bicycles, they generally have two road bikes and two mountain bikes which take up a garage space. / PLUS TWO off-street visitor spaces per dwelling where there is limited on-street parking. / People don't know how they will live in a space until they are actually in residence. It may look fab to buy "the dream" but in reality, if you're an island it's not much fun. / For fourteen years I have lived in Park Terrace, Central City. For that time I have not been able to invite people over for coffee and cake on my birthday. I go to a friend's suburban home in a 'normal' residential area with on-street parking or we go to Merivale Mall where we can park. / I have a mother who contracted polio in 1937. Mumzie now requires a wheelchair van. / The planner I spoke to told me that if you required mobility parking then you wouldn't buy into the dream. There seems to be no provision for falling ill or becoming elderly. / Where does Nurse Maude park? Where does the gardener park? How do couriers / Ballantynes / Conroys deliver? / The plan looks ok for people with no friends or family in Christchurch and who keep good health but is very isolating for people who fall ill or like to have people over.

Reference 4

As in an area of San Francisco we visited recently, the ground floor should be for residents car parking with storage units/cupboards for outdoor activity gear. Depending where the complex is, the front of each ground floor could be a small shop, but under cover parking/storage areas are essential even if they have to be accessed by a back alley type access way. Do not assume that all inner city residents will be happy to be car-free, or have to be first in for the limited car park spaces that may be all some developers provide. As a potential resident of the inner city I do not want an apartment with no garage/storage facilities

Reference 5

What is needed in a multi-unit development is not necessarily one garageable parking space per unit but a mix of 60% garages, 20-30% carports and some special covered space for electric or pedal bikes. In other words, space needs to be apportioned. Note that small flats have a turnover of merely 8 months' occupancy and when I talk to neighbours about this frequency it is invariably because such flats have little or no storage. Kiwis have stuff even if they don't have a car.

Reference 6

The Canterbury Sustainable Homes Working Party supports the removal of minium carparking requirements. Public transport and walkability of the city centre makes it likely that some residential occupants will choose not to own a

car. Overseas inner city developments are finding a significantly reduced demand for carparking. However the ongoing perceptions of the market desire for carparking gives rise to the concern that excessive carparking may still be constructed as part of developments – and that “design for car turning” could still be an outcome. Shared parking spaces rather than individual garaging should be considered for more efficient use of space. As a result the CSHWP recommends that maximum carparking standards be included in the District Plan.

Reference 7

/ I would propose a minimum of one off-street garageable parking space per unit is required.

Reference 8

As long as this is restricted to small localised inner city areas only such as new eastern residential belt this is acceptable. This new proposed rule should not be allowed beyond the 4 aves

Comments received via email and post

Reference 9

In the case of **parking**, the group members acknowledge that in some inner-city areas, for some developments, parking may not be needed for each unit, but that in other areas, particularly those with narrow streets, **on-site parking is essential**, not only for the residents of new developments, but to allow for the ease of movement and safety of existing residents. Until we see alternative parking management mechanisms put in place, then we will remain concerned about the on-street conflicts that occur within our neighbourhood and may compound with greater densities. While many of us walk and cycle within the Central City, owning a car is often still a necessity for longer trips.

Reference 10

Parking is also very important, each unit will have a minimum of two tenants, each of them one car.....so a two car for each unit parking space is advisable. Doing less is once again putting one head under the sand.

Reference 11

I wish to express my concern and alarm at the proposed changes that are to be implemented for people living in the inner city regarding, most importantly, the fact that there will be no provision for parking nor, it seems, will there will be rules as to height and size of commercial buildings, size of dwellings etc. It seems common sense is going to be ignored. Many people will need cars to get to work and I think that apartments, flats, homes should have at least one parking space be it a garage, a parking area or on the kerb.

Reference 12

4.4.8 We believe that any reduction in the parking requirements should be in line with the reality as we have outlined it.

We are disappointed that the CCDU/Government’s zero car parking option does not agree with us

4.4.9 Further, we believe that in the very narrow inner city streets at least, the recommendations of the CCDU/Government’s plan on queuing space are not only inadequate but potentially dangerous and should not be followed.

Reference 13

We very much support the removal of car parking minimums. However, we would like visitor cycle parking minimums for residential development, even when residential units have garages because visitors are unlikely to be able to use these facilities.

Reference 14

The proposed reduction of car parking space.

Within a residential development site, a reduction of car parking space will pose problems. Until a satisfactory inner city shuttle service connecting to intercity and suburban transport is provided, there will not be satisfactory parking for resident's cars. Perhaps a half way measure of .5 car parks for each residence should be considered.

Non-residential activity

Non-residential activity – Local services ok

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Agree providing services required for a vibrant community are allowed.

Reference 2

Agree. Having small business in residential areas is one of the things thta gives vibrancy to overseas cities.

Reference 3

Small businesses such as a dairy which directly serves the community with residence is acceptable.

Reference 4

Non-residential activities must be only associated with the function of residential areas. Therefore no industrial activities whatsoever. Professional activities, hospitality (cafes, restaurants etc), retailing, leisure facilities etc. compatible with comfortable and un-intrusive enjoyment and use of residential areas are appropriate.

Reference 5

There needs to be flexibility to allow coffee shops etc in residential areas

Reference 6

However, that should allow restaurants and cafes but exclude bars as they are extremely anti-social neighbours in my experience .

Reference 7

Wouldn't it be great to just pop down for some dinner, to go to a movie, for retail etc??

Reference 8

It is critical to allow for the provision of non-residential activities which support the local neighbourhood e.g. dairy, laundromat, medical facilities, while retaining the residential focus of the zone. This is particularly important for communities which will be developed with a lesser focus on car transport. People will want to access facilities on foot, by bicycle and public transport and mixed use development provides for this.

Reference 9

/ I think it should be more around noise and air pollution, and other pollution. Having small busineses creating local products for a neighbourhood is a good thing. It also encourages creativity and innovation as well as community as local people of a like mind and interest gather together.

Reference 10

This is particularly important for communities which will be developed with a lesser focus on car transport. People will want to access facilities on foot, by bicycle and public transport and mixed use development provides for this.

Reference 11

Non Residential activities should be restricted to very small and customized localities where such activities are clustered together eg local dairy, cafe, hairdresser, mechanic.

Non-residential activity – Mixed use preference**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

I believe that the whole Central City needs to be mixed use with upper level apartments and penthouses, having traveled to Asia and 8 or so countries what I have observed is that the older areas with lots of residential in upper levels and commercial and restaurants on the ground floors, these are the really vibrant buzzing parts of the city both during the day and in the evening. The modern commercial areas absolutely die at night, and weekends, and over the holiday periods.

Reference 2

Against this proposal. The central city is NOT the suburbs and should be reflected in a variety of businesses being allowed (including allowing Calander Girls Strip club to remain). People should expect noise in the city and bringing a culture of NIMBYism from the suburbs will be detrimental.

Reference 3

this provision make sense for residential areas that need protection from noise, air, visual and other commercial pollution but it is important to allow commercial activities that support residential to be thrown into the mix , this is inner city living and people expect a good mix of activities - otherwise it will feel like supersized suburbia. innercity living needs a point of difference and a healthy mix of uses is the key to that

Reference 4

I like the idea of mixed zones. It means more chance of people being around most of the time which is good for security and human comfort. / / However, that should allow restaurants and cafes but exclude bars as they are extremely anti-social neighbours in my experience .

Reference 5

This is always a tricky balance. I think mixed use should be strongly encouraged as this provides the most live and safety for a city.

Reference 6

Mixed use space is ideal - allow for non-residential activities within residential areas. Wouldn't it be great to just pop down for some dinner, to go to a movie, for retail etc??

Reference 7

The CSHWP supports encouraging mixed use development and feels that the proposed amendments are too restrictive. It is critical to allow for the provision of non-residential activities which support the local neighbourhood e.g. dairy, laundromat, medical facilities, while retaining the residential focus of the zone. This is particularly important for communities which will be developed with a lesser focus on car transport. People will want to access facilities on foot, by bicycle and public transport and mixed use development provides for this.

Reference 8

There needs to be an appropriate mix of activities maintained and provided for in all areas. Making zones blanket residential leads to more traffic and commuting for work, leisure, sports etc. Chch needs to transition AWAY from being so car dominated.

Reference 9

I support this proposal in part. Neighbours need neighbours and a sense of community and continuity of residential activity. This is particularly important in the areas that used to be called L4C. Various precincts have been created and mixed use zones are also defined in the wider plan. Similarly, the Central City Living Zone needs to be maintained and encouraged to flourish. Residential activities occur 24/7. Activities which interfere with this prime use must be minimised. Given that L5 zones already break up the CCLZ, it is important that other non-residential activities and intrusions are minimised. Non-residential activities should be restricted to owner/occupier activities. New, large scale, city wide based activities (churches, sports stadiums, entertainment halls) should be excluded from the CCLZ.

Reference 10

I think mixed-use zones are needed to make the city a vibrant place.

Reference 11

variable heights are needed in neighbourhoods, as is mixed use

Reference 12

i disagree, i think that mixed use is key and i would prefer that all buildings are mixed use as in e.g. amsterdam - floor levels have a ceiling height of 3.5m so they can be shops, apartments or workshops as the market requires over time. middle floors are most often offices, and then residential on top, but again with flexibility to convert easily. i believe this would be more positive for our city than restricting non-residential. / / encourage residential, rather than restriction of other activities.

Reference 13

I am getting more and more concerned by this survey. Multi use is the key to good urban places! / Particularly concerned by the statement "ensure that non-residential activities do not interfere with residential activities". The point of living in the inner city is to have access to these activities! Not to remove them! The change here is moving in the wrong direction.

Reference 14

Beacon supports encouraging mixed use development. It is critical to allow for the provision of non-residential activities which support the local neighbourhood e.g. dairy, laundromat, medical facilities, while retaining the residential focus of the zone. This is particularly important for communities which will be developed with a lesser focus on car transport. People will want to access facilities on foot, by bicycle and public transport and mixed use development provides for this.

Reference 15

History has shown that vibrant inner cities around the world and made up by people being able to live and work on the same site. The idea of 'zones' such as business, residential and commercial are a nomenclature of the 1950's that needs to go. People live integrated lives, not boxed compartmentalised lives. Modern buildings and cities have work, play, leisure, shopping, education and parking all on the same site - just like many ancient towns (where people were the focus and not cars).

Reference 16

Mixed use should be encouraged throughout the central city area as it is a way to achieve affordable apartment above business premises. Less restrictions the better.

Comments received via email and post**Reference 17**

I am for a mix of commercial and residential for Christchurch central, commercial includes new schools and sport facilities, shopping and essential services.

Reference 18

Mixed density buildings and mixed tenure are supported as they reinforce neighbourhood stability, allowing people to stay in the same community throughout their lives and also encourages diversity (Welch, A, 2011). These factors have the potential to impact on health and wellbeing.

Recommendation: that the CCDU consider rules around mixed tenure within each development to allow equitable access to people at different stages of their lives.

Reference 19

13. It is acknowledged that one way of rectifying this situation is to insert rule 4.1.5 into the Mixed Use zone rules.
14. It is submitted that the outcomes the parties were seeking to achieve through the inclusion of rule 4.1.5 in the City Plan could readily be achieved under the new Mixed Use zone.
15. However, considering the objective of Plan Change 18 and the Draft Chapter proposed Mixed Use zone, DJ K supports the rezoning of the Site to Mixed Use zone subject to the following.
16. DJ K Holdings requests an exception to the standard height maximum (Draft Chapter - Map 2) be provided for the Site.
17. The environment results anticipated for the Living 4B zone were also amended to include the following:

' landmark building on the corner of Hagley Avenue and Moorhouse Avenue.'

18. The proposed rezoning under the Draft Chapter effectively completely disregards the extensive amount of time, effort and resources spent on the part of both DJ K and the Council over a period of more than two years to reach a solution for an appropriate planning regime applying to the Site to provide for a "land mark building" to be established on the Site.
19. The maximum height specified for this site in the Mixed Use Zone is 14m. It is submitted that this height maximum should be increased for the Site.

20. The Site, located on the corner of Moorhouse and Hagley Aveues, is in a unique setting and a gateway for the city. It is submitted that an exception to the height maximum should be provided for corner sites, like this one, to enable a better urban design outcome and accentuate corners.

Non-residential activity – Retain existing

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

current controls are sufficient to determine appropriate use of a property.

Reference 2

I see no reason to restrict it further. I think the zones and the precincts are going to create black holes during different days of the week/times of day. It seems ridiculous. Mix it all up - it's a city centre.

Reference 3

I support the existing provision

Non-residential activity – Full support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Agree providing services required for a vibrant community are allowed.

Reference 2

I support this proposal

Reference 3

Good idea.

Reference 4

Agree

Reference 5

agree

Reference 6

A non-residential activity must NEVER interfere with the ability to live comfortably. / / Noise, smell and obstructive parking will disrupt inner-city living for most. / /

Reference 7

agree

Reference 8

I totally agree with this proposed change. I have experienced the problems created by allowing non residential activities to encroach into residential areas.....and despite the current rules there seemed to be nothing we could

do about it. When a non-residential activity is approved, the next applicant uses the fact that there's already commercial /non-residential premises in the area as an argument that their application should be approved as well. Even though CCC says a precedent is not set by such approval, that is not what has happened in reality. I know for sure that the impact of the Salvation Army development (still to be built, although approved before the earthquakes) on the corner of Gracefield + Salisbury is going to be enormous. Even with two CCC planning reports concluding that the development should NOT go ahead, the Commissioner approved it with only minor concessions. Anything that can help Living Zones remain residential, rather than being eroded by pockets of non residential premises, has my full support (and gratitude!).

Reference 9

Agree

Reference 10

I support this policy, especially in the inner city. The living areas are ;already so small that a mixture of residential and non-residential activity does not work--the latter negatively affects the former. This change in policy will 'force' businesses to locate in commercial areas to the overall good of a new and thriving commercial district.

Reference 11

Yes keep zones strictly residential. / In particular the near-by business zones must have noise restrictions such as no late-night noise from bars and night-clubs.

Reference 12

Agree. Having small business in residential areas is one of the things thta gives vibrancy to overseas cities.

Reference 13

I support this proposal. Currently, non-residential uses intrude too often and too easily into residential neighbourhoods within the central city.

Reference 14

Any non- residential activities must be notifiable and permanent residence mandatory. Furthermore, why allow such where the aim is to fully populate the inner city? For example, Golden Homes has a large corner section Madras/Bealey Avenue. No one lives there and such a business contributes nothing to the community of people living around it. Small businesses such as a dairy which directly serves the community with residence is acceptable.

Reference 15

Agree this change appears sound.

Reference 16

Non-residential activities must be only associated with the function of residential areas. Therefore no industrial activities whatsoever. Professional activities, hospitality (cafes, restaurants etc), retailing, leisure facilities etc. compatible with comfortable and un-intrusive enjoyment and use of residential areas are appropriate.

Reference 17

Agreed

Reference 18

This is great,

Reference 19

OK

Reference 20

I support this proposal - residential areas should be restricted to residential activity. /

Reference 21

However, the tight limits on non-residential uses inside the CCLZ are encouraging: 4a.3 : Critical Standards for CCLZ are well constructed, to reflect the intended 24/7 residential nature of the zone.

Reference 22

I agree with this.

Reference 23

This is one point that the proposal does very well. Strong limits on non-residential activities are very important. Well done.

Reference 24

Agree

Reference 25

I agree.

Reference 26

Historic Places Canterbury supports the proposed restrictions on non-residential activity.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 27

Further consistent with that emphasis on recovery of communities, I support and commend the provisions of the Draft chapter which propose;

I. The objective of making Christchurch one of the best small cities in the world, and one with the best urban environment in New Zealand.

II. The simpler method of calculating the maximum permitted building height limit of 14m.

III.

Clauses 4a.3.1 and 4a.3.2 as Critical Standards aimed at containing and preventing non-residential activities within the Central City Living Zone.

Reference 28

Rule 4a.3.1 – Scale of Activities

It is important to restrict non-residential activity in residential areas. By way of example, there is currently an application for resource consent for the Majestic Church at 53 Kilmore Street. We have submitted in opposition due to the large scale and intrusive nature of the proposed activity, immediately across the street from one of our sites. It is already putting some of our potential new residents off.

Reference 29

b. Very tight limits on non-residential uses in the new residential zone (Central City Living Zone, CCLZ). This is paragraphs 4a.3.1 and 4a.3.2 on pages 26-27 (A Liveable City). This is very important.

Reference 30

I support the City Plan principles that non-residential activities should be:

1/ small scale

2/ compatible with residential activities,

- 3/ do not displace residential activities,
- 4/ and assist the creation of inner city neighbourhoods.

Non-residential activity – General Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Non-residential activities may be useful but the controls over their proliferation currently are extremely weak and do not adequately consider the residential needs of the people you hope to have living full-time in the city. / In addition the new rules mean any objections to these non-residential uses are severely constrained.

Reference 2

I agree with this provision to some extent.

Reference 3

There needs to be flexibility to allow coffee shops etc in residential areas

Reference 4

As long as non-residential activities do not negatively impinge on neighbouring residents this should continue to be permitted.

Reference 5

Agree that need to ensure that commercial activities need to be appropriately located.

Reference 6

Non Residential activities should be restricted to very small and customized localities where such activities are clustered together eg local dairy, cafe, hairdresser, mechanic. These non residential activities should be permitted only if they service the local neighboring residential area. Any larger commercial enterprises have no place within a residential area. Any liveable inner city residential area should in no way share the neighborhood with a motel, Hotel, or tourist operation. These activities should be relegated to specific commercial designated areas that are well removed from residential areas so that a residential ambiance is preserved. In particular the Avon Loop area is a totally inappropriate position for a hotel to be situated in.

Reference 7

Non residential activities are already encroaching on residents safety e.g. Car parking on both sides of the street narrowing the roads and creating a traffic hazard.

Reference 8

Absolutely. This city is in great need of more mixture between residential and non-residential areas to be more lively and make the streets be a nicer place to simply walk around in. As long as this does not rime with a global homogenisation.

Reference 9

Agree but apply to only new operations.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 10

OTHER THINGS WE SUPPORT:

1. Limits on non-residential uses in the new residential zone (Central City Living Zone, CCLZ). This is paragraphs 4a.3.1 and 4a.3.2 on pages 26-27.
2. Simpler definition of maximum height (to the top of the highest point) is more logical than current "X m plus 3.5 m for a sloping roof" definition.

Reference 11

Agree with provisions, except that service space should not be located forward of any part of the building.

Non-residential activity – Specific

Comments received via email and post

Reference 1

Rule 4a.3.2 (residential coherence) raises potential uncertainty as to its application insofar that 'only those persons who reside permanently on the site can engage in the activity'. This could, for example, preclude any activity where clients or visitors 'engage in the activity'. In contrast, the existing residential coherence rule requires 'at least one person engaged in the activity [to] reside on the site', in which case this uncertainty does not arise.

Non-residential activity – Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Is there really a problem here?

Reference 2

We should set a goal of creating a percentage (ideally a high one) of the inner city which has tree canopy cover. We should encourage green areas and green roofs and walls so that the city feels like a good place to live.

Reference 3

Heritage properties may be adversely affected by such stringent controls as the proposed provision seems to imply, especially if there is a sudden increase in modern accommodation available in the central city

Reference 4

As the owner of a property in Manchester Street I am concerned about the activity of sex workers in the street - I applaud the encouragement given to more residential provision in the city. / / The presence of sex workers in a residential or proposed residential area does nothing to enhance or encourage people to move to live in the inner city. / / More work needs to be done by sex worker organisations, social workers, the Council and government agencies to encourage sex workers to move to indoor premises or provide some non-residential area for sex workers to operate.

Reference 5

We live near the corner of Manchester & Peterborough Streets and strongly believe that prostitutes should not be able to carry out business in a Residential location. / Please identify an area within the CBD where they can ply their trade. / The girls that work our corner are just the tip of the iceberg. Minders who sit in their cars throwing RTD cans & McDonald papers out the windows, wacko types who prowl the area with pitbull dogs all night, we've found

knives, clubs and steel bars in convenient hiding places not to mention faeces on our properties and burglaries are common. If you want to build a lovely new CBD make provision for the Prostitutes early on.

Reference 6

No view.

Reference 7

No comment

Comments received via email and post

Reference 8

- 4.6 **Population intensification** The CCDU/Government plan wishes to make most of the “simplification” on the basis that such changes are necessary to build a larger population for the inner city.
- 4.6.1 The Victoria Residents’ Association conducted an excellent study which showed clearly that under the existing development standards such population intensification was not only possible but likely and sustainable.
- 4.6.2 The CCDU/Government plan and earlier versions of it have removed large tracts of residential land from the inner city to site stadia, “fan-zones” and such features.
- 4.6.3 The CCDU/Government plan persists in allowing the Mixed Use Zones which ought to be returned to residential housing, but have in recent years been wastelands, car yards, offices and workshops. This is particularly to the east and south of Latimer Square, west of Colombo Street below Cashel Street and around Cranmer Square.
- 4.6.4 The CCDU/Government plan should be amended to ensure that all residential areas stay residential and many of these Mixed Use areas return to residential.

Non-residential activity – Other suggestions

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1-2

/ I think it should be more around noise and air pollution, and other pollution. Having small businneses creating local products for a neighbourhood is a good thing. It also encourages creativity and innovation as well as community as local people of a like mind and interest gather together.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 3

4a.3.2 Residential Coherence Health and wellbeing are enhanced by the ability of people to make informal social contact with others. Easy (preferably walkable) links to key destinations help foster informal social connection. The greater the level of connectivity within a local area, the greater the ease of travel, and the more likely people are to make informal contacts (CSIRO 2009).

Oppose: the restrictions on health facilities in the residential area. As more people are attracted to the Central City, there will be an increase in demand for primary health facilities. It is important that health facilities are easily accessible to an aging population.

Recommendation: that the location of health facilities are permitted over a broader area.

Recommendation: that the CCDU keep the mixed use non residential activity zoning to allow for local businesses such as fruit and vegetable sellers, dairies and cafes to service their local communities.

Reference 4

Agree with provisions, except that service space should not be located forward of any part of the building. The way the rule is drafted it would be possible to locate the service area in a front yard to the side of the building.

The provision of service space could be left to the market or could be a building consent matter only. Location and screening of service space to be covered by fencing and setback rules.

Reference 5

Alternate uses than residential Due to the angled street frontage of the subject property orientating towards the boatshed and floodpath issues on the subject property restricting residential activities at street level, it would be desirable to activate this ground plane with a retail or commercial office space – such as a florist, café and other uses that will assist in further activating and enhancing people experiencing the recently completed Avon River Precinct works. Minimal alternate uses from residential would be desirable – say 10% of the gross floor area.

Other

Other – Activity Status

Comments received via email and post

Reference 1

<p>Scale of activity – other activities (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.3.1)</p> <p>Site size – other activities (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.3.2)</p> <p>Hours of operation – other activities (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.3.3)</p> <p>Traffic generation – other activities (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.3.4)</p> <p>Residential coherence – other activities (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.3.6)</p>	<p>Changes to the intent of ‘other activity rules’</p> <p>(non residential activity rules) are outside the scope of this review – they have been previously changed under the recovery plan.</p>	<p>Some drafting changes made to reflect there being only one zone by referring to hatched areas on the zoning planning map.</p>	<p>Community standard and Critical standard 4.3.1 replaced by Critical standard 4a.3.1.</p> <p>Community standard Site size residential and other activities 4.3.2 deleted.</p> <p>Community Standard 4.3.3 Hours of operation replaced by Critical standard 4a.3.3</p> <p>Community Standard 4.3.3 Traffic generation other activities replaced by Critical standard 4a.3.4</p> <p>Traffic generation</p> <p>4.3.6 Residential Coherence replaced by Critical standard 4a.3.2 Residential coherence.</p>	<p>1. As written 4a.3.1 is very liberal in terms of the permissive floor area for non residential activities.</p> <p><i>...40m² or 30% of the gross floor area of all buildings on site, which ever is the larger</i></p> <p>30% could produce a large floor space – this is especially problematic when it is considered in conjunction with the removal of retail restriction rules – see the discussion on retailing (4.4.5 below)</p> <p>2. Deletion of Community Standard 4.3.2 would be consistent with the approach in Phase 1 of the District Plan Review.</p> <p>3. The new critical standard for hours of operation 4a.3.3 is a simplification of 4.3.3. The hours of operation are inconsistent with Phase 1 of the District Plan review which recommends that the hours of operation end at 2100.</p> <p>4. Traffic generation rules simplified and standardised to just</p>	<p>1. The Council opposes the use of the term which ever is larger and instead proposes that a simple maximum of 40m² should be used.</p> <p>2. The Council supports the change.</p> <p>3. The Council supports in part the intent of the new Critical Standard for hours of operation 4a.3.3 but that hours of operation read <i>0700 – 2100</i>.</p> <p>And that the consent status for non compliance with the hours be commensurate with the outcome of the Phase 1 District Plan review.</p> <p>4. The Council supports in part the intent of the new critical standard 4a.3.2 and that it be amended to read or have the same meaning as <i>‘Only those persons who reside permanently on the site and the equivalent of one other full time</i></p>
---	--	--	---	--	---

				<p>the one set of criteria.</p> <p>5. The new residential coherence rule is significantly simplified by restricting people engaged in the activity to being permanent residents on the site.</p> <p>This conflicts with the approach in the district plan review for home occupations that enables one full time equivalent person to be employed on site.</p>	<p><i>employed person who resides elsewhere can engage in any activity</i></p> <p>.....</p> <p>And that the consent status for non compliance with the rule be commensurate with the outcome of the Phase 1 District Plan review.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Reference 2

- Volume 3 - Section 2 Living Zones - Proposed Rule 4a.1 Activity Status: Central City Living Zone:

4a.1. 1 PERMITTED ACTIVITIES

(a) Unless specified as a discretionary activity under rule 4a.1.3, all activities shall be Permitted Activities , provided they comply with all of the relevant development and critical standards. and the city wide standards.

(b) Emergency service facilities.

Other – Built Form and Amenity and Role of CCLZ

Comments received via email and post

Reference 1

Consistent with that emphasis I advocate an amendment of the proposed Changes to Volume 2 of the City Plan as follows:

In the policies to advance 11.9, Policy 11.9.1 be altered by current sub paragraphs

(b) and (c) becoming (c) and (d) respectively, and a new subparagraph (b), namely;

(b) recognizing and facilitating the recovery of existing inner city residential communities;

Reference 2

Objective 11.10: Built Form and Amenity The CDHB supports the wording of this objective regarding built developments contributing positively to the amenity values of the area and therefore to the health and safety, quality and enjoyment of the environment for those living within the area. However, the CDHB encourages the inclusion of accessibility in this objective.

Recommendation: that the word 'accessibility' be added after 'safety' to Objective 11.10, in order to be consistent with 'An Accessible City',

Reference 3

CHANGES TO VOLUME 2

Objective 11.10. Built form and amenity This objective is not supported by its policies. Prescribing minimum standards for residential development will not ensure that it contributes positively to the amenity values, safety, quality and enjoyment of the area.

Policy 11.10.1 (b) refers only to the amenity values for occupiers. Policy 11.10. 1 (a) talks only of integration.

There is no mention of appearance, safety, sense of place, maintenance of existing quality etc.

Reference 4

Issue 6.1.4 – Amenity and urban design

While the speed of recovery is important, so too is the quality of the built form. Poorly designed development can adversely affect urban amenity values, rural amenity values, historic heritage, health and safety, integration with community, educational, social and commercial facilities, and overall liveability. These matters are important for retaining population and attracting skilled workers and new business opportunities. They will affect the timing and the success of recovery.

Explanation

Sometimes the desire to rebuild quickly competes with the desire to build well or build back better. Enabling timely and appropriate development during the recovery period in a manner that does not compromise the key values of either existing or future communities is a challenge that must be recognised at Greater Christchurch, city, district and neighbourhood levels. Rebuilding can also impact on issues of significance to Ngāi Tahu, affecting their relationship with ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. In particular, good urban design will contribute to vibrant and renewed centres and help support wider wellbeing objectives such as quality of life, economic vitality and crime reduction.

Reference 5

1. To provide for the operation of NZFS Commission properties:

- Volume 2 - Section 11 Living - Proposed Objective 11.9 Role of the Central City Living Zone - Policies:

Policy 11.9.3 To ensure community health and well-being is provided for by:

Enabling the continued operation, maintenance and upgrading of emergency service facilities in the Central City Living Zone.

Reference 6

“Objective 11.9 - Role of the Central city Zone” (page 9 A Liveable City) A Policy “d” should be added that recognises and enhances existing Communities and their distinctive character”.

Reference 7

We support Objective 11.2 insofar that the role of the Central City Living Zone is to support the restoration and enhancement of vibrancy of the Central City.

Reference 8

9. We request that Policy 11.9.1 is amended by adding a new clause (d):

(d) Ensuring that residential units within 75 metres of the Central City Business Zone are insulated in accordance with the City Plan requirements.

10. The purpose of this clause is to help reduce reverse sensitivity issues and to ensure that residential amenity is enhanced for those persons who choose to reside in close proximity to the primary commercial zone in the Central City.

11. We seek that a new clause be added to Policy 11.10.1 to require acoustic attenuation measures for new residential development as follows:

(e) Avoid or remedy potential reverse sensitivity issues by requiring acoustic attenuation measures for residential development in the Central City Living Zone.

Reference 9

Decision sought: (requested changes shown in red and Italics)

AMEND Objective 11.10 - Built Form- Amenity, Environmental and Cultural Values A form of built development in the Central City Living Zone that enables change to the existing environment, while contributing positively to the amenity, cultural and environmental values of the area...

ADD new bullet point to policy Policy 11.10.1 (e) minimise the impact of development on cultural values and the environment.

Reference 10

Decision sought: (requested changes shown in red and Italics)

ADD new policy under Objective 11.10 11.10.3 Recognise and provide for Ngāi Tahu cultural landscapes in the residential development by protecting and restoring: indigenous biodiversity; places of cultural value including wāhi tapu, wāhi taonga and mahinga kai; and incorporating Ngāi Tahu heritage values into landscape and urban design.

This new policy needs to also be reflected and carried through in 4a.2 Development Standards for Central City Living Zone.

ADD additional bullet point under Objective 11.10 f) protect and incorporate Ngāi Tahu cultural landscapes values.

Reference 11

Social housing Support in part:

Policy 11.9.1 under Objective 11.9 includes providing a flexibility of housing types which are suitable for a range of individual housing needs. However, there needs to be explicit reference to include affordable housing in the City centre.

Our reasons are: The draft document needs to specifically provide for socially sustainable residential development that includes the provision of affordable housing within the City Centre. This will contribute to the creation of sustainable communities by encouraging a mixture of social demographic to the City Centre. For example, City Centre living can be particularly advantageous to older members of the community due access to social networks, amenities, facilities and public transport.

Decision sought: AMEND Objective 11.9 Role of the Central City Living Zone

A predominantly residential environment offering a range of residential opportunities, within the central city to support the restoration and enhancement of a environmentally and socially sustainable and vibrant city centre.

Reference 12

Objective 11.10.1 (b)

The wording used is “protect amenity values for occupiers” which must be referred back to the heading and therefore means “occupiers of residential development”. This leaves an opening for the protection of amenity values for existing residents to be ignored. It is true that the Appendices do refer to consideration of effects on amenities for existing residents, but the overall rule should of necessity do likewise. Therefore, it should read: “protect amenity values for all occupiers, whether existing or future.”

Other – Categories of Activities

Comments received via email and post

Reference 1

Residential activities and other activities (except travellers' accommodation) - all standards (Living 5 Zone) (Volume 3, Part 2, 5.1.1)	Reference to “Peterborough – As for L4A zone”;	Reference changed to “Peterborough – As for L4C (Central City) zone”; · New reference added to “Montreal – As for L4C (Central City) zone”;	As resolved by Council on 28 February 2013		The Council supports the change. but note that the Living 5 zone is under review as part of Phase 2 of the DPR.
Site density (Volume 3, Part 2, 5.2.1)		Plot ratio of 0.8 for Montreal St L5 added – this reflects the existing 0.8 on	As resolved by CCC on 28 February 2013		The Council supports the change, but note that the Living 5 zone is under review

		the Peterborough block.			as part of Phase 2 of the DPR.
Sunlight & outlook for neighbours (Volume 3, Part 2, 5.2.3)	The more restrictive Diagram D recession planes applied to the Central City Living 5 Zones	Recession planes restriction for new Montreal L5 added; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peterborough St changed to Diagram E (less restrictive) 	As resolved by CCC on 28 February 2013		The Council supports the change. but note that the Living 5 zone is under review as part of Phase 2 of the DPR.
Street scene (Volume 3, Part 2, 5.2.4(c))	(c) Requirement for lower building height in L5 in Avon loop where no street setback was required as per the old map 39G.	(c) deleted and replaced with no street scene setback provision for those parts of Avon Loop L5 where no street scene setback is shown on the amended Map 39G.	As resolved by CCC on 28 February 2013		The Council supports the change, but note that the Living 5 zone is under review as part of Phase 2 of the DPR.
Separation from neighbours (Volume 3, Part 2, 5.2.7)		3m setback requirement now applies, Montreal L5 now added to the rule	As resolved by CCC on 28 February 2013		The Council supports the change, but note that the Living 5 zone is under review as part of Phase 2 of the DPR.
External appearance (Volume 3, Part 2, 5.2.8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Montreal L5 had no controls, (c) Building alterations and new buildings in the Avon L5 were a controlled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In both Montreal and Avon L5 areas, new buildings, alterations and additions visible from public places are now a discretionary 	As resolved by CCC on 28 February 2013		The Council supports the change, but note that the Living 5 zone is under review as part of Phase 2 of the DPR.

	activity	activity, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-clause (c) now deleted 			
--	----------	---	--	--	--

Reference 2

Site density (Volume 3, Part 2, 5.4.1)		Montreal L5 now subject to 0.9 plot ratio	As resolved by CCC on 28 February 2013		The Council supports the change, but note that the Living 5 zone is under review as part of Phase 2 of the DPR.
Building Height (Volume 3, Part 2, 5.4.3)	Avon L5 – controls as per map 39G	Montreal and Avon L5 are now subject to maximum height as per amended map 39D	As resolved by CCC on 28 February 2013		The Council supports the change, but note that the Living 5 zone is under review as part of Phase 2 of the DPR.

Other – Community

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

The crucial component to the rebuild, and recovery of "the central city" is people, people people, a quote here / " if you take care of the upper floors the ground floors will take care of themselves "

Reference 2

That the chapter does not include any significant spatial guidance on where diverse communities will be stimulated.

Reference 3

That the chapter does not include any significant spatial guidance on where diverse communities will be stimulated. A more fine-grained approach is required with an emphasis on neighbourhoods which are intimate, walkable places with distinct character and strong inclusive communities /

Comments received via email and post

Reference 4

The chapter does not include any significant spatial guidance on where diverse communities will be stimulated. As it stands, the chapter (aside from the East Frame and the fringes of the Core) views the Central city as a single entity when the key to success must be to recognise, promote and grow finer grained neighbourhoods. The

standardisation of rules across the Central City Living zone and no new guidance about how the mixed use zone might evolve gives few cues to the market on how attractive residential neighbourhoods can be shaped to provide for the needs of diverse communities.

Reference 5

The Viva Project's Concerns regarding the Liveable City plan

- There is very little to support the creation of Community.

Other – Concerns about methods to achieve vision

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

While some streamlining of the existing rules are needed, what has been presented is not likely to result in a good outcome for the city. A deep understanding of the implications of changing the rules and extensive testing (including worst case scenarios) is necessary to understand what is likely to result. . Much greater consideration and consultation on these changes is needed

Reference 2

Yes: the overall idea of creating a well-populated inner city area is good. But the proposed changes are too radical a departure from the garden city concept that has guided CHC's development over such a long period. The proposed changes remove a huge amount of planning power from the council. Historians are likely to look back and see a tragically missed opportunity to create a truly aesthetically pleasing central city area.

Reference 3

Clause 11.9.1 9c) says the changes should enhance "the creation of inner city residential neighbourhoods", but some of the proposals....such as greater height, less restrictive recession plane, removing all SAMs and not notifying applications for departures against the Standards.....are likely to do the opposite. There are lively, cohesive neighbourhoods in the inner city already. They need to be protected, at the same time that we all work towards developing even more neighbourhoods. Although some of the proposals do recognise existing neighbourhoods, perhaps this could be strengthened. There should be a definite difference between what is proposed for NEW areas, where little is left from the EQs, and those that are largely still intact. / /

Reference 4

It is understood that there is a housing shortage currently in Christchurch so the desire to create good conditions for development makes sense. However the idea that the market will provide high quality design when the market is itself not functioning because of a supply shortage doesn't make sense and will damage the city. It is in exactly this situation that smart, quick and effective design standards are needed. An urban design panel is a critical part of this. Otherwise we risk the construction of many potentially damaging apartments in a short time that will take decades to recover from. Please rethink this aspect of the new chapter, its not very logical.

Reference 5

That the "A Liveable City" chapter also needs to signal how residential development can be supported by non-regulatory approaches

Reference 6

I think it is just so so important that Chch uses this opportunity to do something world-class. To create buildings, spaces, and places that are world leading exemplars of design and that engage the people of Chch. People will accept a slower process if they are involved and feel empowered by the process and they know they are getting

something of higher quality as a result. Throwing away too many rules and checks to make development much more commercially-friendly carries a very high risk of poor quality profit-driven development that doesn't engage or respect the people of Chch. The people and the city deserve so much more than that.

Reference 7

The pretty stuff at the front has many great ideas that acknowledge the past and the present and the future of the central city. It presents a great deal of diversity and hope. Lots of people from diverse backgrounds and interests. / The detail does not support that vision - it appears that a lot of the detail is allowing a less creative future cityscape based more on economic costings and profits than on aesthetic amenity.

Reference 8

I think the CCDU has lots of good ideas but I don't believe deregulation will necessarily produce the intended outcomes. I think we should be seeking excellence in design and nothing less.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 9

The Moa Neighbourhood Group represents residents in the area from Oxford Terrace to Bealey Avenue and Colombo Street to Fitzgerald Avenue. The group meets monthly and regularly corresponds with over 100 residents.

The Moa Neighbourhood Group members support the aspirations outlined on pages 4 to 15 of the document, as these focus on a liveable city with high quality residential housing. We do not however see how this can be achieved through the changes outlined in the second half of the document, and are disappointed that there is no rationale, explanation or evidence of need for each of the proposed changes. In general, the changes appear to make it easier than ever for developers to build residential properties, with very limited quality-control. It also removes the rights of existing residents to play any part in helping ensure the quality and suitability of new developments in their area, particularly neighbouring developments that may directly affect their amenity.

Planning Change 53, which brought in the existing city plan provisions, was initiated by the Council to address a noticeable deficiency in housing amenity within the Living 3 and 4 Zones. Planning Change 53 was a result of a comprehensive review process with substantial supporting evidence. The improvements in the quality of housing beginning to result from this change are at risk of being overridden through the current changes, in favour of short term gains in housing numbers. In some of the more sensitive areas, comprising narrow streets, small sections, lower rise buildings and older character homes, such as our own, this could result in long lasting negative effects.

A major objective of the proposed changes is to remove rules and processes that could impede higher density residential development in the inner-city. There is however no evidence provided that the proposed changes are needed to meet the Council's and CERA's goals of a substantial increase in residents in the inner-city or are a key limiting factor to development. Our observations from living within the Central City is that a significant number of sites are already underdevelopment or well advanced in the planning stages. There is also evidence (report prepared for CCC, 2008, by Boffa Miskell) that a population in the range of 12,000 - 24,000 in the central city could be achieved by 2026 under existing provisions, especially with more available sites post-earthquakes.

Reference 10

In conclusion, the Moa Neighbourhood Group acknowledge the need for high density housing in the inner city, but they want such housing to be of high quality and in keeping with the area in which it is built. We are conscious that housing of greater density becomes more complex to design and manage over time. The planned changes appear to remove the safeguards that would ensure 'A Livable City' for existing and future residents.

Reference 11

A liveable city is not one that is imposed and one that is solely economically driven. If the people putting this proposal forward care about the future of Christchurch they will review and revise the plans to consider quality and context. A suggestion would be to start with pockets of development, assess in 3-5 years time and go from there. To develop a zoning plan with such a magnitude of change is leaving too much to chance and taking too high a risk with the outcome, and therefore has a greater potential of failure. Consider a phased strategy, one that works towards a long term goal of dense urban living, this will be more palatable and can then be adjusted as lessons are learned.

Reference 12

2. There is no indication in the document how the Central City living zone relates to adjacent parts of the City. For instance, the Central City Living Zone provisions should (but do not) overlap the central business zone in the same way that business activities overlap but are controlled in the living zone. Dwelling throughout the Central city, including central business districts, should be encouraged.

Reference 13

Whilst supporting the overall intent of the changes the NZIA Canterbury Branch has a number of concerns regarding parts of the CERA/CCDU 'A Liveable City' Draft Residential Chapter. These particularly relate to the proposed changes to Volume 3 of the City Plan .Our main concerns relate to the removal of any qualitative design assessments for medium density residential developments in the Central City Living zone, and inconsistencies in the way proposed rules are to be applied to the Central City Living zone compared to other zones .We support the concept of a more simplified and enabling planning process, perhaps based on established urban design guidelines and a more discretionary resource consent process, as opposed to a "fixed rules" approach, but the removal of any design assessment requirement and changing the planning process purely to expedite inner city development projects, is fraught with risks in our opinion and may not deliver the aspirational vision for A Liveable City.

Reference 14

A simplified and more enabling planning process is supported but we recommend that consideration be given to a more discretionary approach, based on established design guidelines, rather than "fixed rules" .This will encourage real innovation and diversity.

Reference 15

Our comments below relate to the following specific parts of the CERA CCDU 'A Liveable City'

- Draft Residential Chapter.

The aspirations for residential development in the central city described in the first part of the document are commendable and are exactly what this 'A Liveable City' - Draft Residential Chapter should be setting in place to achieve. These include a city centre that is:

an inspiring place to live

an attractive place to invest

the best urban environment in New Zealand

However, it will not be realised if the proposed changes to Volume 3 of the City Plan are implemented largely due to:

the removal of independent qualitative urban design assessments.

the removal of the requirement for 'bulk and location' non compliances to be notified,

implementing a single homogenous height limit that does not recognise the existing character of our established inner city suburbs.

Reference 16

We oppose the proposal to amend the rules and assessment matters in 4.00 - 4.4 and 14.2 of volume 3 Section 2 Living Zones as necessary to delete provisions and references to L4A L4B L4C and the special amenity areas and the alterations set out in 4 a.1.

We believe that the amendments are in general less preferable to what they purport to change. While they are expressed in terms that suggest that the quality of development will be enhanced we believe they are in effect lessening standards required to ensure enjoyment of those who take up residence in the city and while seemingly suggest a capacity to increase the ability of the inner city to accommodate greater numbers they will enable a less rigorous management of the inner city environment.

We believe the standards of development which the amendments propose to change were consistent with the earlier consultations that generated the recovery plan. It appears to us that the amendments are a compromise arrived at for short term responses to promote development which is not consistent with the original intent of the recovery plan.

Reference 17

Beyond the forgoing points of support, I am extremely disturbed by a number of provisions in the Draft chapter which I consider will be counter-productive to the recovery of both existing inner city communities and prospective new residents, there, as well as to Christchurch people generally (in so far as all citizens will inevitably be affected by the circumstances prevailing in the Central City Living Zone).

8. In particular the concern is that the following provisions will lower the quality bar of the urban environment to such an extent that not only will the laudable vision, set out at the beginning of the Draft, never be achieved but instead, a Living Zone that has negative impacts on those living in it and is uninviting to otherwise potential residents, will almost certainly result.

Reference 18

The Urban Design Forum (UDF) is pleased to see that CERA and CCDU seek to encourage more residents to live within the Christchurch central area. The forum supports the sentiments in the first part of the document, but is alarmed to see the proposed means of achieving quality living environments. We do not believe that good urban design will result from the proposed changes to the District Plan provisions.

Reference 19

It is disappointing that the CCDU/National Government "Christchurch Central Recovery Plan: Draft residential chapter" has so little reference to the cogently articulated vision for the city, prepared by citizens and councillors in wide and well attended consultation sessions, but instead attempts to impose a plan that focuses on the expedient and the interests of the CCDU/Government's chosen national and foreign developers and other self-interest groups

2.2 The changes the Minister and CERA propose mirror almost exactly the submissions and subsequent counter submissions by a small group of property developers through their 7 frequently inter-locking property development companies to the Christchurch City Council Plan Change 53 consultation.

All of these submissions were rejected completely by the then Christchurch City Council Planning Committee.

2,3 The CCDU/Government draft residential chapter of the "recovery plan" is simply a developers' charter to proceed as they like in filling the central city with their version of housing, with no constraints and no consideration of the quality, amenity and "high aesthetic values", this latter a quotation attached to the CCDU/Government preamble to the draft residential chapter of the "recovery plan

Reference 20

Specific comments

3.1 The need for a City Plan that is clear, unambiguous and simple to follow, whilst at the same time encouraging growth of the inner city population by providing good accommodation in areas with good living spaces and amenity cannot be overstated.

3.2 The proposed plan states that it has such an underlying basis.

However the CCDU/Government planners seem to rely on the fact that people will approach any plan with the clear intention of ensuring that all they do will enhance the city and the living spaces and environment of the people.

3.3 This clearly is not the case.

As is evident from the widely published comments and requests to the Minister and his department [CERA] from developers, there is a great unwillingness to accept that plans for development might have to consider the total impact they have on the cityscape, greenspaces and of course the living conditions of the people whom the city hopes will choose to make their homes in the inner city.

Without exception, all such comments and the detail of the CCDU/Government plan ask for spaces, light, unit size, amenity provision, parking and density to be severely constrained and subject to developer whim. The justification for such commentary and requests is perhaps summed up:

“The existing plans will not ensure good resource management outcomes but will involve additional time, uncertainty and cost in respect of processing residential developments.”

3.4 The expectation that (some) developers will try to set up places that are of very poor aspect and amenity is reinforced by the Government/CCDU's assertion that the market will demand high quality housing without offering any evidence at all that this is the case.

Indeed the Auckland experience where the inner city was drowned in huge blocks of shockingly poorly designed and built miniscule apartments is a clear indication of what developers will deliver **unless they are constrained by the qualitative urban design assessments** set up here to guide the recovery and clear standards which are genuinely minimum, non-negotiable standards which in the CCDU/Government plan are not.

3.5 The Minister and the CCDU then should take into account the words of the famous British justice, Lord Denning, the Master of the Rolls paraphrased here:

“Laws should be drawn, not so that good men with good intentions can be certain of the intention and meaning of the law, but so that bad men with bad intentions cannot be mistaken about the intention and meaning of the law.”

3.6 To meet this test, the Minister and the CCDU should realize that it cannot rely on people to approach planning with a good and clear intent, but must make rules that are absolutely clear to even the person with the worst of intent, seeking ways to avoid doing what will offer good outcomes, quality buildings and developments and the provision of an amenity of life for inner city residents.

3.7 The Minister and the CCDU should adopt the rule and the practice that all rules and standards set out the **minimum unalterable values against which all intended development should be measured.**

3.8 This would avoid developers seeing these *as maximum standards to be thwarted or countered.*

3.9 The CCDU/Government plan allows at every stage any guideline or rule to be ignored, using the catch-all clause and the lack of public scrutiny of any deviations from the proposed “guidelines”

Reference 21

We especially oppose the Government making approval of the CCDU/Government plan a statutory obligation on the Christchurch City Council, whom we have elected to run our city as we wish it to be run, rather than how the current government wishes.

Reference 22

General Context Urban Design fully supports the objective of increasing the number of people living in the central city. We agree that changes are necessary to the CCP to make it easier to work with, however we do not agree with the approach taken to changes.

The proposed changes will generally make it easier to obtain consent for residential development properties within the four Avenues. While it is important to facilitate residential development, it should not be at the expense of good urban design, i.e. development at any cost. We see the proposed changes as a quick fix which is likely to have long term detrimental effects on the central city living environment.

We are strongly of the view that the qualitative aspects of residential development cannot be left to the market but more of the functional aspects such as unit size, storage, car parking can be.

Reference 23

While the proposed changes are welcome in some respects and will simplify matters, it is imperative that the City Council has greater control over site layout, building form and appearance than these provisions provide.

Preferably through the reinstatement of the UDA and changes along the lines of those suggested above. Without this the effect of the new provisions is likely to make living in the central city much less attractive.

Reference 24

The Council supports and agrees with the broad intent of the chapter as set out on pages 5-7 of the draft. The key elements that can be distilled from "A Liveable City" are that the Minister recognises and is aiming to ensure that:

- a) attractive neighbourhoods containing diverse communities which can broaden the socio-economic function of the central city;
 - b) a central city residential population needs to achieve a sufficient critical mass (perhaps of around 20,000 people) to support the establishment of a range of commercial and social facilities that in turn can sustain the needs of its communities;
 - c) extensive investment in the Core of the Central city will generate residential appeal; d) the central city represents a sub-housing market providing for different demand profiles and needs; e) local context, whether existing or newly created, is important in creating places and communities which people will identify with and aspire to live in;
 - f) the central city housing sub-market needs stimulation and support; 1
- Christchurch City Council Feedback on the Draft "A Liveable City" (August 2014) 2
- g) there is recognition of the difficulties faced in increasing housing supply in the central city and that the Minister is committed to working with the development sector to investigate what is needed to 'unleash' central city living;
 - h) urban design and comprehensive development remain essential parts of the Recovery Plan as a whole; and
 - i) the residential amenity of residents is important.

4. However, in then proceeding to understand the draft chapter's proposals and regulatory changes to the City Plan set out in the appendix, the City Council is not convinced that there is sufficient substance within its proposals, nor finesse in its regulatory changes to deliver on the draft chapter's vision. Furthermore, some of the changes are inappropriate.

Other – Consultation, right to comment, existing resident concerns

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Maintaining ongoing community involvement, ownership and consultation is vital to a safe and health city.

Reference 2

I am concerned that such significant decisions are being made outside of a democratic process. While CERA made sense to me as a reaction to a crisis, the sense of crisis is well past and I believe the decision making which is going to impact significantly on the lives of residents for generations to come should be handed back to the residents.

Reference 3

It removes the say of residents

Reference 4

I'm not opposed to progress as there was much wrong with the current city, but as I understand it the current theme of the CCC is to listen to the people. This draft goes against this principle!

Reference 5

I'm excited about the potential for central Christchurch. As a long term resident my village was almost lost because of the earthquakes but we've been able to hang in here. What I have found disappointing with many consultations pre and post earthquakes is that existing residents (with their knowledge of and loyalty to the area) consistently get overlooked in discussions. The new A Liveable City plan seems to fall into the same trap of being aimed at developers and potential residents while not acknowledging existing residents who give the place its character and are greatly affected by development proposals.

Reference 6

Neighbours must be consulted and we must have sunshine in our gardens.

Reference 7

Residents in 2011 wanted high quality non-compressed living. The former plan should remain.

Reference 8

Please listen to existing residents who already chose to live in the city centre before the earthquakes! / Our rights are being eroded to allow poor quality developments at the expense of a vibrant community

Reference 9

Christchurch is NOT a blank slate. A Liveable City should do more to support the existing people living in the inner city - they are the ones who will spread the news about how good it is to live in the city. But this chapter could ruin their experience. Recognize existing valuable and high-density inner city neighbourhoods, which are essential to supporting city businesses as the rebuild develops.

Reference 10

I'm strongly opposed to many of the changes in the latest review, as they largely ignore the needs and views of the local residents

Reference 11

Most of all I do not want changes that reduce the community input and consultation and bypass existing due process. Existing Neighbours and community are the most important stakeholders in A liveable city. / It is our city and needs to evolve on our terms.

Reference 12

This proposal goes way beyond what is acceptable to individual people in Christchurch. It gives all the power to big corporations/developers who have money as a priority not people. We have seen this problem with leaky houses and we hear stories of poor workmanship by developers who have no interest in fixing their shoddy work up. With no regulations round density, recession planes, parking spaces, notifications, there is no call for developers to ensure that the new developments cause minimum harm to surrounding houses. We have seen the example some years back of a development building on(or over) the boundary of an existing house, where the homeowner was

unable to open her window. This was under the existing conditions. What would happen under even more lax conditions? this is removing people's rights without any comeback. There needs to be intensified housing but not at the expense of people who already live in our city. We have been through enough. Do not take our rights away.

Reference 13

I also think you need to consider the people who already have homes in the city area. Their property values and expectations/opinions must be considered.

Reference 14

Existing residents matter too, we have put a big investment into our houses.

Reference 15

I am not convinced this plan does this. I think the plan has been proposed for the benefit of developers at the expense of the existing and future residents.

Reference 16

The LCP doesn't protect existing neighbourhoods or privacy than protecting existing neighbourhoods. The main changes attack the rights of existing residents and homeowners. by specifically blocking neighbours from being consulted, this seems to go against the entire philosophy of the Resource Management Act

Reference 17

Listen to the earlier submissions by christchurch residents, make effective use of the spaces but don't build the slums of tomorrow with cheap and nasty boxy things that get developers rich.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 18

We object to the combination of fully **permitted** status for residential development with the omission of any notification for non-compliance of rules. This removes existing residents' rights to have a voice, particularly when a new development does not meet the proposed new rules (let alone existing rules). This is compounded by the **omission of the urban design rule (4.2.7)**, its **restricted discretionary status** (for three or more units) and related assessment matters where at least the Council, via the free and independent Urban Design Panel, can provide advice and guidance. This is largely the case for the Central City Business Zone and the expectations for the Central City Living Zone should be no different. This will be particularly important for retaining the quality and suitability to context of developments, when the SAMs are removed.

Under the proposed changes developers' rights will greatly outweigh those of existing residents or the wider community. Members of the group request that resource consent applications in relation to **non-compliance** with any development standards should continue to be **notifiable**. Thus we request the removal in 4a.1.4 of the final statement, "resource consent applications in relation to non-compliance with any development standards shall not be publicly or limited notified". In addition, we request that the urban design rule 4.2.7 be reinstated and assessment matters covering a range of critical residential amenity issues be included.

Furthermore, in almost all cases, resource consent applications for **non-compliance** with the new rules will only be assessed against a small number of matters, including "necessary to enable more efficient, cost-effective and or practical use of the site". Unfortunately, practical and cost-effective use of the site, may well involve denser, cheaper and poorer quality housing, rather than high quality housing suited to a particular context. The group request that the phrase relating to 'practical and cost-effective use of the site' be removed as an assessment criteria for resource consent applications for non-compliance, in all cases. Or at least have it balanced by a statement requiring quality and suitability to context as a matter that must be considered in cases of non-compliance.

Reference 19

I strongly support the position and points made by Dave Kelly:

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/the-press/opinion/perspective/10372757/Liveable-City-plan-treats-existing-residents-as-expendable>

Reference 20

In general terms we are opposed to the amendments proposed and especially the setting aside of the requirements for full consultation in neighbourhoods.

Reference 21

Loss of democracy. The whole thrust of this CCDU/Government plan is to exclude ordinary people from having any input or say in how the city in which they live and work will be shaped.

This plan is a dictatorial set of edicts, justified by the need to “speed-up” rebuilding our city. In fact the long delays the CCDU/Government has caused in their re-writing the plans established by the citizens and their council and the ruthless suppression of initiatives by local people to re-build, are the causes of any delay. We are extremely unhappy at the CCDU/Government plan and its exclusion of citizens from the process.

Reference 22

I agree with Dave Kelly’s comments in this morning’s Press.

CCDU needs to take a step back and stop this process, engage in proper consultation with the residents and protect the rights of residents to control their residential environment.

Reference 23

There is a disappointing abrogation of the ability of existing residents to comment on resource consent applications for breaches of built standards that are designed to directly protect their amenity

Christchurch City Council Feedback on the Draft “A Liveable City” (August 2014) 3

– namely in relation to height, daylight recession planes, and setbacks for buildings from internal boundaries. This is at odds with the commitment made on page 8 of “A Liveable City” While the Council acknowledges that regulation can be streamlined, it is not acceptable for affected person input to be eliminated in this way.

Reference 24

Breaches of standards affecting neighbours on economic grounds

35. The breach assessment matters proposed in the last parts of Vol. 3, Part 2, 4a.2.3, 4a.2.5, 4a.2.6 and 4a.2.7 propose that economic considerations are applied in justifying the breach set standards which impact upon neighbouring sites.

In combination with removal of the right for neighbouring owners to be

notified about developments breach these standards, this change is significant and again is contrary to the statement on page 8 of the draft chapter which states that “the standards will benefit new residents and protect the amenity of those residents who have already made their home in the central city.” Council strongly opposes the use of these criteria within the proposed Central City Living Zone.

36. Council would accept that some minor breaches of development standards affecting neighbours might be justified on economic grounds. However, the use of economic tests without associated scrutiny of other issues fails to recognise other drivers within the stated objectives and policies of “A Liveable City”.

It is council’s firm view is that the reinstatement of Urban Design Assessment would enable applicants to make an economic case for a breach within the context of rational design decisions.

Reference 25

A requirement that affected parties are notified when a development proposal breaches standards which would affect their property.

Reference 26

In "Policies", 11.9 c states "assisting with the creation of inner city residential neighbourhoods." We are here already, we don't require assistance, just support to keep our own character. We have been forgotten on a number of occasions since the earthquakes and this seems to be happening again.

Reference 27

The Proposed changes outlined and explanatory text in "A Liveable City", does not recognise the existing residents whether owners or renters as long term developers and investors of their buildings and their communities.

Reference 28

The document talks of Developers and "turbocharged" development and yet contains provisions whose effects will undermine the current Central City Residents who are by any reasonable definition long term developers investing in their buildings and their respective and distinctive communities. The current Residents should be given the same recognition and opportunity to have input in any proposed developments in their immediate neighbourhood in the proposed changes as the Developers of any new high density buildings.

Reference 29

3. Central City Residents will be formally consulted in any subsequent changes or revisions by CCDU/CERA to the CCC City Plan.

"CERA and other government agencies will continue to work with the private sector to investigate what is needed to unleash the potential for residential development in the city centre." (Last paragraph on page 7. A Liveable City)

Change Required:

That changes be made to include existing Residents to have the same status as the Private Sector in any work conducted which would include revisions and processes related to the residential development in the Central City. The CCDU actively seek feedback from central city residents and research the effects of the proposed Plan changes and inform/consult with the residents the results of this work.

Other - Critical Standards

Comments received via email and post

Reference 1

. Further consistent with that emphasis on recovery of communities, I support and commend the provisions of the Draft chapter which propose;

Reference 2

Clauses 4a.3.1 and 4a.3.2 as Critical Standards aimed at containing and preventing non-residential activities within the Central City Living Zone.

Reference 3

The NZFS Commission seeks the following alterations to the draft Residential provisions:

To ensure the provision of adequate firefighting water supply and access:

- Volume 3 - Section 2 Living Zones - Proposed Rule 4a.3 Critical Standards for Central City Living Zone:

4a.3.9 WATER SUPPLY FOR FIRE FIGHTING

(a) All sites must be connected to the Council's urban reticulated system that provides sufficient fire fighting water supply compliant with SNZ PAS 4509:2008.

Reference 4

Volume 3 - Proposed Section 4a.3 Critical Standards for Central City Living Zone - Proposed Rule 4a.3.1 Scale of Activities:

4a.3.1 SCALE OF ACTIVITIES

Exceptions: Emergency service facilities are exempt from these provisions.

Volume 3 - Proposed Section 4a.3 Critical Standards for Central City Living Zone - Proposed Rule 4a.3.3 Hours of Operation:

4a.3.3 HOURS OF OPERATION

Exceptions: Emergency service facilities are exempt from these provisions.

Volume 3 - Proposed Section 4a.3 Critical Standards for Central City Living Zone - Proposed Rule 4a.3.4 Traffic Generation:

4a.3.4 TRAFFIC GENERATION

Exceptions : Emergency service facilities are exempt from these provisions.

Volume 3 - Proposed Section 4a.3 Critical Standards for Central City Living Zone - Proposed Rule 4a.3.5 Storage of Heavy Vehicles:

4a.3.5 STORAGE OF HEAVY VEHICLES

Reference 5

Exceptions : Emergency service facilities are exempt from these provisions .

Other – Development Standards (4.a.2)

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Beacon opposes the proposed minimum floor standards and draws the CCDUs attention to the Hobsonville Small Home Test Lab <http://www.axisseries.co.nz/lab/> which provides spacious homes with floor

Comments received via email and post

Reference 2

4a.2.11 ACOUSTIC INSULATION

(a) Any habitable space within a residential unit, which is within 40m of the edge of the nearest marked traffic lane of a Main Distributor, Local Distributor, or Arterial Road as defined in Part 8, Appendix 4A and 4B shall achieve a minimum external to internal noise reduction of 30 dBA (Dtr, 2m, nT)⁴.

Resource consent applications for non-compliance with this Rule will only be assessed against the following matter:

(a) The extent to which a reduced level of acoustic insulation may be acceptable due to mitigation of adverse noise impacts through other means, e.g. screening by other structures.

This is the rule that really gets on my nerves. It slows down the resource consent process and needs an additional acoustic consultant which is expensive (generally round \$800-\$1500 + GST) at the early stage of a project. You can use the standard solution in the city plan but it would be very expensive and the window solution is not feasible using standard window suite .

Additionally the extra construction costs can be quite extensive with special glazing and extra layers of plasterboard not the inside BUT its all a waste of time because it relies on people leaving their windows closed - this is unhealthy & not practical

The bit that really gets me is the patronisation assumed in this rule- it doesn't apply to L1 or L2, so no requirement along Fendalton Road but needed for inner city, are inner/ medium density people less capable of making good decisions than those in L1/L2- come on!. Give people the choice- if they don't like traffic noise they don't need to buy or rent, . This revised plan lets the market choose in terms of parking, why not for acoustic issues? Please get rid of this unwieldy and unnecessary rule (& do the same for L3 please!)

Reference 3

We have the following comments on the changes proposed below:

4a.2.2 Ground Floor Habitable Space:

b) At least 30% of all residential units within a development shall have a habitable space located at ground level.

Reference 4

Parking area can be underground. I also think that 35sqm for a single unit title is too small, it should be a minimum of 40sqm.

Reference 5

Acoustic Insulation Neighbour noise has been shown to result in a negative impact on psychological wellbeing (Guite, Clark et al. 2006, p.1122).

Support: CCDU's development standards on noise reduction in terms of insulation levels and building setbacks to achieve a minimum external to internal noise reduction of 30 dBA (Dtr, 2m, nT).

Recommendation: that CCDU considers the development standards that reduce further both neighbourhood noise and external to internal noise recognising that ultimately a city environment is noisier than a suburb.

Reference 6

CHANGES TO VOLUME 3

4a.2.1 Minimum unit size This should be a building consent matter. It is one area which could be left to the market.

4a.2.2 Ground floor habitable space The intention of this rule is to avoid ground floors being occupied solely by garages and to ensure interaction between the street and the property and in this respect is supported. However, the rule as drafted will not necessarily achieve this. There is no requirement for the ground floor room to have windows onto the street. This could be an issue particularly where properties have south facing street elevations. The requirement for only 30% of residential units within a development to have a habitable space at ground level may be appropriate for 4 storey apartment blocks, but where a section is developed with say six town houses at right angles to the street, only the front one and one other need have a ground floor habitable room.

Reference 7

4a.2.9 Fences and screening Agree with clauses (a) & (b).

Clause (c), there should be no exception for service space or outdoor space. i.e all fences within the 2m setback should be 1 metre or less or 50% visually transparent. It should be the whole of the fence which is 50% transparent

(i.e. equal amounts of void and solid). This rule has a misleading diagram in the CCP which allows for fences to be only 25% transparent.

4a.2.10 Landscaping and tree planting Not sure that the 20% requirement is necessary as well as the outdoor space provisions. Consider the current rule (4.2.13(d)) requiring a boundary landscaping strip where any access way or car parking area is located close to the boundary is essential. It is simple to understand and has a significant positive effect on the appearance of developments when viewed from the street, from the neighbouring property and from within the site.

Reference 8

<p>Street scene and accessways (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.2.3)</p>	<p>(a) required 1-2m street scene setbacks in L4C (Avon Loop) as per planning map 39G;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sub-clause (a)(v) providing for height reduction by 2m in some Central City areas (map 39G); sub-clause (c) - rule on placement of car parking in L4C (Avon Loop) For Park Terrace (between Bealey and Armagh/Rolleston cnr – a part of former SAm 31) - road setback was 2m 	<p>references to L4C (Avon Loop) and map 39G</p> <p>deleted – normal L4C 2m setback rules apply;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sub-clause (a)(v) deleted (no height reduction) ; subclause (c) deleted Added new road setback of 4.5m for Park Terrace L4C area; references to some SAm areas deleted; 	<p>Street scene and accessways controlled in 4a.2.6.</p> <p>a. Equivalent references to L4C (Avon Loop) and map 39G</p> <p>not included in 4a.2.6</p> <p>b. Standard 2m setback rules apply;</p> <p>c. No equivalent sub-clause 4.2.3 (a)(v) included in 4a.2.6 . (no height reduction);</p> <p>d. No equivalent sub-clause 4.2.3 (c) included in 4a.2.6</p> <p>e. Added new</p>	<p>The provision is in accordance with the analysis undertaken by the CCC in its Central City Living Zones review. It should be supported.</p>	<p>1. The Council supports the inclusion of the intent and dimensions in 4a.2.6</p>
--	---	---	--	--	--

			<p>road setback of 4.5m for Park</p> <p>Terrace included (in Map 3).</p> <p>f. No references to SAm areas included in 4a.2.6.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Reference 9

<p>Ground floor habitable room (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.2.10)</p>	<p>Generic rule for all L3, 4A, 4B and 4C – 50% of all units in development shall have a habitable space at ground level.</p>	<p>Resource consent to breach 4.2.10 Ground floor habitable room becomes non publicly notified not requiring other parties written approvals.</p> <p>Specific sub-clause added for L4C in Central City and percentage of units required to have a habitable space on the ground</p>	<p>That the ground floor habitable room provision be retained as Development Standard 4a.2.2 but that it be reduced to 30%.</p>		<p>The Council supports the change.</p>
---	---	---	---	--	--

		floor reduced to 30%;			
--	--	-----------------------	--	--	--

Reference 10

Building overhangs	4.2.4 Building overhangs	Deleted.	This rule was introduced by Plan Change 53 in response to bad built outcomes. It has been through a recent section 32 and First Schedule process and should be retained. The rule has been included in the Phase 1 District Plan as sent to the Minister for comment.	The Council opposes the deletion of the rule.
Screening of Parking	4.2.14 Screening of parking	Deleted.	Not carried over in Phase 1 of the DPR.	The Council supports the deletion of the rule.
Noise from Pre-schools	4.2.1.9 Noise from preschools – other activities.	Deleted.	Phase 1 of the District Plan review recognises that pre-schools are a necessary facility in residential zones and has provided for them as permitted activities in some situations. A resource consent to establish out side of those situations is recommended to be a restricted discretionary activity	The Council requests that provision is made for the establishment of pre-schools as a permitted activity in certain circumstances as per Phase 1 of the District Plan review. CERA may also wish to review the provisions of 4a.1.3 for consistency.

Reference 11

Acoustic insulation.	4.2.15 Acoustic insulation	Rule relating to insulation of habitable spaces within 20m of a collector road deleted.	Phase 1 of the District Plan review has reviewed and retained the rule in relation to 20m from a collector road. The CERA approach makes this rule easier to interpret.	The Council supports the deletion of the 20m / collector road rule.
4a.2.8 Service space		The final word of rule 4a.2.8(b) refers to	This should refer to a habitable space. This will be consistent with the advice CCC has given the Minister in terms or recommended changes to Chapter	The Council requests that the reference to Habitable room in rule 4a.2.8(b) be changed to habitable space.

		rooms .	14 of the DPR	
--	--	---------	---------------	--

Reference 12

- 1) Rule 4a.2.2 ground floor habitable space. This rule requires all street-fronting units to have a habitable space at ground level. This approach was valid for zones where the height limit was less than 11m, as the typical built form is two storey townhouses. If the proposed blanket height limit of 14m is confirmed, then this implies that the anticipated typology is 3-4 storey apartment blocks, with units horizontally layered. The proposed rule does not work for layered units, as the upper level street facing units will not have ground floor habitable space (as the units are wholly contained on the 2, 3, or 4th floors). Provided ground floor units have habitable space fronting the street, then the outcome the rule is seeking will still be achieved. As the anticipated typology (3-4 storey apartment blocks) inherently can't comply with the rule, then the rule needs amending to clarify that it is the overall complex or development that needs ground level habitable space facing the road, rather than every residential unit. Likewise part ii) of the rule requires at least 30% of units to have ground floor habitable space. The key outcome is that at least 30% of the ground floor area of the overall development is habitable i.e. not just garaging. If you have four storey apartments (as implied by the 14m height limit), then inherently three quarters of apartments will be located above ground level. The rule should be amended to clarify that 30% of ground floor area of the overall development should be habitable space.

Reference 13

2) Rule 4a.2.1 – Minimum unit size

We have no issue with this rule. It is similar to that for provision for vehicles. The residents themselves will decide. If the size is insufficient then they will not buy.

Currently we are proposing apartments ranging from 50m² to 265m². They each appeal to their own demographic.

What makes dwellings of small size work is their layout and aspect, their sun and outlook, their privacy. Small dwellings can be made to feel spacious and comfortable with generosity of dimension, for example by using high ceilings.

(As an aside our family have lived in a cottage of 65m² for the last ten years. We have just added a further 10m². Our family comprises two adults, two young children, previously two cats and the occasional chicken. The space works brilliantly, due to the reasons outlined above.)

Reference 14

Rule 4a.2.2 – Ground floor habitable space

We struggle with this rule a great deal. When we are building apartments over multiple levels then to have to place a habitable space at ground floor is prohibitive and makes for an uncomfortable space. It is too rough to be of any use.

The reason behind the rule is appreciated, due to the number of mostly terrace / townhouses which have been developed where the garaging takes up the best living space on the ground floor forcing the living up. Living up in such circumstances makes for poor design in our opinion. However, this result came about due to the requirement for carparks. As that requirement is being dropped then this should be too. It is unworkable, though Council have been happy to allow this rule to be avoided in appropriate circumstances.

Perhaps this rule should apply only to dwellings which stand alone (or attached) i.e. terrace style housing, where there is no other dwelling above or below them.

Rule 4a.2.4, Outdoor Living Space. We submit that similar principles apply to this rule. Leeway should be given in appropriate circumstances, such as multi-level apartment buildings.

Reference 15

Rule 4a.2.7 – Separation from neighbours

The key to this rule is the same as that for the other issues we have identified as most important to the residents – height limit, recession plane, setbacks.

Aside from the submissions made above that the current rules in these areas should not be changed, it is strongly submitted that any breach of these rules requiring resource consent should be of limited notification, as it currently stands. If the right to be consulted on these essential matters is removed then it will backfire. Residents will lose confidence. Please see earlier comments on resource consents.

Reference 16

Volume 3 - Proposed Section 4a.2 Development Standards for Central City Living Zone - Proposed Rule 4a.2.3 Building Height:

4a.2.3 BUILDING HEIGHT

Exemptions: Hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities are exempt from these provisions.

Volume 3 - Proposed Section 4a.2 Development Standards for Central City Living Zone - Proposed Rule 4a.2.10 Landscaping and Tree Planting:

4a.2.10 LANDSCAPING AND TREE PLANTING

Exceptions: Emergency service facilities are exempt from these provisions.

Reference 17

3. If residential development is to occur within or in close proximity to the Central City Business Zone, residential accommodation must be designed to meet acoustic insulation standards so that residents are not adversely affected by noise nuisance and that the commercial businesses have the assurance that their operations will not be impacted on by reverse sensitivity issues.

Reference 18

4. We SUPPORT the inclusion of minimum acoustic standards for residential units adjoining busy roads (such as Victoria, Salisbury and Montreal Streets) to be included in the proposed rules.

5. We REQUEST that clear cross referencing is placed in the Central City Living Zone provisions that link to the Noise Standards chapter set out in the Review of the Central City Noise Provisions - Christchurch City Recovery Plan. We wish to see consistency between the Residential Living provisions and the Noise Provisions that CERA has recently consulted on.

6. We REQUEST that additional acoustic insulation requirements are placed on residential units that are located in close proximity to or within the Central City Business Zone.

7. We have made some suggestions to the provisions which in our opinion will further assist in achieving the desired outcomes sought by CERA and further support the policy framework within the Plan. These are set out below.

Reference 19

Rule 4a.2.11 Acoustic Insulation:

12. We SUPPORT Rule 4a.2.11(a) as a practical response to help deal with residential activity in close proximity to noise generating activities.

13. We seek that a new clause be added to this rule which is consistent with the proposed new noise standards for all zones with the Central City, as follows:

(b) Any habitable space within a residential unit located within the Central City Living that is within 75 metres of the Central City Business Zone shall achieve a minimum external to internal noise reduction of 35dBA (Dtr, 2m,nT)

Reference 20

ADD new standards for stormwater 4a.2 Development Standards for Central City Living Zones

4a 2.12 Onsite Water Detention and Reuse (a)

(b) (c)

3.4

Each Residential building shall be fitted with an onsite stormwater detention facility with at least XXX(to be finalised with rūnanga) capacity to minimise the impact of stormwater runoff from the site. The detention facility shall include a treatment system to minimise the contaminants discharged from the site.

Each residential unit shall be provided with at least 10,000L (to be finalised with rūnanga) of onsite stormwater retention for domestic use.

Each residential unit shall be fitted with water use minimisation appliances and fittings.

Reference 21

AMEND wording- 4a.2.10 Landscaping and Tree planting a)A minimum of 20% of the site to be landscape treatment..... including a minimum of one native tree for every 250m2 of gross site area...

Reference 22

ADD - 4a.2 Development standards for Central City Living Zone

New standard that provides for a mixture of unit sizes including family size housing units (min 3 bedrooms). ADD - Rules Add new rules to reflect the above amendments providing for affordable housing.

Reference 23

- Limit of landscaping requirement down to 1 tree per 250 m2

Reference 24

In respect of the specific Central City Living zone provisions and rules, CN5 and AHL are generally supportive subject to the following comments:

Rule 4a.2.2 (ground floor habitable space) raises potential uncertainty as to its application and is otherwise onerous/inflexible in terms of its requirements. Specifically:

o Part (a) of the rule requires 'any unit fronting a road or public space...' to provide habitable space at ground floor level. As worded this suggests that ground level habitable space is required for upper level units which front a road or public space. Given this would be entirely impractical for upper-storey units in three-level developments contemplated in the zone (for example), it is presumed and submitted that the rule should instead read: 'any unit located at ground floor level fronting a road or public space...';

o Part (b) of the rule requires 30% of all residential units within a development to have a habitable space located at ground floor level. Subject to ground floor level units providing habitable space as required by part (a) of the rule, with dimensions as required by part (c), a specific percentage (and certainly one as high as 30%) is considered unnecessary and onerous.

Reference 25

Rule 4a.3.4 (traffic generation) has an extremely low threshold for traffic generation (16 vehicle movements per day, equivalent to 8 trips to a site and 8 trips from a site), which in tandem with the critical standard status would raise significant consenting uncertainty to almost any non-residential activity. The status quo (in terms of traffic generation and discretionary activity status) is preferred.

Reference 26

CN5 and AHL submit that the proposed non-complying activity status for a breach of rules concerning other activities (rules 4a.3.1-4a.3.4) is onerous and will prevent or discourage innovative developments in the Central City Living Zone which may involve some appropriate non-residential activity (e.g. mixed use developments, small cafes or convenience retail/services as part of large residential developments, child care facilities, etc). CN5 and AHL submit that these rules should be community standards (discretionary activity status), whereby applications can be considered on their respective merits, without the presumption against approval which is implied by non-complying activity status.

Reference 27

I wish to object to the following proposals and ask that they be cancelled:

Reference 28

3. reducing the minimum size of apartments

Other – Development Standards (2.2-2.4)

Comments received via email and post

Reference 1

People living and working in the central city will need secure covered places to store and park their bicycles. They will also need good lanes and paths to get around. The East Frame plans mention cycleways but the map on page 13 shows none. Consultation requires all parties to know what is on offer. That is not made clear in this document.

Cycle parking indicated in the plan is inadequate, and there is no mention of provisions for creating or expanding cycle parking as more people choose the modes that best fit their needs. If it is not provided people will be forced to drive or bus, regardless of what their real need and desires may be. Please keep in mind that this document seeks to plan for the future, and do so.

Residential developments, in or out of the central city will need to offer secure, covered cycle parking for residents and for visitors. Please amend to provide that requirement in this plan.

Commercial developments will need to supply secure covered cycle parking for staff and customers. The figures found on page 32 are grossly inadequate, and again, do not provide for future demand. Please consult directly with Spokes to develop numbers which will not discourage people from cycling. Failing here undermines mode choice and will find bicycles parked at every possible spot likely leading to conflicts with road and footpath users and the disabled community. Please, let's not plan for failure.

Spokes offers a correction to the table found on page 32. The lack of any cycle parking requirement for students is an almost unbelievable oversight. With students coming primarily from their nearby inner city residences cycle parking for at least half of the enrolment is indicated. Room for expansion should be provided in all instances.

Reference 2

2.4.3 Parking for People with Disabilities – All zones within the central city

Christchurch has an aging population and there will be more and more demand for accessible parking spaces in the future.

Recommendation: that the Christchurch City Council provide more on-street accessible parking spaces as there are currently no provision for parking spaces for people with disabilities for residents.

Recommendation: that there is provision for parking spaces for people with disabilities for any large residential development which will include visitor parking.

2.4.4 Cycle Parking – All zones within the Central City The provision of good quality cycling infrastructure is an important factor in encouraging people to cycle. By having a high number of cycle spaces available, people will be encouraged to bike in the Central City.

Recommendation: that the minimum number of cycle parks is doubled.

Reference 3

<p>Street scene (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.2.3)</p>	<p>Referred to L4B (Central City) which doesn't apply in Central City any more</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to L4B in the Central City deleted. (References to some SAm areas deleted – see SAM changes outlined below); 	<p>All references to L4B deleted.</p> <p>All SAm related provisions for all SAMs within the Central City deleted.</p>	<p>The deletion of the L4B references would be in accordance with the analysis undertaken by the CCC in its Central City Living Zones review. It should be supported.</p> <p>The CCC analysis for the Central City Living Zones review found that some SAMs could be removed, some could be reduced in area and some rules could be changed. There is no analysis in the consultation document explaining the deletion of the remaining central city SAMs</p> <p>Phase 2 of the District Plan review is dealing with SAMs – these remaining SAMs can be re reviewed as part of this process.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Council supports the intent of the complete deletion of L4B references in the City Plan as they relate to the Central City. The Council opposes in part the deletion of all SAM related provisions except those retained, changed or reduced in size as resolved by CCC on 28 February 2013.
---	--	---	---	--	---

Reference 4

<p>Site density - other activities (Volume 3, Part</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule for L4A Exception for SAM 25, 26, 27 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> L4A deleted Exception for SAM 25, 26, 27 deleted 	<p>Deleted</p>		<p>The Council supports the change.</p>
--	--	---	----------------	--	---

2, 4.4.2)					
Open space – residential activities – L4C (Avon Loop) (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.4.3)	Specific rule for L4C Avon Loop	Rule deleted	Deleted		The Council supports the change.
Building Height (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.4.4(i))	Existing Central City height limits as a critical Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule (i) deleted • Breach of heights become a discretionary activity (Community Standard) 	Breach of height limits to become a restricted discretionary activity.	This is consistent with the recommended approach for Phase 1 of the District Plan Review.	The Council supports the change.

Reference 5

- Volume 3 - Section 13 Transport - 2.4 Development Standards: Parking, Loading and Access : All Zones within the Central City - 2.4.7 Access type and design: All Zones within the Central City - Clarification of Table 7:

(7) Where a fire appliance would be required to enter a site in order to address an emergency, access way width and height dimensions must be provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509 :2008.

Reference 6

- Volume 3 - Section 13 Transport - 2.3 Development Standards: Site Access - 2.3.3 Length of vehicle crossings:

2.3.3 LENGTH OF VEHICLE CROSSINGS

Exceptions : Emergency service facilities are exempt from these provisions .

- Volume 3 - Section 13 Transport - 2.4 Development Standards: Parking, Loading and Access :
All Zones within the Central City - 2.4.14 Vehicle Access to sites fronting more than one street:
All Zones within the Central City:

2.4. 14 VEHICLE ACCESS TO SITES FRONTING MORE THAN ONE STREET - ALL ZONES WITHIN THE CENTRAL CITY

If a site fronts more than one street ...

Exceptions: Emergency service facilities are exempt from these provisions.

Reference 7

Parking Requirements and lack of focus on walkable and off road cycle solutions

Reference 8

1. **2.4.3 PARKING FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES – ALL ZONES WITHIN THE CENTRAL CITY NOTE: For the avoidance of doubt there is no requirement to provide parking spaces for people with disabilities with respect to residential activities in the Central City.**

This apparent attempt to exclude people with disabilities puzzles me, especially since a stated objective is to have diverse communities. If a segment of the population that requires special assistance is not provided for, that group will be absent from the central city. Of note is the general lack of a requirement to provide car parking space 2.4.1 (a). Of course families with children will require safe and accessible car parking and if this is missing they will not wish to live in the CCLZ. If the City had an effective public transport system, similar to what I have used in liveable cities overseas, then car parking becomes less of a requirement. Unfortunately I have not read or heard of any plans to provide effective transport options in central or greater Christchurch other than the car.

Reference 9

2. **2.4.4 CYCLE PARKING - ALL ZONES WITHIN THE CENTRAL CITY**

Research has shown that retail activity and spending increases with cycle accessibility, partly because cyclists find it easier to “stop and shop” than motorists. In auto-centric cities like Christchurch it can be difficult for retailers to recognize the financial advantages of providing easy “parking” for non-car modes of transport. Consequently, (a) where there is no building set back and cycle parking is not required, may do some premises and their occupants a disservice. I suggest that the city ensure that there are sufficient cycle parking spaces handy to businesses and residential buildings to support the building occupants and their visitors /customers.

Reference 10

In the interests of promoting a sustainable Liveable City, we also suggest that the minimum number of cycle parks are increased.

Other - Environment, Sustainability

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1-2

There is a real lack of environmental goals in the CCDU led projects in Christchurch. This is really disappointing and to me reveals the lack of commitment to the values expressed in the share an idea process.

Reference 3-4

A more fine-grained approach is required with an emphasis on neighbourhoods which are intimate, walkable places with distinct character and strong inclusive communities / • That the Central City Recovery Plan (p61) references the goal of delivering back a more sustainable city. The CSHWP recommends that 'A Liveable City' includes provisions requiring that new homes meet environmental performance standards and include the ability for homes to be adapted for different life stages (e.g. HomeStar, LifeMark). These standards are currently proposed in the District Plan review.

Reference 5

That the Central City Recovery Plan (p61) references the goal of delivering back a more sustainable city. Beacon recommends that 'A Liveable City' includes provisions requiring that new homes meet environmental performance standards and include the ability for homes to be adapted for different life stages (e.g. HomeStar, LifeMark). These standards are currently proposed in the District Plan review

Reference 6-7

*Existing trees should only be allowed to be removed if they are hazardous, dead, diseased or dying, within a building envelope, close to or interfering with drainage and sewer systems, or utility wires and cables, or causing damage to property including roofs and footpaths. The City should work proactively with development applicants to retain as many healthy mature trees within the central city as possible. / *Hedges should be encouraged within the design rules, instead of concrete, block or wooden fences, adjacent to footpaths and roadways, to meet the public's wish for a greener city both appearance and sustainability wise.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 8

The plan should take note of and implement measures to enable a change within a few years to a non fossil fuel economy, eg photovoltaic roof mounted power generation, walking distance to all facilities, the development of micro public transport systems, and so on. Sustainability as a general principle should be the driving force and should be specifically identified and applied throughout the document.

Reference 9

In your building plans, I did not see any allowance to photovoltaic panels being a requirement for the building, neither the recycling of white water. I think you have now the opportunity to do the right thing to bring ChCh to a 21st Century level, then you should use this opportunity to do the right thing from the start. no matter about the initial cost.

Reference 10

The new building would have photo-voltaic panels to reduce heating bills and attracting low income tenants

Reference 11

I am impressed by the inclusion in the Liveable City draft plan of clear guidelines for green areas and the planting of trees.

Is this related to goals for levels of greening within the city?

Many progressive cities around the world have established such goals and if we wish to fully take advantage of the rebuild opportunity to create a world level liveable city I believe we should set a firm goal.

Advantages of having a high proportion of green areas in an urban area, apart from creating an aesthetically pleasing environment are-

- Temperature modification of buildings.

- Air quality improvements through pollution absorption and oxygen production.

- Carbon Dioxide storage.

- Stormwater absorption and filtration.

Goals set for tree canopy cover by overseas cities include-
 London – 20 to 25% tree cover in 2025
 Chicago – 14 to 17%
 Toronto – 17-34% tree cover by 2050
 Seattle – 18 to 30% tree cover in 30 years
 Sydney- aims to increase tree cover by 50% by 2030
 All these cities do not have the advantage we have of starting from scratch.

In Toronto green roofs are mandatory for developments over 2,000 square metres. They currently have 492 green roofs in their City.

I would like to submit that the CCDU creates a goal for the percentage of green cover that should be achieved in central Christchurch (if it doesn't already have one) and that it creates a policy that promotes and encourages green roofs and walls for new developments.

Reference 12

Supplementary Water Storage The provision for the collection and storage of 20,000litres of stormwater for non potable purposes is encouraged. The benefits from this include:

Alternative to potable water for non-potable uses such as gardening/vehicle washing

Conservation of potable water ☐ Possible stormwater control ☐ Emergency preparedness ☐ Insulation (when for example, included as a bladder under flooring)

The inclusion of supplementary water storage is reasonably easily incorporated into new builds and Community and Public Health promote this approach as a step towards making our city and towns more sustainable.

Reference 13

Sustainable building standards.	Life stage inclusive and adaptive design for new residential units. Energy and Water efficiency standards.	These are standards that the Council has shown a strong interest in pursuing during the development of the residential chapter of the District Plan review.	The Council requests that the rule or a similar one to it be included in the Central City Living zone.
---------------------------------	---	---	---

Reference 14

Other matters

It would be good to see provisions in the draft residential chapter which encourage green building practices. HPC understands that the Council, in its District Plan Review, is proposing to introduce environmental performance standards for new homes and to include the ability for homes to be adapted for different life stages. It may be that if such changes are introduced they will also apply to the central city living zone. If that is not the case there will be a significant discrepancy in standards between this area and other residential areas of the city. The draft should be amended to ensure that any such changes introduced by the Council will also apply to the central city living zone. It would be undesirable to have a lesser standard in the inner city and this would work against the goal of the Recovery Plan to deliver a more sustainable city.

Reference 15

Lack of protection of water

Oppose: Ngāi rūnanga oppose the adoption of the proposed District Plan Changes, enabling residential development within central Ōtautahi/Christchurch, without appropriate protection and enhancement of water and the Ōtākaro/Avon River.

Our reasons are:

Ngāi Tahu, as tāngata whenua, have customary rights and responsibilities associated with freshwater resources in the region, as expressed through the exercise of manawhenua, rangatiratanga, kaitiakitanga and manaakitanga, and as guaranteed by Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Ensuring that freshwater management recognises and provides for these rights and interests is critical to enabling tāngata whenua to protect water as a taonga for future generations.

Changing the way water resources are valued must underpin and drive the changes needed in the way freshwater resources are managed and used. Water is a taonga, and the collective responsibility for protecting the mauri of this taonga is a fundamental principle of Ngāi Tahu freshwater policy. The right to use water must be premised on a responsibility to care for water.

For Ngāi Tahu, the current poor state of cultural health of the waterways and groundwater is evidence that water management and governance in the takiwā has failed to protect freshwater resources. Within central Christchurch, water quality is degraded as a result of urban and rural land use. This has significant effects on the relationship of Ngāi Tahu to water, particularly with regard to mauri, mahinga kai, cultural well-being and indigenous biodiversity.

The proposed changes to the City Plan to enable housing development within central Ōtautahi/Christchurch will put additional pressures on water resources. Not only will there be greater demand for water, but there will be increased pressure on waterway setbacks, runoff and demand for flood mitigation measures.

Whilst Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga support the rebuild in principle, they do not support the hard engineering modification of waterways, nor the establishment of any structures within the waterway setback.

To minimise the impact of development on water, as a Ngāi Tahu taonga, ngā rūnanga request that all developments enabled under the proposed A Liveable City are required to appropriately manage the onsite use and reuse of water.

Management of stormwater that takes into account Ngāi Tahu Manawhenua cultural values and recognition of our waterways as a taonga to where adverse effects of stormwater should be avoided. Consideration also need to be given to Ngāi Tahu Manawhenua cultural values in relation to the treatment of sewage so as to avoid adverse effects.

Decision sought: (requested changes shown in red and Italics)

AMEND Objective 11.10 - Built Form- Amenity, Environmental and Cultural Values A form of built development in the Central City Living Zone that enables change to the existing environment, while contributing positively to the amenity, cultural and environmental values of the area...

ADD new bullet point to policy Policy 11.10.1 (e) minimise the impact of development on cultural values and the environment.

ADD new standards for stormwater 4a.2 Development Standards for Central City Living Zones

4a 2.12 Onsite Water Detention and Reuse (a)

(b) (c)

3.4

Each Residential building shall be fitted with an onsite stormwater detention facility with at least XXX(to be finalised with rūnanga) capacity to minimise the impact of stormwater runoff from the site. The detention facility shall include a treatment system to minimise the contaminants discharged from the site.

Each residential unit shall be provided with at least 10,000L (to be finalised with rūnanga) of onsite stormwater retention for domestic use.

Each residential unit shall be fitted with water use minimisation appliances and fittings.

Reference 16

- Lack of Environmental Sustainability aspects

Reference 17

- * (Principles (beyond TBL) of sustainability across all areas – input is crucial at the outset of planning and design to gain the most effective and efficient outcomes: from green engineering, social and cultural considerations, biodiversity, style and beauty, and other non-market values. It is the cultural and biodiversity elements that especially preserve and nurture a unique sense of place – the heart and soul of local identity).

Reference 18

- Sustainability principles introduced, with developments required to develop to a standard of no less than 6 Home Star rating rate for residential developments and 5 Green Star rating for commercial buildings. The business case for sustainably designed buildings is now extremely well established (see for example the Green Building Council's Central City Plan submission http://www.nzgbc.org.nz/images/stories/-NZGBC_Chch_submission_Central_City_Plan.pdf) and Christchurch has an opportunity that very few cities get to significantly improve the sustainability of our housing stock in a short period for little to no extra cost. We will be seriously failing to future-proof our city if we allow last century thinking and short term thinking about building design and costing to stand in the way of grabbing this opportunity.

Reference 19

3. Look to the future - Bottom lines re: development/construction/insulation (sound and heat) standards should not be the aim – aim higher. Innovation, sustainable materials, green energy, light, space, comfort, privacy. These are all essential for enjoyable living. Independent quality checks should be happening on all new builds to ensure high standards are met before any sign off. You need to immediately improve your insulation standards, heating and outdoor space provisions. I'm living in a new build over here and these areas are well below par. Consider other/alternative heating systems other than the heat pumps – I would question the health issues with this, as someone with sensitive skin, my skin reacts immediately, badly, whenever one is on.

Reference 20

5. Develop your Brand : The Garden City : You've got an international brand that the world believes, unfortunately at the moment it's not true – use it and create the green beautiful haven that Christchurch could and should be. Its disappointingly starved of gardens, parks and green space. *Develop more green space and parks please. Its important the parks are large enough to enjoy – eg. A park and a sports field are 2 different things. You need space for cyclists/walkers/exercise, places to sit, have picnics, places to have outdoor concerts, theatre, music, markets, events. *Your city landscaping and planting should be the best/ most innovative and most beautiful in the world – aim high, think big – it doesn't have to be expensive – it does have to be beautiful and dramatic - large swathes of naturalistic planting in 1 colour throughout the city – flowers and scent everywhere. *Allotments – as well as community gardens can I suggest you develop areas/allotments for low cost lease by residents in the surrounding area to grow their own fruit and veg and flowers. Fruit and veg are expensive over here – its difficult to eat healthily in Christchurch. As an urban dweller for years in Dublin, Ireland I had my own allotment/green space which I leased off the council 5-10minutes walk from my apartment– it's a fantastic way to green up a space at low cost to the council and is fantastic for residents, community spirit,urban safety, aesthetics and health and enjoyment of gardeners. If new developments/apartments are being built with no garden space – this is a way to solve that and

bring the community together. It could happen all over the city, these plots could include community gardens, private leased allotments to local residents, and some allotments given to addiction groups, schools, the elderly/disadvantaged – you could design placement of these to encourage bee corridors all throughout the city and throughout New Zealand. It's a fantastic way to get people of all social levels to interact and is great for improvement of run down areas – instills pride in the locals.

In Dublin, the space was fenced off with locked access to allotment- holders, and each allotment fenced off, the area dug over with top soil and a large locked container provided to store gardeners tools, and a tap for water access. Ground must obviously be safe for food growing and a joint large compost heap set up from the start (people trained what to put on it etc) would be wise. There may need to be a council pick up of green waste once a year at end of season Autumn/Winter. *Flower and Garden shows/landscape design competitions should be encouraged, continued and developed.

Reference 21

Sustainable Design

- This is an excellent opportunity for the City to consider investing in sustainable networks, such as heating, sustainable stormwater retention systems, and to establish clear expectations on new development. Other features such as roof gardens can easily be incorporated into the rule based planning framework proposed.

Other – Housing and rent affordability

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

We love living in the inner city and have done for nearly 20 years, we like being able to walk in to town, go to a restaurant or movie, do some shopping or just see the sights. It saddens us that when our flat is demolished early next year, this will probably mark the end of us being able to live in the Central City and possibly even in Christchurch. Many of the newer buildings have small rooms, little or no storage, garages are rare, as are quality outdoor areas or gardens and most are crammed together like sardines. Rents in Christchurch are also getting ridiculous too (we currently pay \$275/week for a 3 bedroom townhouse in the Central City and are unlikely to be able to repeat that anytime soon). We have very full lives and have a lot of gear (vehicles, bikes, kayaks etc), we don't like the idea of living in the suburbs but a cramped apartment is never going to work for us. Currently I'm reasonably well paid, working in the mining industry in Australia, but with the current slowdown that is likely to come to an end soon and it will be back to low NZ wages and the struggle to get by in a broken city. I love living in Christchurch and it will be sad to leave.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 2

and also the need to afford the outgoings for a body corp unit which is at present 3000 dollars a year plus 1300 dollars in rates a year for 40sqmetre. Which pushes the low end of the market rent to high. and does not include the high heating bill for the long and cold ChCh winters. IF YOU ARE THINKING OF LOW INCOME FAMILIES and WORKERS you might have to think the way the rates are calculated for residential high density units and low cost source of energy, of course fast low cost internet, will enable many to work from home.

Reference 3

To make Christchurch city somewhere anyone would want to live needs the following to be considered and addressed urgently: 1. Rent Control Essential – supply of properties and rental cost are a disgrace. At the moment

there is no city or amenities and rents are through the roof. Coming from Ireland where we've had our own devastating property crash if you really want people to live in your city and you don't want to destroy your economy my advice is to control your rents – I'm personally horrified that currently rent in a zombie city with no amenities is above what I paid in a European city full of amenities, transport and parks. This makes no sense and will have people leaving Christchurch in droves. Surely you need an army of people to help with the rebuild rather than the one or two workers I've seen on each huge construction site. There needs to be clear incentives for workers, designers, artists, families to live in this city not just incentives for developers to build. Surely Christchurch residents have lived through enough devastation and all need a safe, decent place to live, a home – I've met many who refuse to pay the rents and live in motor homes now??? I'm shocked. Do not abandon your current residents.

Reference 4

Solve your homeless problem if not for human empathy and compassion then for the New Zealand Brand – I've seen people living in tents and cars in this city – that's not ok.

Reference 5

Affordable housing

The Plan should include for the provision of affordable housing within the City Centre to contribute to the creation of sustainable communities by encouraging a mixture of social demographic to the City Centre. This includes families, elderly, new entrants to the housing market, or those who require additional financial assistance.

We understand that 399 Manchester Street is being developed by Housing New Zealand in partnership with the private sector and we support this innovative approach. However, this does not provide for a balanced and mixed community throughout the proposed residential area.

City Centre living can be particularly advantageous to older members of the community due access to social networks, amenities, facilities and public transport. Families would be well located to existing and proposed parks and recreation facilities, education, and health. People requiring financial assistance into housing would be located in a busy city centre surrounded by community, social networks, in close proximity to public transport and community facilities.

Reference 6

Affordable housing provision should be required as part of new development and rules should be incorporated into the plan requiring this.

In addition, a mixed community needs the right kind of development to purchase or rent and measures to encourage developers to provide housing for a mixed social demographic must be incorporated to support the above. A mixture of unit sizes should be required including family size housing units (min 3 bedrooms) through the policies and rules.

Other – Transport

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Uncertain as to whether included in the full chapter but I think the public transport is poor having just been to other like sized cities (between 250 and 500k population) and seen that they have a rail and or tram system incorporated. This is an essential part of a modern city that wants to make itself more liveable.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 2

We encourage the CCDU to focus on making the Central City a pedestrian friendly environment where local residents are able to easily walk or cycle in their neighbourhoods and use local transport¹. Active transport and public transport have direct links to public health by: 1) Enabling individuals to more easily reach their daily physical activity targets 2) Reducing the need for individuals to own personal vehicles thus • Reducing vehicle emissions that affect respiratory health and contribute to greenhouse gases and climate change • Reducing congestion thus creating a safer and more efficient road network

3) Enabling those who are for whatever reason unable to own and/or drive a car. These include the elderly, people with disabilities, and children.

Reference 3

- That the Liveable City plan co-ordinates with the CCP Accessible City Chapter supporting good public transport and a bike and walking friendly city.

Reference 4

4. Pedestrianise large areas of the city – To bring life to a city you must have that buzz of people milling around and interacting on the street. Create hubs of activities – shops/restaurants/bars/parks/outdoor markets (Lyttleton Saturday market a great example) - NOT SHOPPING MALLS OR MOTORWAYS PLEASE. One of the most lively areas in the city is the restart area because its got small groups of shops/cafe frontages an interesting mix of things, no cars and its

outdoors – well done , but its only 1 small area & we still need green space. This means you've got to do the following: *develop live/work/shop units & aesthetic(not plastic) shop frontages onto the streets. *encourage people out of their cars and out of the malls, by improving and encouraging public transport/cycling eg light rail/tram – park and ride systems work well in most other European cities eg Nice (France) and Dublin (Ireland) & most cities now have city bikes to hire all over their cities. Parking charges should be high in the city. *remove the motorways in the city – I've never been to a city with so many large roads/motorways right in the centre – it makes it an uncomfortable, noisy, highly un-aesthetic place to be. *Pedestrian Crossings throughout the city essential – it's highly dangerous and extremely frustrating being a pedestrian in Christchurch – the worst city I've ever been in, in the world, as a pedestrian.

Other – Urban Design Concerns

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Diversity is the key. There needs to be a wide mix of people and building styles to reflect the modern contemporary society that we live in. It CANNOT be a replication of suburbia and in particular modern subdivisions with their restrictive covenants, people want to live in the city to be away from this. / I am also apprehensive about the widening of Manchester St and the use of Manchester St as a major bus lane. Buses are smelly, noisy and leave soot and dirt over neighbouring buildings and this should be taken into consideration. / The idea of rain gardens is to be commended.

Reference 2

At the moment, I don't feel like Christchurch will ever be a livable city because it is being designed for only one type of person: rich, white, over-45, male. If you want a good city, let it breathe. Have diversity and small scale developments. People only go to malls because it is convenient - nobody wants to live in one!!!

Reference 3

The CSHWP raises the following additional points: / • Concern that many of the proposed changes strip out any form of recognition (or ambition to achieve) diversity in the urban environment – e.g. height, heritage, diversity in urban design /

Reference 4

Medium density residential developments near the centre of Christchurch are a really good idea. But many of the ideas proposed will result in terrible developments. Reading between the lines this seems like a desperate attempt to attract developers to build. But these relaxations of the rules will lead to very low quality buildings and outdoor spaces. A very low quality legacy

Reference 5

Just be careful not to allow developers to build whatever they like. This is worrying because it can lead to cheap mediocre buildings which will not enhance our city in the long run. We have to look ahead not just to tomorrow. I'm concerned our city will look boring. Great cities have a mix of heights, styles and certainly value their heritage buildings which add to the character and variety in the city scape.

Reference 6

More consideration needs to be given to the aesthetic appeal of buildings- no one wants to look at ugly buildings for the next 100 years.

Reference 7

/ Christchurch has the potential to be a leading city green wise and community wise. Similar to Colorado and places in Melbourne. Largely what we are seeing is multi units and houses going up quickly all looking the same and stacked one on top of the other. Also a prevalence of tilt slab. This is short sighted cf. how beautiful Napier is and the character it has. We don't want a tilt slab city that is constructed for the benefit of developers making money, we want it eco friendly, community wise, affordable, and celebrating a richness of diversity in culture, business, the arts, ages, abilities and crafts. It needs to be friendly for people, plants and animals.

Reference 8

I believe quality of urban design is key to the city. Without it it won't be a desirable place to be. I think there is an incredible danger in taking the emphasis off this, while planning a place where people want to live. / / "Vibrancy" is a word I see getting used often in the plan, and this doesn't happen by separating residential and non-residential activities. Inner city living appeals to people because of the amenities afforded to them. Why would you live in a tiny apartment if you didn't have the city as your living room?

Reference 9

Beacon Pathway raises the following additional points: / • Concern that many of the proposed changes strip out any form of recognition (or ambition to achieve) diversity in the urban environment – e.g. height, heritage, urban design /

Reference 10

There needs to be more comment on ensuring the designs of buildings, footpaths and open spaces are accessible. There is some reference but not throughout the document. To give everyone an opportunity to live, work or play in this area the design needs to include everyone. Not just those who use wheeled mobility devices but also those who have sensory impairments.

Reference 11

Is there an opportunity to use accessible design for rebates? / / Concerned with 4 a. 2.9 - what is there to ensure visibility for vehicles entering and exiting properties. Will design include ensuring visibility for drivers of vehicles reversing from driveways across footpaths and shared paths? / / Why has the comment for the continuous pedestrian footpath along the road frontage been deleted? Is there a requirement to have a continuous accessible footpath throughout each development including adjacent to the roadway/property boundary included?

Reference 12

Im concerned the changes will facilitate the construction of really tall, cheap, ugly, small apartments, which is about the opposite of what is needed for a sustainable christchurch.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 13

Removing urban design assessments, minimizing development standards, and streamlining the resource consent process may very well speed up some developments but the risks associated with this, in particular poor built outcomes, don't make sense and will not deliver the aspirational vision for the city centre.

Reference 14

The value of local character

Another relevant finding of the Value of Urban Design research was that urban design that supports local character can potentially add a premium to the value of housing, reinforce a sense of identity among residents and encourage them to help actively manage their neighbourhood and offer people meaningful choices between very distinctive places, whose differences they value.

With the removal of the Special Amenity Areas, the introduction of a blanket height limit of 14 metres and the removal of the Council's ability to consider the context and appearance of a building, the capability of retaining and restoring the character of the various locales that make up the central city residential areas will be seriously eroded.

In some locations mass clearance has left nothing to work with and so the first development will set the scene for future development. If the first few developments do not achieve good outcomes then enticing developers into new neighbourhoods will be even harder, and will work against the overall objective of getting more housing, particularly in areas that have been less attractive in the past.

Reference 15

Quality of housing The CCDU/Government plan pretends to want quality housing for residents but will let "the market decide"

It shows examples from existing and new projects as examples but hides the 6 storey towers jammed together in "the East/Green Frame.

It sets minimum sizes for apartments but hedges that with all possible exclusions and exceptions, and denies any meaningful storage or garaging space – or even access for handicapped citizens.

It seems to suggest that the new Dual-key apartments being built are not in fact simply ways of offering shelter in less than minimum size apartments which do not have all the features that real apartments contain.

Reference 16

The outcome of the proposed changes may well suit developers but is likely to result in a bland monotony, a lack of diversity of neighbourhoods and a serious loss of character for some of Christchurch's distinctive early neighbourhoods. The proposed changes place touching faith in the market providing quality housing but even with the controls in place under the current city plan, the general quality of medium density developments within the city provides little evidence to suggest that the quality of the urban environment weighs heavily on the mind of developers. The market may well provide the size of dwellings people want and the sorts of conveniences people desire in their homes but all too often in the past multi-unit dwellings have ridden rough-shod over the amenity of existing inner city dwellers. It is notable that in the explanation for the changes, the reasons given are to balance the needs of developers for flexibility and to give certainty about amenity to the extent that potential residents will

have the confidence to move into the area. Concern about the impact on the amenity of existing neighbourhoods does not rate a mention.

Reference 17

The rules as drawn up may well be satisfactory for the blank slate area of the east frame but the one size fits all approach of the plan completely fails to take into account or provide any protection for the quality and character of existing neighbourhoods.

Reference 18

Issue 6.1.4 – Amenity and urban design

While the speed of recovery is important, so too is the quality of the built form. Poorly designed development can adversely affect urban amenity values, rural amenity values, historic heritage, health and safety, integration with community, educational, social and commercial facilities, and overall liveability. These matters are important for retaining population and attracting skilled workers and new business opportunities. They will affect the timing and the success of recovery.

Explanation

Sometimes the desire to rebuild quickly competes with the desire to build well or build back better. Enabling timely and appropriate development during the recovery period in a manner that does not compromise the key values of either existing or future communities is a challenge that must be recognised at Greater Christchurch, city, district and neighbourhood levels. Rebuilding can also impact on issues of significance to Ngāi Tahu, affecting their relationship with ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. In particular, good urban design will contribute to vibrant and renewed centres and help support wider wellbeing objectives such as quality of life, economic vitality and crime reduction.

Other – Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Christchurch is a market town. It is supported by the farming community around us. Four wheel drives happen. Skiing happens. Boating happens. Broken legs happen. / Chicken coops with bicycle access may be great for 20% of the community for 20% of their lives but I predict a lot of turnover as people out-grow the novelty of inner-city-as-an-island life.

Reference 2

Bring back Centennial Pool. / Stop trying to create pods of like-minded businesses. / Do not build a new covered sports arena; build something useful to all.

Reference 3

Do not assume that future residents will be carless or have no use of garage type storage facilities, or unable to participate in some form of gardening to keep themselves occupied.

Reference 4

The 14m building height maximum in the Avon Loop redzone must be removed. / There should be no building allowed in the Avon Loop Red Zone - no building in perpetuity. / I was forced off my land in the current Avon Loop Red zone by bullying CERA threats of loss of services, loss of insurance, loss of land value, loss of accessibility. I lost my community and my neighbourhood, I lost my way of life of 23 years. I did not want to leave. I wish I did not leave. I signed papers under duress. Every day I grieve this loss. CERA say their decisions about the red zone were to help people move on. I wanted a choice to stay but due to the process I had NO choice. I cannot "move on". / I do NOT want to find that I was forced off simply for building to be allowed back into this area. / /

Reference 5

I wish to strongly support the submission made by the MOA Residents - Chair: [REDACTED] I am the Treasurer, longstanding resident and person alongside my late husband [REDACTED] instrumental in the creation of the pocket park Moa Reserve. The development on Ely Street called JLC apartments is a very good model for what is both valued and enjoyed by owners and renters alike.

Reference 6

You must make it attractive to potential owner-occupiers and very long-term tenants (one bed units on leases). / / If the area is predominantly occupied by casual tenants it will be acceptable only to those under 30 .

Reference 7

That adequate shared storage space must be allowed for within developments e.g. for kayaks and bikes. /

Reference 8

Perhaps you could call the resulting mess 'the Warwick Isaacs' slums'

Reference 9

Thank you for the opportunity. I look forward to seeing this eventuate. Cantabrians seem not to be as ready as Wellingtonians or Aucklanders to embrace inner city living but should these urban dwellings be well designed & liveable people will choose to live there.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 10

1. The document makes no reference to essential State supplied resources, eg 20,000 more residents will require about six new state primary schools, however these sites are not identified. If there are to be an additional 30,000 people living inside the four Avenues, then then necessary social services must be provided. As schools in particular require quite large sites, their locations must be planned for and indicated on the planning maps.

Reference 11

I am a resident at [REDACTED] Hurley Street, in the Living 5 Zone in the Avon Loop area. At present, I am displaced because of the February earthquake, but lived at this address for 22 years. I am rebuilding my home, knowing that this is now in a 50 year flood plain. The 5 March flood, when the Avon River broke its banks to flow down Hurley Street has not diminished my determination to return to the neighbourhood and community that I live in.

I am the Secretary of the Avon Loop Planning Association.

Reference 12

Eastern ChCh has lost quite a number of services and would like them to see replaced so that the community will be able to access them at walking distance. Which includes a gymnasium, swimming pool and a pub.

Reference 13

Urban living above all, means to be close to shops, sport facilities, pubs, restaurants, schools and working places.....creating high density dormitories areas with no shops is not ""urban, but suburban..

Reference 14

I understand the urgent need of redeveloping the centre, and attracting developers but one has to consider the long term urban plan and this has to reflect also a modern concept where you play where you live. Also should reflect an aging population who needs services at their door step, like in the old village concept where young families would live side by side to older people forming a balanced social environment

Reference 15

Safe neighbourhoods

The National Guidelines for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) developed by the Ministry of Justice in 2005 explain that “CPTED is a crime prevention philosophy based on proper design and effective use of the built environment leading to a reduction in the incidence and fear of crime as well as an improvement in the quality of life”. The proposed changes to the District Plan remove the ability of the Christchurch City Council to vet applications for CPTED best practice.

Reference 16

We also acknowledge the existence of Christchurch City Council strategic documents, including the Integrated Wellbeing and Sustainability Assessment of the draft Central City Plan, which require the natural environment, safety, attractiveness and inclusivity to be considered in its planning and policy processes as part of its commitment to healthy Community Outcomes 2006-12. Urban development can impact on the health of the public living or working in the city. Therefore the continued use of the Integrated Recovery Guide is recommended to ensure a comprehensive review of residential areas in the city.

Reference 17

A commitment to good urban design principles ensures that the physical environment is attractive and accessible to residents. There is an increasing amount of evidence illustrating an association between the physical environment and psychological health. A Greenwich study published in 2006 illustrated that neighbour noise, feeling over-crowded in the home, being dissatisfied with access to green open spaces, being dissatisfied with access to community facilities, and feeling unsafe to go out during the day, are all independently negatively associated with psychological health (Guite, Clark et al. 2006).

Reference 18

The Council notes that it has been 2 years since the introduction of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan. This Recovery Plan directed the City Council to work with CERA and propose changes to its planning rules for submission to the Minister within 6 months - i.e. by 1st March 2013. This was delivered by the City Council. Subsequently, the Minister has chosen to direct CCDU to progress “A Liveable City”. The draft chapter has now been published, a further 17 months after the Council delivered the draft rules to the Minister, and based on the Council’s analysis, still represents a work in progress.

2. This time delay is disappointing. It is worth highlighting that during this period, developers have been approaching the City Council with residential proposals. Staff advice during this period has been to relay news of delays to changes in the planning framework or to refer people on to CCDU.

In order that landowners, developers and housing providers are given a clear direction on priorities, amended planning provisions and the role of other initiatives, the Minister and government more widely (noting the points in 4e) below) are urged to move swiftly to put in place a coordinated policy approach. Further observations around timing are made in sections 7-9 below.

Reference 19

The chapter talks about the city needing to achieve a critical population mass, however there is no route map towards raising the current population of 5,000 to a suggested level of around 20,000. The East Frame is proposed to deliver homes for 1,500 to 2,000 new residents, and above average redevelopment might achieve a further uplift of 5,000 by 2020. This leaves a gap of around 8,000. The market will need confidence that there is commitment towards targets.

Reference 20

The Core will have significantly high amenity to leverage residential demand which may drive higher amenity of adjacent residential development. However, away from the Core - to the north and east of the central city in particular – public spaces and amenities around which higher density housing might be encouraged to grow are less prevalent and should be a focus for smaller scale non-regulatory intervention alongside the East Frame Neighbourhood.

Reference 21

In addressing the residential demands of a more diverse sub-market – detailed in the “What people Want” box on page 7 - the draft chapter often runs counter to the demands for “Neighbourhoods which are intimate, walkable places with distinct character and strong inclusive communities”. The standardisation of rules, weeding out of variability in built form and diminution of the role that high quality design plays fails to ensure delivery of features that contribute to attractive and distinctive communities.

Reference 22

The “Making it Happen” section talks about the intention of government to work with the development sector to stimulate residential development in the central city. This is a clear recognition that the planning framework alone will not transform housing delivery. However, the government’s housing policy and approach to interventions in the market currently seem uncoordinated with this chapter introducing a further dimension. Whether inside or outside of “A Liveable City” some clarity needs to be offered in relation to how initiatives including the Christchurch Housing Accord and Land Use Recovery Plan will operate together with and alongside “A Liveable City”, in turn giving the market clear signals about how and where to invest in particular products.

Reference 23

The Council undertook a robust public consultation process when it developed its recommended plan. Some of the changes in the document are a significant departure from the Council’s plan – particularly the deletion of important urban design matters and the standardisation of height limits. The Council expects that CERA and CCDU would have discussed these directly with at least the listed Consultees in the Council document before finalising its draft for public comment.

Reference 24

Whilst the Council acknowledges that under the CER Act 2011 that CERA and the CCDU do not have to undertake as robust an analysis as the one the Council undertook in developing its recommended plan, there is a disappointing lack of available evidence within or associated with the document.

Reference 25

Coordinate the timing and format of the changes to the District Plan to reflect the ongoing review process now prescribed in the Order in Council.

3. Include more tangible regulatory and non-regulatory initiatives to support residential growth and redevelopment. The city council would suggest the following as opportunities, a) Consider opportunities to put in place more proactive planning rules that encourage and incentivise site amalgamation and comprehensive development outside of those areas where residual height and amenity controls, listed in 1. above, are to be retained.

b) Undertake a review of the effectiveness of the Central City Mixed Use zone provisions in delivering residential accommodation, alongside an evaluation of opportunities to establish one or more residential clusters in the southern half of the central city around which private investment might be stimulated.

c) Identify and be proactive in stimulating residential growth across the wider Central City Living Zone by using land assets, amenity or public service improvements to uplift local amenity and create conditions to lever in private investment.

d) Recognise that the East Frame is such a large scale opportunity and that it does provide a test bed to integrate a component of affordable homes in manner which addresses the unhelpful social stigma applied to this part of the market.

4. Whether inside or outside of “A Liveable City”, indicate the coordination of government housing policy which aligns initiatives and directives across the Land Use Recovery Plan, the Christchurch Housing Accord and the ‘A

Liveable City’ chapter, to avoid gaps, overlaps or conflicts in delivery across housing supply, economic performance or public benefit outcomes.

5. Clarify why the extensive work around support initiatives and interventions involving the City Council and other government agencies have not been included within “A Liveable City”, instead being referenced in a commitment to “work with the Private Sector to investigate what is needed to unleash the potential of residential development in the central city”.

Reference 26

<p>Urban design appearance and amenity (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.2.7)</p>	<p>Provisions combined for Central City and other SAm areas.</p>	<p>Clause altered – specific provisions for SAm areas within Central City - subject to assessment matters in Volume 3 Part 2, rule 13.2.8 Urban design, appearance and amenity.</p>	<p>No equivalent Urban design appearance and amenity rule.</p>	<p>The consultation rules package relies entirely on built form standards to produce acceptable design appearance and amenity outcomes. The CCC’s experience is that reliance on such controls alone is insufficient to ensure acceptable outcomes. For this reason the Council introduced Plan Change 53 which inserted a restricted discretion on urban design, appearance and amenity.</p> <p>In accordance with Land Use Recover Plan Actions the CCC has reviewed and refined the restricted discretionary activity standards and assessment matters as part of Phase 1 of the District Plan review. These standards should be included to complete the approach to urban design and amenity in the Central City.</p>	<p>The Council very strongly opposes the deletion of the urban design appearance and amenity rule from the plan as resolved on 28 February 2013. The following rule or its equivalent should be included in the Central City Living Zones:</p> <p><i>The erection of new buildings and alterations or additions to existing buildings including all accessory buildings, fences and walls associated with that development, that result in:</i></p> <p><i>a .three or more residential units, or</i></p> <p><i>b. one or two residential units on a site smaller than 300m2 gross site area, or</i></p> <p><i>c. one or two residential units</i></p>
---	--	---	--	--	--

					<p><i>resulting in residential floor area greater than 500m²;</i></p> <p><i>d. over 40m² of a building used for other activities, on a site is a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p> <p>The assessment matters should be as per those in <i>14.9.6 Urban Design and Maori urban design principles</i> as sent to the Government for comment – or as amended for public notification on 27 August 2014.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Reference 27

Retailing – other activities (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.4.5)	Reference to L4C (Avon Loop) – changes out of scope of project	Mechanical changes – the intent remains the same	Deleted.	<p>There are no controls on retail activities – other than 4a.3.1 Scale of Activities under the cascading rule 4a.1 retail would be a permitted activity. This is in direct conflict with proposed policy 11.9.2(c)</p> <p><i>To ensure non-residential activities in the Central City Living Zone: (c) do not compromise the role of the Central City Business Zone or the aim of consolidating that area of the Central City or the Central City Mixed Use Zone.</i></p>	The Council opposes the deletion of Rule 4.4.5. – except that part that relates to the Avon Loop.
--	--	--	----------	--	--

Reference 28

Generally (Volume 3, Part 2, 13.2, 13.2.4, 13.2.7, 13.2.9, 13.2.10, 13.2.11, 13.2.13 - 13.2.17)	References to L4A, L4B and L4C	Changes made to reflect the deletion of the L4A and L4B zones in the Central City.	Encompassed in consequential amendments		The Council supports the change.
Urban design, appearance and amenity - Living 3, 4A, 4B and 4C Zones (Volume 3, Part 2, 13.2.8)	(b) contained specific matters related to various SAm areas	Matters related to SAm 22, 30, 31, 32, 33 have been deleted	All Central City SAm provisions deleted.		The Council opposes in part the deletion of all SAm related provisions except those retained, changed or reduced in size as resolved by CCC on 28 February 2013.
Volume 3 Part 2 – Living Zones - Appendices	References to L4A in various diagrams; · Diagram D applied to all of L4C zone; and L5 (Peterborough) and adjoining non-living zones; · Diagram E applied to L5 (Avon) and adjoining non-living zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References to L4A deleted in all diagrams; Diagram D applies to L4C zone outside the Central City only but references to L5 (Peterborough) and adjoining non-living zones are now in Diagram E Diagram E – 	Encompassed in consequential amendments		The Council supports the change.

		<p>references to L5 (Avon) and adjoining non-living zones now deleted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diagram E (less restrictive) now applies to L4C and L5 inside the Central City; 			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Reference 29

Demographic horizons as assessed through the Urban Development Strategy suggest there is a current shortage of 1- 2 bedroom units, and this should be the primary housing the central city provides. This is not to suggest that exclusion of other demographics needs to occur. Enabling family friendly central city living has proved popular internationally, and also leads to lifelong trends.

Reference 30

When I look at what appears to be one of our growing societal norms, that of building large retirement villages in the suburbs for our aged population, I can't help but think that we could be under utilising one of our greatest resources – that being the wealth of knowledge that our elders have to offer. Over recent times, the major decision-makers in our communities, and society as a whole, has shifted from our elders towards the youthful, more independent minded, and dare I say more egocentric, members of society. As humans we naturally strive to discover our independence and control our own environment as much as possible. This is reflected in our desire to develop residential environments where we can live in our partitioned units of space, and keep outside influence to a minimum. For the majority of society, even our aging parents are effectively “partitioned” to live out their remaining lives in gated retirement villages with other ageing individuals.

Wouldn't it be great if we could keep the collective experience of our aged population with their sage wisdom more integrated with our following generations, and somehow foster symbiotic relationships between the different age demographics? To me, the vibrant inner city core would have to be an ideal location for this type of social interdependence to manifest and grow. In our plans for the inner city rebuild, do we have room to accommodate the design and development of residential complexes that would encourage this mix of young and old, or will the city centre continue to be the bastion for the young and upwardly mobile?

Reference 31

The specific parts of the draft Residential provisions for the CCRP that the NZFS Commission's feedback relates to are:

- Aspects of the draft Residential provisions that may impact on the operations of the NZFS Commission, including:

oThe provision of sufficient water supply for firefighting purposes, and o Physical access for fire appliances.

- Aspects of the provisions for Non-Residential Activities in the Central City Living Zone that may impact on the operations of NZFS Commission properties.

Reference 32

The NZFS Commission encourages the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Minister to make the changes listed above to the draft Residential provisions to ensure that the role, functioning and existence of emergency service operations and facilities within the proposed Central City Living Zone is recognised.

The NZFS Commission has qualified staff, experienced in all aspects of this submission, and would be happy to assist and/or advise in any way possible.

Reference 33

The Council's previous Plan Change 53, which brought in the existing city plan provisions, addressed a noticeable deficiency in central city housing amenity with a comprehensive review process. The Change has been observed to result in the quality of housing improving. Developers are welcoming encouragement to do better. But such improvements are now at risk from the proposed planning regime.

Reference 34

Lack of Ngāi Tahu values in introductory pages

Support in part: Ngā Rūnanga generally support the intent of the draft A Liveable City in trying to establish an attractive central city neighbourhood with a diverse community, recognising that people are its heart and soul. However, the introductory texts (pages 5 -14) fail to give specific recognition to Ngāi Tahu in this process, including the restoration of cultural values in order to bring life to the city centre.

Our reasons are: Ngā Rūnanga support the sustainable development of communities, however, this can only be achieved through the recognition of the kaitiaki and manawhenua role of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri whānau, and the restoration of cultural values. This would ensure consistency with the intent of the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan

Decision Sought: Amend the introductory pages to specifically include wording that explicitly describes the importance of Ngāi Tahu values in residential development including their kaitiaki and manawhenua role; the restoration of their cultural values and visibility of their cultural identity in the design of the development. Also their needs to be acknowledgement of Ngāi Tahu as partners in the recovery process.

Reference 35

Lack of recognition and incorporation of cultural landscapes

Support in part: Ngā Rūnanga support the inclusion of landscaping and open space requirements. However, there needs to be further provisions to adequately recognise Ngāi Tahu cultural landscapes. Cultural landscapes, as addressed in the Mahaanui IMP, are geographical areas with particular traditional, historical, spiritual and ecological value to Ngāi Tahu. Cultural landscapes are integral to Ngāi Tahu identity. This includes recognising the relationship of Ngāi Tahu to special sites such as wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga and mahinga kai.

Our reasons are: Ngāi Tahu have a cultural, spiritual and historical association with Ōtautahi that is centuries old. The resources of the waterways, wetlands and forests were important as mahinga kai, supplying kāinga within the area and further afield. The name Ōtautahi links the city of Christchurch back to the ancestor Tautahi. While the last 160 years have seen a dramatic change to the natural and cultural landscape that once characterised Ōtautahi, Ngāi Tahu remain connected to this landscape, and continue to advocate for the recognition of the city as a shared landscape and a more visible indigenous presence in the urban environment.

The restoration of cultural landscape values in Ōtautahi is critical to rebuilding the relationship of Ngāi Tahu to this ancestral place. This was an important kaupapa for tāngata whenua prior to the stirring of Rūamoko, and has become even more important in the post- earthquake environment. The rebuild and redevelopment of the city presents the opportunity for local government, Ngāi Tahu and the community to incorporate and showcase Ngāi Tahu cultural identity and values in a more visionary and integrated way. Enhancement of cultural landscape values contributes to the cultural and social wellbeing, through enhancing a sense of identity and belonging for Ngāi Tahu in the city.

The Mahaanui IMP outlines policies in 5.8 Ngāi Tahu Whenua, to enhance Ngāi Tahu cultural landscape values. These include: protection and restoration of indigenous biodiversity; protection and restoration of places of cultural value to Ngāi Tahu; incorporating Ngāi Tahu heritage values into landscape design through the use of traditional place names, interpretation, artwork and public structures and setting aside appropriate areas of open space within developments.

Reference 36

Health and a Cohesive Community

To achieve the aims stated above requires the development of a cohesive community or several smaller communities in the central city. The required cohesiveness is severely damaged by motor vehicle traffic passing through an area. In relation to the East Frame the main points of concern are that Manchester Street which runs down the west side of the frame and Gloucester Street and Hereford Street which transect the frame appear to be streets which will carry a significant amount of traffic. This is not favourable to the development of the communities that are aspired to. "Roadways and traffic can act as physical and psychological barriers to contact particularly where roads bearing high levels of traffic cut through housing areas, limiting or disrupting interpersonal networks and reducing social contact. The impact is greater on those who have limited access to the range of transport options, including older people, the unemployed, those with young children and those with disabilities."2

Of just as much concern is the issue of air pollutants. This has not been properly considered in the Christchurch transport strategic plan because the national regulations in relation to air pollution have been inappropriate. 3 The Ministry for the Environment imposed excessive regulations regarding PM10 through the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality, and Environment Canterbury, as their agent, has attempted to meet them.4 This has led to inappropriate planning because of concentration on an incidental air pollutant.

Reference 37

In 2013 the World Health Organisation (W.H.O.) stated in relation to sources of air pollution affecting health: "Most evidence accumulated so far is for an effect of carbonaceous material from traffic." This was first recognised in Holland in 2002, when it was found that cardiopulmonary mortality was associated with living near a major road (relative risk 1.95) and the relative risk of dying if one lived near a major road was 1.41. Since then, many studies have confirmed and extended these observations and the statement by the W.H.O. world experts is the most dependable current statement concerning causation of ill-health by air pollutants.

WHO also stated: "Long-term (years) exposure to PM2.5 is associated with both mortality and morbidity. The evidence is weaker for PM10." The PM10 theory on which the Ministry for the Environment's regulations were based has now been relegated to relative insignificance. The consequences of this are that effort and planning should be directed to reducing exposure to motor vehicle exhausts. This has significant implications for the implementation of "A Liveable City" and the transport plan for the inner city.

Reference 38

Whilst the Christchurch transport strategic plan supports the aim of an increased proportion of journeys to be made by foot, cycle and public transport, arrangements for the development of public transport and the separation of housing, and pedestrian traffic from motor-vehicle traffic are inadequate.

Reference 39

Whilst Christchurch will not have the large number of tourists that are attracted to those cities, nevertheless, tourism will continue to play an important part in our economy. To create a desirable environment in the city will create touristic appeal as well as being a worthwhile act of preventive medicine for local citizens.

Unpleasantness and toxicity from vehicle emissions will become a more serious problem as the population and traffic density increase.

Reference 40

In order to achieve better separation of motor traffic exhausts from pedestrians and residential areas it will be necessary to consider further options. The strategic road network and freight network around the city should achieve their aims. For the central city areas another transport system is required which integrates with the core public transport network of the outer city at good interchange facilities. Electric minibuses and cycles would be possible modes of transport from these interchange facilities at the boundaries of the central city. It is possible that such transport could also efficiently link parking buildings at the boundaries of the central city with various central locations. Electric or hybrid taxis might meet other requirements for transport from or within the central city.

Such a system would minimise the contact of people with significant pollutants and would meet the concerns of the National Institute of Water and Atmosphere Research.⁷ It pointed out that "for urban air pollution ... *where* the emissions take place is just as important as *what* is being emitted." As "atmospheric pollutants have a much shorter lifetime the exact location of where the emissions occur has a crucial influence on their effect." The locating of sites to monitor carbon monoxide, nitrogen and sulphur oxides, ozone, PM_{2.5}, ultrafine particles, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and heavy metals, is thus important.

Locating the fast one-way roads outside the central core is a very positive design choice. The encouragement of vehicles into the inner-city via distributor streets needs to be reconsidered, as the fewer the number of vehicles in the central city the more congenial and healthy it will be for pedestrians and those who work there. If the access of vehicles was restricted this would demand a really efficient inner city shuttle service to ensure convenience of access to services and shops.

A broad approach to planning, consistent with the "Wider Health and Well-being Impacts of Transport Planning" authored by the Canterbury District Health Board, Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury is essential.² It is made more compelling by the WHO advice about air pollutants which will increase with the inevitable growth in motor traffic that will accompany increases in population.

Reference 41

The Majestic Church has lodged a resource consent application with CCC (RMA 92025955) seeking approval for a mixed use spiritual facility / residential development.

The submitters are concerned that the City Plan will provide for a spiritual facility in all other living zones as a permitted activity, but that within the Central City Living Zone a spiritual facility will be a non-complying activity.

Reference 42

Historically, the Living 4C Zone is characterised by a variety of residential environments of special residential character, amenity and coherence. These range from the large scale character homes and mature planting in the central city west to the medium to small lot sizes and small cottages styles in the Avon Loop, Moa and Victoria areas. Although a medium- high density is prescribed throughout the zone, various heights recognise that a contextual approach to the scale of development is necessary to preserve the special characteristics of each area.

There is a need to preserve the special characteristics of the area. Environment standards are also, in part, contextual to ensure that each neighbourhood does not experience adverse environmental effects due to incompatible development. Consequently only activities which contain at least some permanent residential accommodation are anticipated. Exceptions are made for specified activities on specific sites which serve a strategic function. However, spiritual facilities are excluded from these exceptions for the Living 4C Zone.

It is the view of the submitter that a spiritual facility is an integral part of a community fabric, and that spiritual facilities should be provided for as a permitted activity in the proposed Central City Living Zone. As stated above, all developments are required to comply with City Plan environmental standards of the new zone, thereby restricting the scale of development to that which is considered acceptable for the living environment. Such standards include; sunlight and outlook for neighbours, street scene, separation from neighbours, building length, access, etc.

Reference 43

Relief Sought

The submitter seeks that the CCRP is altered to allow for spiritual facilities as a permitted activity within proposed Central City Living Zone. It is important that this change is made to ensure that the CCRP and associated changes to the City Plan allow for establishment and on-going operation of spiritual facilities within all Living zones and to be recognised as a legitimate, sustainable and appropriate use of land in the Central City Living Zone.

Relief sought: Provide for Spiritual Facilities as a permitted activity within the Central City Living Zone.

However, while The Majestic Church considers the provision of spiritual facilities in the Central City Living Zone to be an important element to rebuilding communities and providing opportunities for social interaction and connection, if the Minister is not minded to grant this submission, then Majestic Grow Limited seek that their land at 53 Kilmore Street (refer to figure 1 above) is rezoned Central City Mixed Use. This zoning reflects the historic use of the site for Education, restaurant and residential. An education facility operated on the site for 96 years, only closing in 1970 when the University of Canterbury was relocated to Ilam. The buildings stood neglected for a decade and a half before the buildings were converted to residential apartments and a restaurant during the early 80's. The restaurant was established in 1982 while the apartment conversions occurred from 1981-1986. Residential activity on this site is therefore relatively new, with residential occupation only being in the last 25 years. Please refer to the enclosed report *Architectural Heritage of the Normal School* produced by CCC – Town Planning Division. We therefore seek the following:

Relief sought: rezone 53 Kilmore Street as Central City Mixed Use Zone.

Should the opportunity arise to speak to this submission the submitter would welcome the opportunity. Please advise of any public forum where this may be able to occur.

In the alternative we would be pleased to discuss any aspects of the submission, including the relief sought, in order to assist the decision making process.

Reference 44

Design Standards

We have the following comments regarding design standards within the Plan:

Page 16 'Statutory direction to amend the district plan' provides an overview of the approach to development standards proposed. In particular Points 1 and 2 summarise the 'bottom lines' for new development, which are in turn transposed to objectives, policies and rules. A fundamental question with this approach is: have these bottom lines, and in turn rules, been tested to ensure that these will in fact result in good development? Or will they simply result in development that is adequate?

The draft plan emphasises the creation of buildings rather than the creation of spaces. To make the City Centre a liveable City, the planning framework needs to seek to create spaces that will make the City Centre an attractive and feasible place to live.

It is unclear within the Plan how secured by design principles have been incorporated. A liveable city needs to be safe, and the current wording of the rules does not appear to provide for this.

Other – Suggestions, advice

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Through land ownership the Government is well placed to develop good examples (why isn't the Breathe site underway?) and offer incentives, particularly in reduced or delayed land costs. Get this underway in the East Frame and a big contribution to the housing stock can be made. The capacity of existing residential areas is much less and therefore change not so urgent.

Reference 2

A Master Plan is required for A Liveable City in order to achieve the stated objective that both CCDU and CCC have of 20,000 people living in the inner city. With an overall plan this objective can be achieved, but without one it will take a very long time

Reference 3

I live near Victoria Street, in a cohesive neighbourhood with little damage from the quakes, I think you need two "living zone - 1 for us who have been here all the time and already live in a dense neighbourhood and another for the areas wrecked by the quakes

Reference 4

- That the "A Liveable City" chapter also needs to signal how residential development can be supported by non-regulatory approaches

Reference 5

Remember, Cities are a long game and are never "complete". / / Do not rush, and remember we are making decisions for future generations and how they will live in this place.

Reference 6

Land taken from those in the Eastern Frame which is not to be used as part of the park but is instead going to be used as commercial or residential development should be returned to the original property holders.

Reference 7

The council needs to ensure that it does not get itself into large amounts of debt for buildings not important to most citizens, such as the stadium and restoring the town hall. Ratepayers do not want this. A stadium is not a priority and definitely should not be in the centre of the city.

Reference 8

That the "A Liveable City" chapter also needs to signal how residential development can be supported by non-regulatory approaches for example stimulating residential growth by using land assets, and amenity or public service improvements to create conditions to lever in private investment. /

Comments received via email and post

Reference 9

It is accepted that residents help to create a vibrant city centre, and the private sector needs to see sound commercial benefits it is to invest in inner city residential development. Developers need tangible incentives to proceed with developments in the central city living zone (ie subsidised land purchases, rates relief, removal of development levies, and so forth). This is an area that needs real attention, and quickly, in order to encourage long term sustainable medium density residential development in the Central City Living zone.

We had the makings of a great central city prior to the earthquakes but it is fair to say that it was far from perfect. We now have a blank canvas in many respects and an opportunity to create a central city which is an inspiring place to live, an attractive place to invest, and one of the best urban environments in New Zealand. There needs to be greater engagement with the design professionals whose skill and creativity will ultimately shape the central city

.The local architectural community in particular needs to be given a stronger voice and we would welcome the opportunity to work more closely with CCC and CERA/CCDU on key planning changes impacting the redevelopment.

Reference 10

Minimum site density	14.3.3.17 Minimum site density from development or redevelopment of residential units.	This rule ensures that the intensification targets in the Regional Policy Statement are met.	The Council requests that the rule or a similar one to it be included in the Central City Living zone.
----------------------	---	--	---

Reference 11

Firstly, we feel that the rebate for development contributions would be better replaced with a contribution based on the true cost of service provision. Central city development costs are significantly lower due to existing services. As the rebate expires in 2015, this would be a better use of funds and have a greater longevity to support inner city residential development. Perhaps this rebate could be used to provide incentives for higher home star rated builds, with the rebate being tied to the Home Star rating.

These amendments should also encourage affordable housing, implementation of Home Star ratings with incentives for higher rated proposals, and good urban design. Whilst it is important to prioritise things such as setback, height regulations, and site coverages these things should not be at the cost of other arguably better goals. Flexibility in code to achieve a lower carbon future should be prioritised.

Reference 12

Development contribution rebate

This rebate scheme has without doubt been of assistance in keeping our central city dwellings competitive with the surrounding neighbourhoods. Pre-earthquake Councils often used to make grand statements about how they would like 10,000 or 30,000 people in the central city, but these grand words were never followed up with concrete acts. This rebate scheme is a concrete act and it works.

It should be borne in mind that the true cost of a development contribution to a resident is at least 25% more than the contribution itself. This is due to the fact it becomes a cost of the project and as such is subject to the additional costs of financing, margin, marketing and the like. We have heard Council officers say some things about this, such as “it is a tax on the developer, not a cost”, and other such stuff but frankly this is absurd and very unhelpful.

If a development contribution is a \$24,000 charge from the Council to the developer then the final charge from the developer to the resident is \$30,000. This makes, for example, a \$490,000 apartment \$520,000. This is the reality. Please do not underestimate this.

There are however two problems with the current rebate scheme;

The dollar limit. This should remain unlimited into the future. This rebate genuinely assists with competitiveness. Leave it unlimited until such time as central city living has a momentum of its own.

The timeframe limit of 2015 to start on site works. This effectively places the deadline at todays date given the time it takes to get a development out of the ground. The timeframe must be extended until such time as central city living has a momentum of its own.

This is a good policy and must be retained.

Reference 13

Confidence

This is the most important factor in residential living in central city living in Christchurch.

We find our buyers and residents are uncertain about the central city. They are also very flighty and the slightest scare will chase them away. The things that we think will encourage confidence in central city living include;

An urgent start and completion of the Breathe project. This is crucial.

Early completion of such amenities as the Avon River Precinct, the Margaret Mahy Playground, cycleways and walkways, the Arts Centre re-opening, parks and reserves.

The earliest possible start and completion of the initial East Frame residential projects.

Provision of certainty around planning rules which protect their living environments, including especially height limits, recession planes and setbacks.

We think the following will discourage confidence in central city living;

The Breathe project stall spilling into the public arena. People have been looking forward to this. This is crucial.

Delay and / or change to those matters in ii. above.

Delay and / or change to that in iii. above.

Lack of certainty around planning rules per iv. above.

Removal of the limited notification procedure for resource consent applications.

(We are concerned that the delays in getting the Breathe and East Frame projects underway is on the verge of spilling into the public arena and that this will severely knock confidence in central city living. These should be attended to with urgency)

Reference 14

I think you need two living zones – one that continues to protect us, who already live in long established, cohesive inner city neighbourhoods, with their own character and which doesn't favour developers, who could destroy the present amenities. We need to keep the lower building heights, less steep recession planes, cost effectiveness not allowed as a non-compliance assessment and some say in what happens next door. The second zone could cover those areas where large numbers of buildings have been demolished and there are very few existing residential neighbours.

Please don't stop protecting us who live in the inner city already, we love living here and supporting the businesses within the city and walking to work. Please consider having two different living zones.

Reference 15

Incentives, such as a reduction in development contributions, are given to developments that have sustainability features over and above the city plan requirements. Please see attached document.

Reference 16

DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS – the impact on affordability and sustainability

As previously stated, *The Viva Project* and *Jasmax* are committed to the sustainable development of central Christchurch (the City) with well-designed, affordable, medium-density, mixed-use residential housing.

We understand a key objective of the *Breathe Urban Village* competition is to enable developments that are replicable and ultimately encourage people to return to the City.

We support this approach wholeheartedly.

We are keen to create solutions that address the issue of development contributions (DCs) not only for this competition but also for the development of the City generally. Our vision is to see the City become a vibrant and innovative place to live and work.

DCs in Christchurch are about \$21,000 a unit for residential housing. On this basis, DCs for the *Viva/Jasmax* proposed *Breathe Development* would amount to about \$1.5 million. At this level our affordable concept is not economically viable. The dwellings would be too expensive for the anticipated market price point.

We propose that DCs for residential developments within the four avenues of the City be abolished or substantially reduced.

This would clearly signal that the Christchurch City Council (the Council) wishes to reverse the flight to the *exurbs* and make it attractive for both developers and residents to return to the City thereby contributing to its vibrancy and economic sustainability.

High quality sustainable developments will more than pay their way in the future through rates and business activity whilst reducing the Council's long-term infrastructure costs.

We suggest that Council focus on reducing DCs for inner city developments proportionally to the developments delivering measurable sustainable benefits which reduce environmental impacts and infrastructure demand.

A suggested scale is:

25 per cent reduction for any multi-unit within the four avenues at density equal to or greater than 50 dwellings per hectare (net/site density). This figure is identified in the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy as a target for the Central City area.

For units achieving Home Star 6, add further 15% (total 40% reduction)

For units achieving Home Star 8, a further 30% (total 70% reduction)

For units/developments achieving net-zero energy and with initiatives to reduce private transport congestion, (less car parks, provision for car sharing, bike infrastructure, ebikes), would achieve a complete 100 per cent reduction.

We envisage a fully-sustainable village could be negative with regard to DCs.

A time limit of, say, 10 years could be placed on these incentives to encourage the City's rebuild.

Commercial buildings are not our focus in this proposal. However, similar incentives could be established for commercial buildings within the City.

Reduced levies may encourage people to return to the City. This would result in greater revenue streams for the Council.

We attach a copy of the documentation of a *Certified Green Star Project*. This commercial project resulted in a greater than 65 per cent reduction in DCs due to a third-party certified reduced demand on the Council's (Far North District) infrastructure.

This case study demonstrates DCs savings that comfortably paid for the Green Star documentation (this being a commercial project) and NZGBC's rating while allowing the client to confidently invest in sustainable, green technologies and practices.

Summary

We need to find solutions that support inner-city, sustainable development that are well received by the Council, Developers and the Christchurch Public as a future and replicable solution for the City.

We recommend that development contributions for residential developments within the four avenues of the City be substantially reduced or eliminated for developments which meet agreed standards.

Furthermore, *The Viva Project* and *Jasmax* strongly recommend the *Breathe Organisers* adopt this approach for the competition and the concept then be applied to future City developments.

Reference 17

6. Art, Culture and Design should be integral to city development – *provide incentivised Design/Art/Technological/Business Enterprise hubs & business incubation units where designers, artists and entrepreneurs can work and interact. *Bring art and design to the people – on the street, in public places/parks/within buildings *Every large new build (esp any public builds) should have a Per Cent for art/design scheme included in the budget *New galleries (design & art) with quality shows including international should be encouraged and developed.

7. Christchurch should be a jumping off point for all travel in NZ – clear information and easy public transport links to tramps – affordable bus and particularly train links throughout New Zealand essential.

Other – Developer oriented concerns

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

It is tailored for developers and offers little for people who may want to live in the inner city

Reference 2

It removes the say of residents and puts everything, with reduced restrictions, in the hands of developers and CCC. It would be a very sad day most likely to leading the the destruction of the character and diversity that Christchurch has

Reference 3

Don't give the power to the developers. They are concerned with profit, not with a liveable city.

Reference 4

This seems very developer-focused and too severely limits the opportunity to require good design and energy efficiency standards. Past events have shown that we need regulation, however irritating it may be - regulation administered with flexibility where necessary but still regulation.

Reference 5

It is unclear what the purpose of the plan is if not to favour developers.

Reference 6

Really disappointed with the almost total focus on developers, the failure to acknowledge the work the CCC has done in setting up the design standards and the stupidity in thinking that developers will build higher quality without checks and balances. This is completely out of touch with current residents thinking in regards to diversity and equality. It will not bring neighbourhoods together, rather it is divisive and removes rights for people to be heard. When you're living in high density you need to think very carefully about how it all fits together, poor design will lead to unlivable and dysfunctional neighbourhoods and decrease the unique and special character of areas. We will end up with a homogenous and ugly city not a vibrant, thoughtful considered one.

Reference 7

Medium density residential developments near the centre of Christchurch are a really good idea. But many of the ideas proposed will result in terrible developments. Reading between the lines this seems like a desperate attempt to attract developers to build. But these relaxations of the rules will lead to very low quality buildings and outdoor spaces. A very low quality legacy

Reference 8

. It gives all the power to big corporations/developers who have money as a priority not people.

Reference 9

Just be careful not to allow developers to build whatever they like.

Reference 10

The rights of developers must not be held higher than the rights of other citizens of the city, including existing property holders.

Reference 11

Approving "A Liveable City" will kill Central Christchurch, not revitalise it, as developers will build the most they can on a site to get the maximum return. The result will be rows of high-rise apartment buildings like central Auckland. No thanks.

Reference 12

This is the third review since 2011 and residents are getting tired of being ignored as the plans are made more and more developer-friendly. Existing residents matter too, we have put a big investment into our houses.

Reference 13

As an inner city resident of 6 years I am passionate about my city and love living in a wonderful inner city community. It is important that the plans and rules put in place now for the rebuild and to bring in more residents encourage beautiful, well planned, exciting and interesting houses built to be around for many many years. I am not convinced this plan does this. I think the plan has been proposed for the benefit of developers at the expense of the existing and future residents.

Reference 14

There are some things I agree with and some I don't. The proposal is for a developer led housing solution with little design or environmental standards, and no right of objection from neighbours. Most Developers are concerned with making money and not with the public good, that's what the council and government is for.

Reference 15

"the market" hasn't yet delivered a range of dwellings, and it's concerning this seems to be supported by developers trying to make the most cash by allowing more space to be built on in a denser way. All planning theory seems to be out the window, it's absent in the LCP rules which focus on benefits to developers. As a prospective home owner I'd be put off from investing my life savings in such an unregulated environment.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 16

The CCDU/Government draft residential chapter of the "recovery plan" is simply a developers' charter to proceed as they like in filling the central city with their version of housing, with no constraints and no consideration of the quality, amenity and "high aesthetic values", this latter a quotation attached to the CCDU/Government preamble to the draft residential chapter of the "recovery plan

2.4 The CCDU/Government plan everywhere makes reference to "the market deciding" but once the building is done then there will be no opportunity for potential residents be they owners or renters to make any choices apart from take it or leave it.

2.5 In addition in almost every section dealing with the amenity and social aspects of the buildings it seeks to have erected, the plan includes a variation of a catch-all clause that will let every developer ignore the few rules that exist – e.g. *necessary to enable more efficient, cost effective and/or practical* [considerations].

Reference 17

As we said at the outset, this is no plan to rebuild residential central Christchurch but a developers' charter to create what mayhem they like.

Reference 18

Giving a lot of power to the developer rather than existing businesses and residents.

Other – Specific

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

The comment in the draft page 6 blue box should have a bullet point including accessible for everyone.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 2

If the Minister is minded to proceed with the changes to the District Plan as proposed in the July draft, the following technical amendments would be necessary or require clarification

Page 20 – 1st box amending Policies 11.4.8 and 11.4.9 by including reference to the 'Central City Living Zone', is that just the addition of the words 'Central City Living Zone' in the policy heading?

2nd box, adding objectives, should say insert new objectives 11.9 and 11.10 and renumbering will be required, as there is already objective 11.9-11.11.

Page 21 2nd box, Amend the rules and assessment matters in 4.0-4.4 and 14.2. 14.2 should actually be 15.2 of Volume 3, Part 2.

3rd box, what clause number do you want this to come before/after?

- Deleting planning map 39G will require consequential amendments eg: reference to the map can be found: V3 P2 4.2.3, 4.2.7, 4.4.3.

- Will Central City Residential Zone be CCR Zone?

- It would be helpful if CCDU could provide all the clauses showing amendments for boxes (e.g. page 29 2nd box, amending rules and assessment matters in V3, Parts 7,9,10-14.) That's a lot of amendments and without knowing what clauses, and having to do a word search and then having to work out if it relates to Central City only, will take longer. For absolute clarity of intentions it will be essential that the consequential changes are worked through as the author must have a list of where in these parts the changes are and what is to be amended.

Reference 3

2. In the various Consultations by the Christchurch City Council and CCDU input that led to the release of "A Living City"- the intention was to produce Plan Changes for Residential Living in the whole Central City. The proposed changes and emphasis in the images and text highlight the need to "turbo-charge" central city development of high density living by developers. The document has many changes that remove the current residents' input in the planning process as recognised by the current Christchurch City Council (CCC) City Plan and the spirit of the RMA. A reasonable person would conclude that the "A Living City" document is there to solely promote high density development and directly and deliberately reduce the influence and rights of the existing central city residents!

Change Required:

The proposed changes be redrafted so that the CCDU at least recognises “Traditional central city living” residents who have rights under the existing CCC City Plan and their proposed changes submitted to CCDU. The proposed changes should reflect the needs of ALL residents and their communities.

Reference 4

Peterborough Village Inc. has previously supported the combination of densified re- development and high amenity. Thus Village interests support the aspirations outlined at pages 4 - 15, as these focus on a liveable city with high quality residential as well as mixed use residential development. However the high quality cannot be achieved through the City Plan changes proposed. The proposed changes target Peterborough Village Inc. speedy processing and not quality outcomes. The proposed methods also remove the urban design advisors and local interests from assisting in achieving the quality and suitability of adjoining new developments. Yet local experience has demonstrated the value of these contributions. The proposed methods are a serious threat to assurance for both developers and locals that a high amenity outcome would be achieved.

Reference 5

Earthworks and accidental discovery Oppose:

The development standards fail to address the issue of the protection of wahi taonga and wahi tapu during earthworks.

Our reasons are: Any activity that involves ground disturbance or earthworks has the potential to uncover wahi tapu and wahi taonga. An accidental discovery protocol on its own is insufficient to protect Ngāi Tahu Manawhenua cultural values and ensure Tikanga is followed.

Decision sought: ADD new standard

The incorporation cultural monitors and use of cultural monitors on all sites of significance to Ngāi Tahu manawhenua. Documentation, recording and correct Tikanga to be followed in relation to any sites where a likelihood of discovery of items of significance to Ngāi Tahu Manawhenua is possible. In addition compliance with the Historic Places Act and the requirement for an archaeological authority. Any accidental discovery of wahi taonga and kōiwi must be carried out in accordance with Appendix 3 of the Mahaanui IMP Appendix 3; Accidental Discovery Protocol.

Other – Full Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Push the proposed changes through asap!

Other – General Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

I support the concept as published.

Reference 2

Good Start, get more creative, consult proper capable architects and urban designers, go further, never be complacent, take the planning where it is and treat it as the starting point. This the opportunity to embrace design and not just control design with limitations. Really good Design will make CHC, it has to be designed in any case so embrace it and encourage it, inspire don't constrict.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 3

Generally- its great that the rules have been simplified, it was pretty confusing before & the difference between L4a, L4b & L4c were pretty tenuous.

Reference 4

Our community **supports the overall goals** of the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan., i.e. more inner city residents; higher density; simpler rules, more happy residents, protecting amenity for existing residents, and protecting and creating varied attractive neighbourhoods.

Reference 5

I am a long standing member of the Chester Street Residents Association. As such I support measures which will implement the vision of A Liveable City (as that vision is articulated in the first five pages of the Draft Residential Chapter for public comment [the "Draft Chapter"]).

2. That support extends to a acceptance of the objective of increasing the residential population within, or near, the central city--- as currently defined--- to between 12,000 and 24,000 people.

3. In particular there is support for the recognition in the Draft chapter that; People want central city

People want central city neighbourhoods that are intimate, walkable places with distinct character and strong, inclusive communities. They want an authentic urban living experience including being close to cafés, shops and amenities. They want to feel safe and secure, and have access to great schools and good jobs. They want urban environments with high aesthetic value, open space and trees. (emphasis added)

4. In commenting further on the Draft chapter I take my cue from the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act. The Recovery Act emphasizes the recovery of communities

Reference 6

Relationship with the Central City Business and Central City Mixed Use Zones It is encouraging to see that the Living Zones provisions are designed to complement the transport provisions introduced through 'An Accessible City'.

Support: The CDHB supports the 30km speed limit zones through the Central City.

Reference 7

Zoning

12. The proposed creation of a single unified Central City Living Zone is broadly supported as a means of simplifying the array of rules in the City Plan. The City Council's Central City Living Zones review, concluded in February 2013, reached this conclusion in recommending a single Living 4C zone. Furthermore, the current District Plan Review intends to reduce the number of Living Zones city wide.

13. The Living 5 Zone rule changes are broadly in accordance with the Council's resolution of 28 February 2013. These are generally supported. However, it should be noted that the District Plan Review may take the Living 5 Travellers accommodation zone in a different direction – depending on the outcome of the Phase 2 review.

Reference 8

As a group we broadly support the draft as proposed, with the primary goal of achieving an attractive Central City with inner city living playing a key part. We support the goal of 12,000 to 24,000 new residents as being both ambitious and achievable as a start but we wish to voice support for increased density over longer timeframes. Internationally compact central cities with a good mix of residential and commercial tend to be less dependent on fossil fuels.

Reference 9

I am pleased by :

- 1) Limiting non-residential activity. The neighbourhood group I belong to has spent years fighting non-residential intrusion so to have that tightened up is great.
- 2) More inner city residents, like me. This has been an aim of the Council for a long time and will help with livening up the city.

Reference 10

We support the following: a. The overall goals: more inner city residents, higher density, simpler rules, more happy residents, protecting amenity for existing residents, and protecting and creating varied attractive neighbourhoods.

b. Very tight limits on non-residential uses in the new residential zone (Central City Living Zone, CCLZ). This is paragraphs 4a.3.1 and 4a.3.2 on pages 26-27 (A Liveable City). This is very important.

Reference 11

2. We generally SUPPORT the proposal to enhance the Central City by providing increased opportunities for residential living within the Living Zones that surround the Central City. We are however concerned that residential living in the Central City Business Zone and fringe Central City Living Zone will impact on the commercial and hospitality uses in the Central City Business Zone where Victoria Street is located.

Reference 12

There are some very good elements of the plan which we support. Specifically:

1. The overall goals are very good: having more inner city residents, getting higher density housing while maintaining reasonable amenity, simplifying the rules where this does not compromise other aspects, having existing and new residents happy and supportive of the inner city, protecting amenity for existing residents, and protecting and creating varied attractive neighbourhoods. These goals are excellent, and we support them so much that we would like the detailed rules to be consistent with them, which at present they often are not (see below).
2. There are very tight limits on non-residential uses in the new residential zone (Central City Living Zone, CCLZ). This is paragraphs 4a.3.1 and 4a.3.2 on pages 26-27. This is very important and very well done. Keeping non-residential uses out of the CCLZ is essential and this proposal does that better than the old L4 zones did.
3. Simpler definition of maximum height (to the top of the highest point) is more logical than current "X m plus 3.5 m for a sloping roof" definition.

Reference 13

In broad terms IConIC supports the proposals set out in *A Liveable City* draft plan. The objectives of the introductory section are desirable and we support the aspiration to increase the population of the inner city residential areas. However we believe that a number of the tools set out in the draft District Plan Provisions will not achieve the stated objectives and could well frustrate their realisation. If this occurs, this will impact on the wider outcome of Recovery.

Reference 14

1. I am a property investor.
2. The broad intent of the draft Christchurch Central Recovery Plan – A Liveable City (CCRP) document is laudable and would encourage me to continue to invest in the general Christchurch Central City area.
3. For example, quotes from the CCRP that are encouraging include:
 - 3.1. *Successful cities need attractive central city neighbourhoods with diverse communities to support business growth and development, and bring life to the city centre.*
 - 3.2. **Traditional central city living** - *Neighbourhoods with intimate character and established communities*
 - 3.3. *Catering for diverse communities*

Reference 15

4. Consequently I support the objectives to:
 - 4.1. Increase the number of inner city residents, protecting amenities for existing residents, simpler rules, creating and protecting diverse communities, limits on non-residential uses in the Central City Living Zone (CCLZ), height restrictions.

Reference 16

SUPPORT:

3. The overall goals: more inner city residents, higher density, simpler rules, more happy residents, protecting amenity for existing residents, and protecting and creating varied attractive neighbourhoods.
4. Very tight limits on non-residential uses in the new residential zone (Central City Living Zone, CCLZ). This is paragraphs 4a.3.1 and 4a.3.2 on pages 26-27. This is very important and very well done.
5. Simpler definition of maximum height (to the top of the highest point) is more logical than current “X m plus 3.5 m for a sloping roof” definition.

Other – Disagree, general

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

no

Reference 2

I'm widely opposed to the draft.

Reference 3

I strongly oppose a large number of provisions in this draft plan. I was very excited by the initial CCDU blueprint plan, but believe this new plan will be a turn in the wrong direction for Christchurch.

Reference 4

Is short sighted and does not take full account of the outcome in the future.

Reference 5

no

Reference 6

CERA needs to get out now and leave all decisions to local authorities. CERA has slowed the rebuild and pushed out smaller local developers with their restrictions in the inner city. CERA has not listened to what the majority of chch residents want.

Reference 7

Some good ideas. However some very BAD ideas - bad enough that they should be removed forthwith from the plan.

Reference 8

No

Reference 9

This does not promote a Liveable City.

Reference 10

I think CERA/Brownlee and their 100-Day Master plan is a travesty that has blighted the city and set us on a regrettable path. This current proposal is just another piece in this dictatorial plan. / / I would prefer none of this was happening and that City Council was allowed to decide what happened in OUR city!

Reference 11

This document simply makes for an Unlivable City.

Reference 12

I am a very angry inner city resident!

Reference 13

No

Comments received via email and post**Reference 14**

I understand that this has been thought to reduce the amount of work and cut the time to give the consent, but I am really worried about the impact of the new density plan will have on the existing buildings and on the normal social urban development. Creating high density, dormitory areas with no interaction of services, shopping areas, parking, public buses, schools, sport facilities, medical centres, is a urban old concept which does not work. It would seem a 'short sighted' concept. Urban areas need to have all services planned and in place before being developed. That includes water and .canalization capabilities, and most important plenty of parking space.and most important small or medium size supermarkets and medical centres. This promote 'living locally' and also would attract older people and young families.

Reference 15

The people will be encouraged to live in high density building if this translates in 'cheap living' at the moment this does not happen, because of the requirements of high fees Body Corp.and City rates and the lack of cheap energy to be able to heat the flats in winter. Because winters are very cold and damp in Christchurch, countries like Germany etc. have made provision to save energy and white water to their urban developments. The size of the balconies.....is also very small, they would only have a aesthetic impact, but not a functional living space. Having a space to hung to dry laundry is a thought for young families. Therefore is better not to have them at all. But once, again having to dry clothes mechanically, has a high cost.

Reference 16

We wish to comment on the proposals set out in the document "A Liveable City He taone e whai wahi ai te whanau"

In general terms we are opposed to the amendments proposed and especially the setting aside of the requirements for full consultation in neighbourhoods.

Reference 17

Nowhere does this plan suggest that the welfare and quality of life of the people who would live in the inner city should have a high priority as the plans allow dense, extremely tall buildings, minimal space and light, with no possibility of appropriate car and transport access

2.6 It even seeks to limit the options for services and retail that inner city residents will need, in favour a few current "high-end" and specialist retailers.

2.7 It is clear that the whole of the plan is about total deregulation of the housing and development sectors within Central Christchurch, perhaps as a model for future deregulation on a national basis.

In this regard the CCDU/Government is currently being assisted by the decision of the appointed commissioner in charge of the Regulations and Consenting section of the City Council to allow and encourage the building of many unconsented, uninspected, unregulated projects in the Central City including two major hospital buildings in which hundreds of people will be forced to work and use services with only the honesty and oversight of "engineers" and "architects" to rely on for safe standards.

[We all know how well that works.]

Reference 18

P R Knight Ltd, oppose the draft provisions introduced in the document "A Liveable City", subject to the relief sought below.

Reference 19

Overall we see these amendments to existing rules as unnecessary, indeed a backward step that will impede rather than facilitate the aspirations expressed.

Reference 20

I think the new Liveable city Plan is unfair to residents & counter productive.

To have no real residential living [small businesses allowed etc.],No suitable height restrictions ,Little easy parking & more,- This plan treats existing residents as expendable.

Reference 21

The initial statement in the introduction to the "Statutory direction to amend the City Plan" says;

The Recovery Plan recognises that the existing Living Zones in the Christchurch City Plan result in an unduly and unnecessarily complex planning environment.

We don't believe this to be the case. There are some complexities which are unnecessary but they are few (outlined below) and can be tweaked without resorting to such large scale changes as those proposed.

In addition, when dealing with Council over the years the process has been painless and helpful. If there are issues we raise them early with Council and get their feedback. We then engage cooperatively with them which is appreciated and leads to easy and positive outcomes. This approach also leads to shorter timeframes and less risk around that associated cost.

Reference 22

The primary objective is stated as:

"... to balance:

- *the need for flexibility in the way that a range of housing types can be designed and built in the inner city, with*
- *the need to ensure the outcome (specifically the amenity) of such developments is sufficiently certain for current residents and to ensure that potential residents feel confident about moving into the area."*

We strongly believe that the proposed changes will in fact work heavily against the second point. Certainty for current residents is stripped away. This transfers directly across to future residents who will see the same issues and uncertainty and have their confidence in central city living knocked. **Retaining the confidence of the residents, current and future, is key to propelling central city living in Christchurch.**

Reference 23

Whilst simplification is supported, the proposed changes are considered unhelpful to vibrant redevelopment of the area. Various proposed changes, particularly those addressed below, are considered contrary to the espoused primary objective of balancing flexibility for developers with certainty of amenity for current and potential residents. The objective is supported, but the proposed means are crude, short-sighted and not respectful of the quality city redevelopment sought.

Reference 24

Village interests, including those making substantial redevelopment investments in the area, are alarmed at the proposed changes in that they will likely encourage low cost, low quality high density re-development that will devalue the neighbourhood from that which many are working toward. Interests do not support that assessment should be focussed on enabling "more efficient, cost-effective and or practical use of the site". We ask that in every instance this be balanced with an assessment matter seeking high quality design respectful of the context.

Outdoor Living Space

Outdoor Living Space – Flexibility needed

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Adequate is a general term and changes from person to person, and situation to situation. Public space should be considered.

Reference 2

People should be allowed to have courtyards if they choose to do so and rules can't be too restrictive.

Reference 3

Yes, the minimums must apply but should be able to be applied flexibly.

Reference 4

I agree that shared space is a critical component in the central city for all potential residents and with the proposal for greater flexibility.

Outdoor Living Space –Private space

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Private space for inner city accommodation is important.

Reference 2

We like having our own private outdoor yard where we can have a garden, eat meals outside, enjoy the outdoors without going out in public. Also if we had kids, they could play outside unsupervised while we were doing other things like cooking meals etc, rather than play on the drive or street or be taken to a park.

Reference 3

I live in the City. I have a private outdoor courtyard so that I can keep happy spoodles. I have a high, solid block fence so that Murky and Dash don't bark at whatever might be going on OUT THERE. They and I need that private space. / I can hang sheets on the line and do the gardening without looking presentable. If the courtyard were open to the traffic none of that living would happen.

Reference 4

Any further restrictions on individual open space per unit should be avoided

Reference 5

Private space is essential for all homes. Increase the private space

Reference 6

Need to ensure there is adequate private and shared space to ensure the inner city is attractive to live in.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 7

4a.2.4 Outdoor Living Space:

(ii) Private outdoor living space shall have a minimum dimension of 4m when provided at ground level and a minimum of 1.5m when provided by a balcony.

It is considered by some the 1.5m balcony dimension is too small

Reference 8

The size of the balconies.....is also very small, they would only have a aesthetic impact, but not a functional living space. Having a space to hung to dry laundry is a thought for young families. Therefore is better not to have them at all. But once, again having to dry clothes mechanically, has a high cost.

Reference 9

Outdoor living space (Volume 3, Part 2,	Generic rule for all L3, 4A, 4B and 4C – 30m ²	Changed to min 24m ² or min 12m ²	Outdoor Living Space 4a.2.4	The 24m ² provision is in accordance with the analysis undertaken by the CCC in its Central City	1. The Council supports the reduction of minimum m ²
---	---	---	-----------------------------	---	--

4.2.11)	outdoor living space requirement, or 16m ² if combined with communal areas.	private if combined with communal areas for the new Central City L4C area.	24m ² . dimension retained but the 12m ² minimum private area reduced to 8m ² .	Living Zones review. It should be supported. In regard to the reduction in the minimum private area the CCC assessment is that 12m ² is the minimum practicable area and that this should be retained.	dimension from 30 to 24. 2. The Council strongly opposes the minimum outdoor private area from 12m ² to 8m ² .
---------	--	--	--	--	--

Reference 10

Outdoor living space (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.2.11)	Generic rule for all L3, 4A, 4B and 4C – 30m ² outdoor living space requirement, or 16m ² if combined with communal areas.	Changed to min 24m ² or min 12m ² private if combined with communal areas for the new Central City L4C area.	Outdoor Living Space 4a.2.4 24m ² . dimension retained but the 12m ² minimum private area reduced to 8m ² .	The 24m ² provision is in accordance with the analysis undertaken by the CCC in its Central City Living Zones review. It should be supported. In regard to the reduction in the minimum private area the CCC assessment is that 12m ² is the minimum practicable area and that this should be retained.	1. The Council supports the reduction of minimum m ² dimension from 30 to 24. 2. The Council strongly opposes the minimum outdoor private area from 12m ² to 8m ² .
---	---	---	---	--	---

Outdoor Living Space – Proposal is unclear

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

I think the proposed provision needs to be defined more clearly in terms of 'increasing flexibility' before it is change. How about some concrete examples of what you mean?

Reference 2

This says nothing about how this will increase design standards - very wishy washy and sounds like bending rules to suit developers, again.

Reference 3

What would the detail of this? I have to say no to this without more detail

Outdoor Living Space – Suggestions

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Private space for inner city accommodation is important. While apartment - style living in the inner central core is likely to occur, each development needs to have access to, at a minimum a common courtyard space, that can accommodate comfortably at least 50% of the residents so that residents can socialise and develop their community in a healthy manner.

Reference 2

the big difference with what is proposed in chch is that cost will limit who in the end comes to live in the central city- so cf to elsewhere where open space occurs within an existing central city, here we are asking people to come into a central city which is to be built- and will continue to be built around them. so it needs to be asked of those who are serious potential residents- what outdoor living space will you require that will ensure you stay. overseas outdoor space is mitigated by access to a vibrant street life. without vibrant street life the outdoor space will have to be larger

Reference 3

but I oppose balcony living areas that overlook existing properties.

Reference 4

I think the proposed provision needs to be defined more clearly in terms of 'increasing flexibility' before it is change. How about some concrete examples of what you mean?

Reference 5

As mentioned earlier, if sections are long and thin, insist on development which is stepped rather than the long skinny "sausage" ones we have at present. Then the units upstairs could have roof gardens and patios and look towards the street. Tiny little balconies are not sufficient for a modern world class city. / / Outdoor space needs to be without a lot of shade; otherwise it is wasted space. Certain flats in No 35 Ely Street are dark and damp. Not acceptable.

Reference 6

changes should be negotiated with the affected parties.

Reference 7

yes, but ONLY if they're decided via urban design panel.

Reference 8

Would like to know what the minimum standards would be. I think they are appropriate to comfortable living at the moment. Perhaps would be nice to amend ideas around communal outdoor space?

Reference 9

As per previous comments - what incentives are there to include accessibility for all within the designs?

Reference 10

This should only be applicable to areas that do not have close access to public green spaces.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 11

In the past I've argued to get rid of minimum unit sizes, keeping the outdoor living space at minimum 3m rather than 4m, reducing internal boundary setback from 1.8m to 1m but im too tired of making submissions I'm going to roll over on these.

Reference 12

This provision definitely needs a rethink. Suggest more could be left to the market providing a site coverage rule is introduced.

Outdoor Living Space –Shared space

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Shared space tends to be no ones space so no one takes ownership, thus generally it isn't used and isn't taken care of.

Reference 2

"Shared open space" does not often work well and can become a seldom used, scruffy-looking, unattractive space.

Reference 3

and decrease the shared space as there are usually maintenance problems with shared space as no-one in the block wants to look after it.

Reference 4

/ Communal, privately managed space in urban environments are almost always under-maintained, underused, and a waste of space. Often they degenerate into eyesores or dangerous spaces. / / It would be better to delete the provision for communal private spaces. I think urban outdoor spaces are best served by public parks.

Reference 5

Shared spaces must be ensured but they must be fit for purpose i.e. not just parking areas but places where people can actually gather and children can play.

Reference 6

Need to ensure there is adequate private and shared space to ensure the inner city is attractive to live in.

Reference 7

It is important that shared public space is welcoming and used by all inner city residents no matter their socio-economic level.

Reference 8

make the shared space a community garden

Reference 9

I agree that shared space is a critical component in the central city for all potential residents and with the proposal for greater flexibility.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 10

Although this is a simplification of an existing rule it is still quite complicated. The assessment matters list necessary considerations when designing outdoor living space, but of course a proposal is only assessed if it doesn't comply with the rules. Without the UDA there is little control over the quality and useability of communal space.

Communal space could be located where it adversely impacts on neighbouring properties.

Outdoor Living Space – Specific

Comments received via email and post

Reference 1

Recommendation: that, for clarity the words “At least” be added to 4a.2.4(v) to read “ At least 50% of the outdoor living space required...”

Reference 2

- 1) The outdoor living space rule 4a.2.4 works well for townhouse typologies. The removal of plot ratio controls and a blanket height limit of 14m suggests that the typical anticipated typology is apartment blocks. If you have 3 or 4 storey apartments, and each unit is expected to have large balconies, then it is inherently impossible to locate 50% at ground level and still provide complying amounts of balconies to upper level units. It is therefore recommended that either the rule package differentiates between 2 storey townhouses and multi-level apartments (preferred outcome), or the 24m/ unit and 50% at ground level requirement is reduced. Otherwise the anticipated housing typology (multi-level apartments) inherently can't comply with the rule package.

Outdoor Living Space – Full support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Ok

Reference 2

Agree.

Reference 3

Agree

Reference 4

Outdoor living space is definitely necessary for more humane living conditions but I oppose balcony living areas that overlook existing properties.

Reference 5

agree

Reference 6

Agree

Reference 7

agree

Reference 8

Yes agree. Maximise outdoor living provision as much as possible.

Reference 9

I agree that it's important to retain these minimum standards, but I am glad to see more flexibility.

Reference 10

I agree with the aims of this proposal.

Reference 11

Agree with the private living space provisions (8m2 balconies etc),

Reference 12

Yes

Reference 13

This seems sensible. Flexibility to give designs room to innovate is important.

Reference 14

ok

Reference 15

Yep, there should be plenty of public space too, so the proposed provision should be okay

Reference 16

I support this. Having outdoor space is important and good landscaping.

Reference 17

I support this provision.

Reference 18

May be ok but must be well designed to a high standard.

Reference 19

agree

Reference 20

Beacon Pathway supports the reduction of minimum outdoor living space as a way of encouraging design flexibility and enabling better use of shared open space.

Reference 21

Agree

Reference 22

agree with this

Reference 23

Yes.

Comments received via email and post**Reference 24**

4a.2.4 Outdoor Living Space A Dutch study (De Vries & Verheji, 2003) of over 10,000 people found that the greener an urban area, the better the perceived general health which impacts on their actual well-being.

Support: the decision to increase the minimum amount of outdoor living space from 20m2 to 24m2.

Reference 25

Support (The resource consent application assessment): The inclusion of the provision for “the extent to which a reduction in outdoor living space will result in retention of mature on-site vegetation, or adversely affect spaciousness of the surrounding areas.”

Outdoor Living Space – General Support

Comments received via email and post

Reference 1

Historic Places Canterbury supports the aim of increasing flexibility of design while ensuring there is adequate outdoor living space. We consider that it is reasonable to take into account communal space when calculating the minimum outdoor space to be provided. We believe a minimum of 8 square metres for the private outdoor living space is generally acceptable provided there is some control to ensure that it is a useable space. We assume this is the intent behind the requirement to have a minimum dimension but it is not clear whether the provisions will achieve this. However, the provision does not seem to make allowance for apartment style buildings with units above ground level such as the St Mary's apartments which are illustrated in the consultation document. This sort of development would presumably be non-complying. There seems a likelihood that the rule could lead to a lack of variety in dwelling types.

Reference 2

Outdoor living space (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.2.11)	Generic rule for all L3, 4A, 4B and 4C – 30m ² outdoor living space requirement, or 16m ² if combined with communal areas.	Changed to min 24m ² or min 12m ² private if combined with communal areas for the new Central City L4C area.	Outdoor Living Space 4a.2.4 24m ² . dimension retained but the 12m ² minimum private area reduced to 8m ² .	The 24m ² provision is in accordance with the analysis undertaken by the CCC in its Central City Living Zones review. It should be supported. In regard to the reduction in the minimum private area the CCC assessment is that 12m ² is the minimum practicable area and that this should be retained.	1. The Council supports the reduction of minimum m ² dimension from 30 to 24. 2. The Council strongly opposes the minimum outdoor private area from 12m ² to 8m ² .
---	---	--	---	--	---

Outdoor Living Space – Disagree

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

The theory is barely adequate but the actual provisions including the trading off of outdoor space for indoor space is appalling. / Current council decisions seem to say that having a tiny room with bench seats around 2 walls plus a big screen TV is adequate provision of indoor space to compensate for the lack of outdoor space.

Reference 2

Oppose. There should be a good minimum outdoor area per unit.

Reference 3

Set requirements of minimum outdoor space need to be protected.

Reference 4

disagree with the communal space requirements effectively forced by clauses 4a.2.4 a and 4a.2.4 b.v. /

Reference 5

What would the detail of this? I have to say no to this without more detail

Reference 6

I reject the proposal. / I support the existing standards and changes should be negotiated with the affected parties.

Reference 7

I support the existing provision

Reference 8

The proposed provision is old fashioned. All leading international designers recommend cultivation of public space. This is what creates places of interaction and a vibrant inner city. Keep the existing provision.

Reference 9

Keep minimum standards and don't change them to give people less space.

Reference 10

The minimums are already pretty small; don't make them smaller.

Reference 11

The minimum standard must not be compromised - if flexibility of design means some get pocket handkerchiefs while others more than is necessary then it may adversely affect how the shared space is utilised & perceived.

Reference 12

Have you seen some of the proposals? Living overseas has alerted me to the fact there is always one person who spoils it for the rest of occupants in dense housing arrangements e.g with noise. Have been involved in noise issues overseas e.g. Where neighbours can be heard thru walls, through the ceiling in multi storey buildings or where there isn't private space crime abounds eg stealing other residents washing etc.

Comments received via email and post**Reference 13****4a.2.4 OUTDOOR LIVING SPACE****1. (a) A minimum of 24m² of outdoor living space shall be provided on site for each residential unit;**

The current rule so 20sqm, this is more than adequate for outdoor living, I see no good reason for increasing it to 24sqm. There is also the additional protection of the minimum 4m width. An extra 4sqm doesn't sound like much but it can make a big difference to the number of units in a development, likely a developer will need to put in a certain number of units to make a project stack up, so increasing the outdoor space may have the unforeseen consequence of reducing the size and comfort of the units. 20sqm is still 4m x 5m wide, that's fine for a little apartment or townhouse. If developers want more than can always add it.

Reference 14

(v) 50% of the outdoor living space required across the entire site shall be provided at ground level.

This is not always possible. Some benefits of having the outdoor living spaces at an elevated height are better sun access and privacy in a more dense living environment. Reconsideration of this rule will allow for more innovative design solutions to be developed such as more generous balcony options at elevated floor levels in lieu of a ground floor living space requirement for this zone.

Reference 15

Rule 4a.2.4(v) (outdoor living space) requires 50% of OLS to be provided at ground level. This requirement is opposed on the basis it is inflexible, impractical for multi-level developments, and will result in inefficient utilisation and development of sites. It is noted that the requirements for 20% site landscaping and ground floor OLS will otherwise provide for an appropriate level of open- space and on-site amenity.

Outdoor Living Space – Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Follow proposed provision with ability to review and refine rules based on feedbacks and evidence. CHC is a unique location and situation, be inventive/creative.

Reference 2

No comment

Reference 3

There needs to be a way to preserve access to outdoor amenity but not compromise medium density housing which is needed.

Reference 4

If you make units too small no one will want to live in them, likewise if you do not ensure that convenient parking is provided.

Reference 5

Ok with retain areas even if design is not so great

Recession Planes and Setbacks

Recession Planes and Setbacks – Suggestions

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

The Queenstown Lakes District Council has provision within the recession plane rules of its plan which allows for a small amount of non-compliance. From memory they permit up to 6 square metres of new building to project through the recession plane. This figure is probably too high if the new recession planes proposed for the Central City Living Zone is the least restrictive of the current L4 recession planes, but even 1 or 1.5 square metres would be a very good idea as this will save CCC policing very minor non-compliances and also save the construction industry a

massive amount of money having to, for instance, make garage eaves tuck under recession planes at internal boundaries (not to mention the ugly parapets with the corner cut off we are used to.) / It would be wise to restrict acceptable small non-compliances to a certain height above ground level (say 5M). I suggest CCC Planners look at what Lakes District has done, as it is very workable and must save them a lot of time not having to sweat the small stuff, without creating negative effects for property owners adjacent to new residential development. This idea could usefully be extended to the other living zones outside the Central City Living Zone. / / /

Reference 2

Set backs should be a minimum of 2m throughout the innercity, no excetions. This is the only way to achieve a consistently attractive street frontage such as exits in Gracefield Ave. Recession planes should not be made more 'liberal', meaning steeper, meaning blocking more sunlight from adjacent residences. Sunshine and a feeling of being 'unrestricted' or not hemmed in are important to inner city dwellers and current recession planes are adequate to ensure this and do not need changing. Casting units in shadow nine months a year greatly affects their liveability and attractiveness to potential buyers.

Reference 3

Disagree; the recession planes should be in the mid to most restrictive not the least. Even current recession planes too foten result in blocking sun and oopen space from neighbours. / 1.8 m is not very much and severely reduces the ability for out door living and enjoyment.

Reference 4

Keep the existing recessionn plane rrequirements. In fact, strengthen them by not allowing garages or any other buidling hard up against a neighbouring property. In SAMS 21 there have been instances of people not able to open their windows because of a neighbouring garage. / Christchurch is one of the coldest cities in NZ and sun is essential ot well-being. Rules should ensure as much sunlight is captured as possible.

Reference 5

Introduce proposed provisions with the condition that these controls will be further developed with flexibility in mind. Consider daylight penetration around buildings, consider development of parametric controls that provide variability of height/separation/setback/shading within a simple algorithm. These are future focused and encourage inventive design solutions and offer more interesting streetscapes.

Reference 6

Side boundary setbacks of 0 for garages is good. / / I prefer to see street boundary setback greater than 2 m. / / As a long time resident of the inner city (14 years) recession planes are very important. I do NOT support using the least requirement. All people need sun and light.

Reference 7

I prefer more restrictive recession planes

Reference 8

The lower variable height limits of the February 2014 draft should be reinstated to recognize existing valuable and high-density inner city neighbourhoods, which are essential to supporting city businesses as the rebuild develops.

Reference 9

i think that all proposals being discretionary via urban design panel would be better than strict rules in this case.

Reference 10

Good idea to be flexible with distance from boundaries. This is restrictive on the long, thin, residential sites. Usually not too much of a concern in the past however, as haven't found resource consent too arduous when designing outside these restrictions with support from the Urban Design Council.

Reference 11

To avoid negative effects on existing high density neighbourhoods with many low (one and two story) cottages, please keep the existing diagram D recession planes in the areas with 11 m height limit (see February 2014 map and my comment on the single 14 m height limit). This still allows higher density, while protecting sunlight for existing neighbours.

Reference 12

I think that the 1.8m setback should be taken out and replaced with 1m as in most other cities, when you have a long narrow site it is really hard to design something which has a good relationship with the road and maintain a private area at the back. That is one reason why we are getting so many developments where one house is put behind another with a long driveway up the side and very little private space.

Reference 13

Flexibility should be key in these rules so that good design prevails

Comments received via email and post

Reference 14

Ive even tried to argue to get rid of recessions planes in certain circumstances but its pointless

Reference 15

Healthy homes are important for people's mental and physical wellbeing. Orientation of buildings to utilise the heating potential of the sun maximises passive heating potential. The World Health Organisation recommend an indoor air temperature of at least 18C; if this can be achieved through design standards that maximise solar potential this reduces active energy consumption, increases the energy efficiency and helps to create

Recommendation: that consideration is given to the development of standards to maximise the sunlight to dwellings so buildings can take advantage of solar gain and improve energy efficiency.

Recession Planes and Setbacks – Neighbour consultation concerns

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

For new development recession planes must favour existing buildings. New buildings must not benefit more than existing from less restriction on recession planes re sunshine/shadows and living space and/or proximity to neighbours.

Reference 2

I think you should do everything you can to safeguard the amenity of existing residential properties - they are the foundation for inner city living! Keep the recession planes and setbacks of the SAMs.

Reference 3

The new proposals also do not allow for neighbours to be consulted.

Reference 4

No where in this document are the rights of current residents being taken into consideration rather the entire focus is on developers. Shameful.

Reference 5

Cera must drop the astounding rule blocking affected residents from commenting on consent applications. The limited grounds to be considered in such applications should be deleted as this favours developers and not the residents. The lower variable height limits of the February 2014 draft should be reinstated to recognise existing valuable and high density inner city neighbourhoods.

Reference 6

any changes negotiated with affected parties.

Reference 7

Neighbouring properties must be respected and not devalued due to denser higher neighbouring new developments.

Reference 8

No changes should be made to recession planes or setbacks which will negatively impact on the neighbours of new developments. The rights of residents currently occupying properties must be respected before the rights of future developments. Neighbours of proposed developments must have the right to be notified and the ability to object to neighbouring developments which would negatively impact on their on properties.

Reference 9

I am happy with what is proposed here with the proviso that neighbours consent should be required if developments fall outside setbacks and recession planes .

Reference 10

With this proposal I again ask you drop the proposed rule blocking affected residents from commenting on consent applications, and also the limited grounds to be considered in such applications should be deleted as this skews the hearing unfairly in favour of developers.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 11

<p>Statement at 4a.1 regarding non notification.</p>	<p>The Council’s approach to notification in the DPR is to make explicit statements on each rule as to the notification requirements. The general rationale being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that ‘public good’ rules (rules that affect the public realm) be non publicly notified. • That rules that affect the amenity of neighbours require written approval or limited notification only. <p>Under this system there will a significant reduction in interpretation debates on notification requirements.</p> <p>Central City Living zones should be consisted with this approach.</p>	<p>The Council opposes non written approval or limited notification requirements for rules 4a.2.3 Building Height. 4a.2.5 Sunlight and outlook for neighbours, 4a.2.7 Separation from neighbours.</p> <p>The notification statement at the end of 4a.1 should be amended so that rules that directly protect the amenity of adjoining neighbours (4a.2.3 Building Height. 4a.2.5 Sunlight and outlook for neighbours, 4a.2.7 Separation from neighbours) require the affected adjoining land owners written approval or limited notification to that</p>
--	--	--

			affected adjoining landowner where that written approval has not been obtained.
--	--	--	---

Recession Planes and Setbacks – Retain existing

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Sunlight and privacy are what everybody wants. Inner-city dwellers are no different to the people of any other suburb. / / I have bought in Park Terrace because of the park view. The existing setback protects that view. I expect that somebody, somewhere, will want it removed. I like it. My dog likes it.

Reference 2

Keep the existing recession planes. Sunlight is the most precious asset of a house and is needed f to keep warm and for quality of living and for growing vegetables and fruit trees in our gardens.

Reference 3

I oppose this proposal. / / The proposal will do nothing to protect and enhance residential amenity for existing residents, especially those in such long-established neighbourhoods as VNA, ICON, Moa, etc. / / I support keeping existing recession plane provisions. The change required would be as follows: top of page 24, change "apply recession plane containment angle diagram E to the Central City Living Zone" to read "apply recession plane containment angle diagram D ..."

Reference 4

Keep the existing recessionn plane rrequirements. In fact, strengthen them by not allowing garages or any other buidling hard up against a neighbouring property. In SAMS 21 there have been instances of people not able to open their windows because of a neighbouring garage. / Christchurch is one of the coldest cities in NZ and sun is essential ot well-being. Rules should ensure as much sunlight is captured as possible.

Reference 5

Oppose. The existing recession planes should be retained. We don't want even closer buildings.

Reference 6

Do not agree with this. Keep it the same

Reference 7

I think you should do everything you can to safeguard the amenity of existing residential properties - they are the foundation for inner city living! Keep the recession planes and setbacks of the SAMs.

Reference 8

leave as they are or have one which is at the most restrictive not the least restrictive of the recession planes. This would look after existing residents

Reference 9

The existing provisions for recession planes should remain as they allow for the character of local neighbourhoods to be retained. The new proposals also do not allow for neighbours to be consulted.

Reference 10

Stay with the existing provision. What is being proposed will have the effect of reducing sunlight and privacy - and hence the quality of living in the city centre

Reference 11

Keep existing provision, overly specific provision will be difficult to work with for designers etc

Reference 12

I reject the proposal. / The existing provisions should stand and any changes negotiated with affected parties.

Reference 13

Existing recession planes must be kept. Neighbouring properties must be respected and not devalued due to denser higher neighbouring new developments.

Reference 14

I support the existing provision

Reference 15

I think we need to keep the existing provision.

Reference 16

I think keeping restrictive recession planes is important. People need light warmth and space. Houses need to utilise natural resources such as the sun and need privacy and space

Reference 17

Keep existing recession planes and setbacks.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 18

3. Keep existing Recession planes.

At present, the CERA proposal changes all the central city zones to diagram E from the current diagram D, which makes the recession planes a lot steeper.

ALPA wants diagram D retained for both the Central City Living and the Living 5 zone (in our area). This would have a major impact in preserving residential amenity for existing residents. At present very few buildings in the L4 and L5 zones even approach the current height and recession plane limits so there is plenty of scope for higher density even with an 11 metre height and Diagram D recession planes.

The current building developments in the Avon Loop (i.e. on the Commerce Club site; and the Squash Club site) are an example where higher density of residents has been planned for, with a scale of development that fits with the existing residential scale. These two storey buildings do not approach the proposed current height and recession plane limits – and yet there is a higher density of residents.

Lower recession planes should be kept for the whole Central City Living Zone and the Living 5 zone.

Reference 19

Retain existing Recession Planes.

The Draft chapter proposes that all Recession Planes should be in accordance with current Diagramme E.

It is advocated that all Recession Planes be in accordance with current Diagramme D.

Reference 20

Similarly, recession planes should be retained at their previous values.

Reference 21

We do not like this rule and think the previous recession plane angles should remain.

Reference 22

Keep existing Recession planes.

The CERA proposal changes all the central city zones to diagram E from the current diagram D, which makes the recession planes a lot steeper. The VNA argues for keeping diagram D. The lower recession planes could be kept for the whole Central City Living Zone, or only for the areas with the lower 11 m height limits (assuming our submission below on heights is accepted). The arguments in favour of keeping diagram D are firstly that this helps a lot with preserving residential amenity for existing residents. Secondly, the existing slopes are already pretty steep, and very few buildings in the L4 zones even approach the current height and recession plane limits so there is plenty of scope for higher density even under 11 m height and Diagram D recession planes.

Reference 23

The CERA proposal changes all the central city zones to diagram E from the current diagram D, which makes the recession planes a lot steeper. For example on a southern boundary, the old rules kept buildings under 42.5 degrees slope, where the new rules increase that to 50 degrees. The VNA argues for keeping diagram D. The lower recession planes could be kept for the whole Central City Living Zone, or only for the areas with the lower 11 m height limits (assuming our submission below on heights is accepted). The arguments in favour of keeping diagram D are firstly that this helps a lot with preserving residential amenity for existing residents. Secondly, the existing slopes are already pretty steep, and very few current buildings in the L4 zones even approach the current (lower) height and recession plane limits so there is plenty of scope for higher density even under 11 m height and Diagram D recession planes.

Just to emphasize how high the density can be under existing rules (height and recession planes), take an example from the corner of Beveridge St and Montreal St where over the first 2000 square metres on the south side of Beveridge St, being an area equivalent to two half-acre sections, there are 12 dwellings dating from 1875 through 2005. These are a mixture of old cottages, villas, new standalone houses and new multi-unit flats. That total works out at one dwelling per 167 square metres, or 60 dwellings per hectare, which is a high density. Crucially, none is higher than 2 stories and all are lower than the existing (diagram D) recession planes.

To prove that this is not an exception in the area, the entire block bounded by Beveridge, Durham, Conference and Montreal Streets is about 17,400 square metres and currently includes 64 separate households, only 26 of which are in multi-unit blocks, the other 38 are standalone houses. This is an average of 270 square metres per household, and 37 households per hectare, which is already quite high density. Yet most households have some garden, and 52/64 have a garage. Again this is achieved while still well under the existing height and recession plane limits, so redevelopment can increase those densities further, even if the heights and recession planes are kept unchanged.

Finally we note that having some areas in the central city for this kind of lower height, smaller “cottage” housing as currently seen in the VNA area offers an alternative to apartment living which can therefore attract additional inner city residents on top of those prepared to live in apartments. Thus, having two types of CCLZ areas can better facilitate the rebuild than a single one-size-fits-all approach.

Change required: top of page 24, change “apply recession plane containment angle diagram E to the Central City Living Zone” to read “apply recession plane containment angle diagram D...”.

Reference 24

It is important to retain existing recession planes (i.e. retain recession plane containment angle D). I have observed that good tenants do not want to live in dwellings that are overshadowed by intrusive buildings or structures.

Reference 25

The CERA proposal changes all the central city zones to diagram E from the current diagram D, which makes the recession planes a lot steeper. I support keeping diagram D. The lower recession planes could be kept for the whole Central City Living Zone, or only for the areas with the lower 11 m height limits (assuming our submission below on heights is accepted). The arguments in favour of keeping diagram D are firstly that this helps a lot with preserving residential amenity for existing residents.

Secondly, the existing slopes are already pretty steep, and very few buildings in the L4 zones even approach the current height and recession plane limits so there is plenty of scope for higher density even under 11 m height and Diagram D recession planes.

Change required: top of page 24, change "apply recession plane containment angle diagram E to the Central City Living Zone" to read "apply recession plane containment angle diagram D...".

Recession Planes and Setbacks – Recession Plane comments

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Relaxing requirements such as recession planes, at the same time that design standards requirements, are being done away with does not make sense to me. / / I was pleased to see that the special characteristics of Gracefield Ave and Park Tce are being recognised. Hopefully, the provisions applied to areas such as this will be strictly enforced. /

Reference 2

While the CSHWP generally supports simplification of the recession plane standards, it is concerned that the standards adopted must ensure that all parts of buildings developed have good daylight access.

Reference 3

This is too simplistic. Steeper recession planes should result in less stand alone developments which could be good. But the downside again is that developers can abuse this rule and do huge buildings. This could lead to huge inconsistency

Reference 4

I oppose the recession plane proposals.

Reference 5

The proposed Recession plane increases the coverage of "shadow" on neighbouring properties. Together with the increase in building heights, this effect will be exacerbated, / / My reading of the regulations suggest that the "containment angle in diagram E" is more intrusive upon neighbours than others, and that whilst it might be least restrictive for new developers, it is most intrusive on neighbours affected by such developments.

Reference 6

The recession planes already cause some problems. A one type fixes all will create a monster that will benefit the big developers and neutralise the ability of the individual home owner to have any input.

Reference 7

The recession plane and shading requirements that affect your neighbours are one of the few aspects of our planning regime that aren't complete BS, as they protect the property rights of the neighbours. Taking away their sun will devalue their property.

Reference 8

Recession planes should be such that neighbours are not shaded. I would be very slow to buy anything in the city if someone could come along and block out the sun.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 9

The recession plane regulations are in our view as current residents, more significant than building heights. (see existing L4C)

Reference 10

We understand that the recession plane angles are to be increased, or steepened. We have been unable to locate the new angles due to time pressure. This comment is made on the assumption that the angles are to be increased, or steepened.

We do not like this rule and think the previous recession plane angles should remain.

The reason is that this is one of the most important rules for protecting sunlight and outlook for neighbours.

Reference 11

The recession planes as prescribed in Diagram E.

This should be replaced with Diagram D as for the current L4C zone. (Clause 5.2.3) The reduction in accessible sunlight, in diagram E, is not acceptable for good living standards.

Recession Planes and Setbacks – Setback Comments

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Too general medium density in certain areas will not require 2m setback.

Reference 2

Two metres is a very tiny setback. It's almost no setback at all. It will rob the city of its spacious feel. Medium density does not have to mean "cramped" in New Zealand. That is what it will feel like. The areas reserved for the 4.5 metre setback are disgracefully minimal.

Reference 3

The range of setbacks determine the diversity of the inner city suburbs. and should remain. Simplifying them by just providing one provides little benefit other than administration.

Reference 4

the main problem with a strict setback rule is that all buildings end up having the same setback and a streetscape can become monotonous. It would be better to consider the area between building and street as a semi public/semi private transition space. Setbacks also depend on orientation. It would be better to state what a setback has to achieve between two properties and between public and private environs and assess the design proposals on how they achieve the overall aim instead of relying on a set distance. (one doesn't fit all !!)

Comments received via email and post

Reference 5

3. Building setbacks from the street: all the illustrations of the "liveable city" in this document show housing either on the street frontage or within 2m of it. It is therefore perverse to require a minimum 4.5m or greater setback throughout the zone. The amount of setback, if any, from the street should be determined in relation to the building's specific location.

Recession Planes and Setbacks – Disagree will impact on sun and privacy

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

We like sunlight getting in to our house and yard and not having a tall building almost at the boundary of our property blocking it out as well as peering directly into our windows.

Reference 2

This is inadequate, both for between neighbouring properties but also as a means of ensuring the people living in these new residential AREAS HAVE ANY QUALITY OF LIFE, ACCESS TO ADEQUATE LIGHT AND SUN AND ARE PROTECTED FROM THE NOISE, INTRUSION VISUALLY AND physically of neighbours. / If you had lived in multi-storeyed complexes you would understand

Reference 3

Shaded,cheap and crowded.

Reference 4

Sunlight and privacy are what everybody wants. Inner-city dwellers are no different to the people of any other suburb. / / I have bought in Park Terrace because of the park view. The existing setback protects that view. I expect that somebody, somewhere, will want it removed. I like it. My dog likes it.

Reference 5

My understanding of the map is that even in existing neighbourhood, where dwellings are largely still standing, the less restrictive recession planes (along with the greater height proposal) means that significantly taller buildings with flatter roofs can be built alongside one or two storey dwellings. This means that an existing house or series of houses can suddenly lose its sun and sense of privacy, two very important aspects of 'amenity', especially in densely populated areas of small sections. This is a very different situation from an area (such as much of the central core) that currently is empty and can be designed with the proposed parameters in mind. / / However, all of this requires good urban planning. The 'market' itself does not necessarily join the dots and ensure that all of the parameters of urban planning are taken into account. Developers tend to look at their own single project, not how one impacts on another.

Reference 6

Daylight access to buildings is an important aspect of achieving liveable and also energy efficient buildings. Recent research done on daylight access in the CBD of Canterbury looked at the post earthquake developments and found the lack of daylight access was having a very significant impact on total energy use in the building as well as the overall amenity of the streetscape.

Reference 7

I oppose the recession plane proposals. "Blue sky amenity" is an established feature in many existing residential areas with the Living City Zone. Changes in height restrictions within the zone are going to allow a lot less light and sun to track around houses and bathe them with sun.

Reference 8

This concerns me. We Kiwis value our privacy. I'm considering living in the central city within the next few years but I don't want to be looking into my neighbour's home! Keep it as is!!

Reference 9

People need light warmth and space. Houses need to utilise natural resources such as the sun and need privacy and space.

Reference 10

Daylight access to buildings is an important aspect of achieving liveable and also energy efficient buildings. Recent research done on daylight access in the Christchurch CBD looked at the recent developments and found the lack of daylight access was having a very significant impact on total energy use in the building. While the Beacon generally supports simplification of the recession plane standards, it is concerned that the standards adopted must ensure that all parts of buildings developed have good daylight access.

Reference 11

The recession plane and shading requirements that affect your neighbours are one of the few aspects of our planning regime that aren't complete BS, as they protect the property rights of the neighbours. Taking away their sun will devalue their property.

Reference 12

Recession planes should be such that neighbours are not shaded. I would be very slow to buy anything in the city if someone could come along and block out the sun.

Reference 13

I do not wish to live in a shadow.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 14

I would like to make a comment on the proposed plan for the Central City Living Zone. I live in the Avon Loop so feel my comments are relevant.

I am concerned that the Development Standards (4a.2) for the Central City Living Zone may be abused as it will nearly always be more 'cost effective' or 'practical ' to encroach on boundaries and recession planes. It is only these standards that protect our amenity value as neighbours.

Our rights to consent to these infringements has been taken away.

I can appreciate that CERA is keen to attract more residents to the central city, but PLEASE don't jeopardise the amenity value of those residents who have been living here, prior to, and since the earthquakes.

I can understand an element of 'give and take' regarding odd shaped sections or to protect mature trees, but please don't allow the existing houses to be over-shadowed by bulk. Without sun, life is miserable!

Reference 15

So, my position is that I am generally against high impact building in proximity of existing low building, therefore I would implement strict covenants to new developments, to allow maximum sun light and space. One and half metre is not enough.

Reference 16

but concerned about the lack of ability to prevent excessive overlooking of neighbours, where lines of large windows could face towards the neighbour at upper levels and at a distance of only 4 metres. Potentially four floors of extensive glazing could face towards neighbouring property, entirely overlooking the garden.

Reference 17

Rule 4a.2.5 – Sunlight and Outlook for Neighbours

We understand that the recession plane angles are to be increased, or steepened. We have been unable to locate the new angles due to time pressure. This comment is made on the assumption that the angles are to be increased, or steepened.

We do not like this rule and think the previous recession plane angles should remain.

The reason is that this is one of the most important rules for protecting sunlight and outlook for neighbours. We lost a potential new resident just two months ago because she felt the current recession plane angles were restrictive. She would be horrified if these were to be increased.

As commented above, this is one of those changes which will backfire. It is essential that the living environments created are comfortable and liveable, and that there is certainty around that environment. This change will again knock the confidence people have in their living environment.

Reference 18

The recession planes as prescribed in Diagram E.

This should be replaced with Diagram D as for the current L4C zone. (Clause 5.2.3) The reduction in accessible sunlight, in diagram E, is not acceptable for good living standards.

Recession Planes and Setbacks – Specific

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

The change required would be as follows: top of page 24, change "apply recession plane containment angle diagram E to the Central City Living Zone" to read "apply recession plane containment angle diagram D ..."

Reference 2

There are other areas like the exceptions above where the set back should be greater than 2 metres. In parts of SAM 30 this would be appropriate. For 90 - 96 Chester St East, a set back of 4.5 metres was required as part of the consents in line with the existing set backs for 86 and 88, 98 and 100. Along this part of Chester Street East, the set back is 4.5 metres or greater. I suggest that a planner takes a walk along here.

Reference 3

I propose that the top of p 24 be changed to read "apply recession plane containment angle diagram D to the CCLZ". / / I support the Setbacks proposals. Setbacks should be maintained and intrusions should be kept to structures below the 2.3 metre height at the boundary.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 4

In regards to the local issues raised above, the group request that **recession planes** should not be increased (made steeper). Thus we request (see p.24) Appendix 1, Volume 3, Part 2, Living - "apply recession plane containment angle **diagram D** (*not E*) to the central city living zone.

Reference 5

rule 4a.2.5 'sunlight and outlook for neighbours' refers to recession planes as shown in Part 2, Appendix 1. This appendix has a number of recession plane 'circles' that specify different angles for different zones, therefore there is ambiguity as to which set of angles applies. The appendix needs to be updated to remove reference to the L4A, B,

and C Zones and to show a single recession plane circle for the proposed central city living zone. If the proposed 14m height limit is retained following feedback, then the most logical circle is 'diagram E' which currently applies to the L4A& B zones over 11m in height.

Reference 6

To ensure adequate amenity, adequate recession planes are important. We do not agree that they be made steeper. Thus we seek that as per Appendix 1, Volume 3, Part 2, Living "apply recession plane containment angle diagram D to the central city living zone", and NOT diagram E.

Reference 7

Change required: top of page 24, change "apply recession plane containment angle diagram E to the Central City Living Zone" to read "apply recession plane containment angle diagram D...".

Reference 8

Change required: top of page 24, change "apply recession plane containment angle diagram E to the Central City Living Zone" to read "apply recession plane containment angle diagram D...".

Recession Planes and Setbacks – Full Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

I support this proposal

Reference 2

agree

Reference 3

agree

Reference 4

I agree.

Reference 5

I agree with internal set backs as a standard and generally 2 metres from the street.

Reference 6

I support the Setbacks proposals. Setbacks should be maintained and intrusions should be kept to structures below the 2.3 metre height at the boundary.

Reference 7

Agree, good idea

Reference 8

Historic Places Canterbury supports the proposed setbacks and recession planes.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 9

4a.2.5. Sunlight and outlook for neighbours Support the use of a single set of recession planes.

Recession Planes and Setbacks – General Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Appears to be workable but the ability to be able to build any structure on a residential boundary should be removed, such as a garage.

Reference 2

While the CSHWP generally supports simplification of the recession plane standards, it is concerned that the standards adopted must ensure that all parts of buildings developed have good daylight access.

Reference 3

Daylight access to buildings is an important aspect of achieving liveable and also energy efficient buildings. Recent research done on daylight access in the Christchurch CBD looked at the recent developments and found the lack of daylight access was having a very significant impact on total energy use in the building. While the Beacon generally supports simplification of the recession plane standards, it is concerned that the standards adopted must ensure that all parts of buildings developed have good daylight access.

Reference 4

I am happy with what is proposed here with the proviso that neighbours consent should be required if developments fall outside setbacks and recession planes .

Reference 5

Agree but want any design for the buildings to be consistent wit good urban design as per earlier question.

Comments recieved via email and post

Reference 6

4a.2.6 Street scene and accessways Generally support the setback provisions, but have a real concern about car parks being located within the setback. The rules would allow say a line of car parks across the front of the site, an aisle and possibly a second row of car parks. Especially likely on south facing sites. This would bring an unattractive element to the street scene and limit interaction between the property and the street.

Reference 7

4a.2.7 Separation from neighbours Agree with retention of long standing boundary setback requirements, but concerned about the lack of ability to prevent excessive overlooking of neighbours, where lines of large windows could face towards the neighbour at upper levels and at a distance of only 4 metres. Potentially four floors of extensive glazing could face towards neighbouring property, entirely overlooking the garden.

Reference 8

Separation from neighbours (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.2.5)	L4C (Avon Loop) – no setback from internal boundary	Normal setback of 1.8m from internal now applies for Central City L4C	Separation from Neighbours 4a.2.7 standardises setback to 1.8m for the entire Central City Living Zone	The setback of 1.8m is in accordance with the analysis undertaken by the CCC in its Central City Living Zones review. It should be supported.	The Council supports in part the intent and dimension in 4a.2.7 and request that part (b) of the rule apply to all
--	---	---	--	---	--

		zone in the Avon Loop area.	<p>Note:</p> <p><i>4a.2.7 (b) Accessory buildings which face the ground floor window of a habitable room on an adjoining site shall be setback a minimum of 1.8m from that neighbouring window for a minimum length of 2m either side of that window.</i></p>	<p>However, whilst the standard at 4a.2.7(b) reflects the existing city plan the district plan review as sent to the Government for comments extends this rule to all buildings in the Residential Medium Density Zone. The rule should be consistent with the CCC position.</p>	buildings.
--	--	-----------------------------	---	--	------------

Recession Planes and Setbacks – Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

no opinion

Reference 2

No comment

Reference 3

This would look after existing residents

Reference 4

Variation is the key to an interesting city - most of these changes are really quite shortsighted and will not result in designs that are special, unique, inviting or liveable.

Reference 5

no comment

Recession Planes and Setbacks – Other concerns

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

I think a touch of flexibility in the interpretation is required so that a sensible design can be made to work if the noncompliance is minor. Some logical thinking needs to be exercised. Often I have had the situation where staff have agreed with me on projects but the damn rules get in the way of what is a good design, where a small compromise would keep the integrity of a design with minimal impact. There are dozens of designs that are hashed together resulting in illogical buildings just because they are dictated to by the damn rules.

Reference 2

Agree with this provided it is accompanied by an urban design assessment. For example, account needs to be taken of placement of windows and balconies to ensure privacy between new development and neighbours.

Reference 3

So long as these provisions are not too restrictive and allow a diverse array of dwellings (including possibly homes relocated from residential red zones) as to prevent inner city living having a subdivision "sameness" to it.

Reference 4

Appears to be workable but the ability to be able to build any structure on a residential boundary should be removed, such as a garage.

Reference 5

This is too broad and doesn't allow for individual circumstances. It sounds good in theory but really allows developers to design and set their own criteria, and to be able to hide behind the new provisions while doing so.

Reference 6

rationalise equals remove restrictions for the benefit only of developers. I am totally opposed to this mad idea.

Reference 7

As per previous comments on ensuring safety and visibility for pedestrians how will this be managed?

Comments received via email and post

Reference 8

I am concerned that the Development Standards (4a.2) for the Central City Living Zone may be abused as it will nearly always be more 'cost effective' or 'practical ' to encroach on boundaries and recession planes.

Residential site density

Residential site density – Concern about developer control

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

On the surface this may be ok but by removing the other controls proposed it again puts the developers in control.

Reference 2

There would appear to be an ulterior motive that isn't being provided such as potentially allowing developers to build very high density housing without potentially the facilities to make this liveable (such as schools, shops, car parking etc)

Reference 3

and puts it in the hands of corporations that are out to make money and don't have a vested interest in the area.

Reference 4

The greed of developers should not be permitted to turn ChCh into high density slums.

Reference 5

density is needed but we do not want tallrise ugly buildings, where developer's interests are protected over everyone elses.

Reference 6

/ Keep maximum density, otherwise developers will simply push more for their money irrespective of green space and privacy and sun

Reference 7

/ "the market" hasn't yet delivered a range of dwellings, and it's concerning this seems to be supported by developers trying to make the most cash by allowing more space to be built on in a denser way. All planning theory seems to be out the window, it's absent in the LCP rules which focus on benefits to developers. As a prospective home owner I'd be put off from investing my life savings in such an unregulated environment. /

Residential site density – Concern about resulting quality, slums etc**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

A maximum density of development needs to be retained to ensure that over development of properties does not occur. Other requirements will not provide for clear guidance on this requirement. Without a maximum density requirement, over development is more likely.

Reference 2

I believe there is a need for a site coverage rule as a safeguard to ensure that there is sufficient balance between buildings and outdoor space to ensure the residential areas are not overdeveloped and there is space for greenery and particularly tree planting and for stormwater drainage.

Reference 3

We like our neighbourhood and don't want it ghettoised with high density housing that is just used as temporary housing for people as it has been poorly thought out (Salisbury Park Apartments are an example, set too close together, small rooms, little or no outdoor space, high turn over in residents, dark & dinghy, "cell block" like layout). Our place has reasonable sized rooms, a private outdoors area, garage and off street parking and is mostly long-term residents/ owner occupiers.

Reference 4

Cramming to many people into a smaller area has the potential to create slums in the future and will be unattractive for some people.

Reference 5

Removing this could unnecessarily create very dense pockets which are out of character with the city at large.

Reference 6

Oppose. Site density controls are vital to healthy living. We don't want Auckland box apartments.

Reference 7

Agree flexibility is needed but community and an attractive city is still far more important than squeezing in as many people as you can into a space. I believe this should still have controls to ensure a suitable outcome.

Reference 8

This is crowding people onto as small a space as possible with all the social problems that creates - under the guise of creating affordable living and maximum use of land. these are still able to be created within set guidelines.

Reference 9

The greed of developers should not be permitted to turn ChCh into high density slums.

Reference 10

density is needed but we do not want tallrise ugly buildings, where developer's interests are protected over everyone elses.

Reference 11

/ Keep maximum density, otherwise developers will simply push more for their money irrespective of green space and privacy and sun

Reference 12

removing it will just create slums.

Reference 13

I object to this. The danger of the proposal is that unit sizes may shrink. Let's think of people's living standards and wellbeing. We don't want people living like battery hens in tiny spaces like those shoeboxes that went up in Auckland.

Reference 14

Im concerned the changes will facilitate the construction of really tall, cheap, ugly, small apartments, which is about the opposite of what is needed for a sustainable christchurch.

Residential site density – Minimum density**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

If anything, make a provision for a Minimum density in residential development (like between 3 and 4 storeys high, which will give a solid density on a people scale).

Reference 2

what about achieving a minimum density requirement to make sure inner city living densities are achieved

Reference 3

i agree with this, but only on the basis that all designs meet a minimum quality threshold, because when done poorly this has in the past (here and elsewhere) resulted in very poor quality, undesirable spaces both public and private. / / ensure urban design panel has involvement for this to work.

Reference 4

Agree. Perhaps consider minimum density!

Residential site density – Neighbour consultation concerns

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

any changes should follow community consultation and due process. /

Reference 2

. It removes the ability of people to have some say in what they want and need in their neighbourhood and puts it in the hands of corporations that are out to make money and don't have a vested interest in the area.

Reference 3

The LCP doesn't protect existing neighbourhoods or privacy than protecting existing neighbourhoods. The main changes attack the rights of existing residents and homeowners. by specifically blocking neighbours from being consulted, this seems to go against the entire philosophy of the Resource Management Act.

Reference 4

Cera must not block affected residents from commenting on consent applications. Secondly, the limited grounds to be considered in such applications skews hearings unfairly in favour of developers. Finally, the lower variable height limits should be reinstated to recognize existing inner city neighbourhoods, which are essential to supporting city businesses as the rebuild continues.

Residential site density - Quality control in place

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

If setbacks and better recession planes are ENFORCED always then the site coverage limits need not apply.

Reference 2

I think this provision would be fine if there were design quality controls in place. but the removal of these raises problems for other changes like this. Dense housing can work but it needs to be very cleverly and carefully designed. It can be a social and urban disaster if not properly developed.

Reference 3

Good, provided checks & control on the quality of the housing provided are maintained. There need to be minimum space standards to ensure bedrooms, livingrooms, bathrooms etc are suitably large and don't end up being cramped.

Residential site density – Retain provision

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

A maximum density of development needs to be retained to ensure that over development of properties does not occur. Other requirements will not provide for clear guidance on this requirement. Without a maximum density requirement, over development is more likely.

Reference 2

At this time the maximum density should be retained whilst there is still enough potential development to significantly increase the residential living in the inner city. Removing this could unnecessarily create very dense pockets which are out of character with the city at large.

Reference 3

Please retain a site density provision.

Reference 4

Disagree.

Reference 5

Existing inner city residential areas are already very dense by any standard the city choose to apply. These areas worked, are working and will work well again in the future if they are allowed to develop along lines similar to those that existed pre-earthquakes. No further density intensification is necessary.

Reference 6

Disagree; retain current densities and require developers to prove that "the collective application of other requirements..."mean that they will not exceed these maximum densities.

Reference 7

Present maximum density works. With recession planes and heights planned to change, more units will happen. which will cram more people together with likely noise, security and behaviour issues. Let the city evolve organically.

Reference 8

Why remove this provision if all it does is re-enforce the collective application of other requirements? There would appear to be an ulterior motive that isn't being provided such as potentially allowing developers to build very high density housing without potentially the facilities to make this liveable (such as schools, shops, car parking etc)

Reference 9

Leave the same please

Reference 10

No the current density standards are sufficient - watering these down will result in poor quality sardine cans

Reference 11

I reject this proposal. / I support the existing maximum density and any changes should follow community consultation and due process. /

Reference 12

Keep the density provisions status quo.

Reference 13

I support the existing provision

Reference 14

Maintain the existing provision - density is needed but we do not want tallrise ugly buildings, where developer's interests are protected over everyone elses.

Reference 15

/ Keep maximum density,

Reference 16

Maximum density makes sense; removing it will just create slums.

Residential site density – Full Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Agreed

Reference 2

I agree- that seems sensible.

Reference 3

I have not reviewed the other sections, but am in principle very supportive of increased density for inner city living, as it is more responsible environmentally in the long term.

Reference 4

agree

Reference 5

I agree.

Reference 6

I support the aim of this proposal.

Reference 7

Agree. higher density as an attribute in itself is a good thing. The control mechanisms are more valuable for quality of space assessment.

Reference 8

Yep, seems fine

Reference 9

I have no issue with this.

Reference 10

agree

Reference 11

Beacon Pathway supports the proposed amendment.

Reference 12

Agree

Reference 13

Agreed

Comments received via email and post

Reference 14

Residential site density (Volume 3, Part 2, 4.4.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule for L4A • Rule for L4C excluding L4C (Avon Loop) – 1.2 floor ratio • Exception for SAm 25, 26, 27 	Residential site density rules no longer apply in the L4C central city living zone. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exception for SAm 25, 26, 27 deleted 	No residential site density rules.	<p>The residential site density rules are difficult to administer and of questionable value in controlling amenity.</p> <p>The District Plan Review Phase 1 has deleted the controls from the Residential Medium Density Zone (the Living 3 zones and the Living 4 zones outside the Central City).</p>	The Council supports the change.
--	--	--	------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------

Residential site density – General Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Our whole city needs to achieve density I think we should be discouraging single storey development. We need smaller plots and reduced plot ratios to push up the multi storey solutions so our city achieves higher numbers of people per hectare. We need to do this so our population does not end up in transport poverty in the future

Reference 2

Fair enough as long as car parking is increased to match the number of residents and visitors to the site.

Reference 3

The height restriction will also limit density.

Reference 4

Follow proposed provision. Design controls need to respond to market and allow for inventive and interesting design outcomes. Work with Architects.

Reference 5

This is acceptable as long as it is restricted to inner city, within 4 ave developments

Reference 6

I think that the density of a development should enforce itself through good considered design

Reference 7

This is OK as long as the height limits are reduced to 11 m and the recession planes keep diagram D in the existing dense neighbourhoods.

Residential site density – Disagree with rationale

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

No these provisions will not provide sufficient control in all cases.

Reference 2

Density is NOT controlled by existing provisions. / / These other "controls" are easily overcome if a developer wishes to and the new plan lets them claim cost effectiveness as a reason for any change to the "controls" The council will be allowing dense dark residential canyons

Reference 3

Density has many factors other than landscaping, outdoor space, setbacks etc. Has the writer of this proposal ever done planning 101? obviously not. Stupid idea.

Reference 4

If you're changing the other controls then density won't be controlled adequately? / / The LCP doesn't protect existing neighbourhoods or privacy than protecting existing neighbourhoods.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 5

Residential site density. Agree that the height, recession planes and outdoor living space provide some control over density but would prefer to see the retention of a site coverage rule. This could help simplify the outdoor living space rule, is easy to understand and ensures a good balance between built and open space. Problems could arise with the proposed provisions, where communal space is provided indoors.

Residential site density – Suggestions

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

No these provisions will not provide sufficient control in all cases. I believe there is a need for a site coverage rule as a safeguard to ensure that there is sufficient balance between buildings and outdoor space to ensure the residential areas are not overdeveloped and there is space for greenery and particularly tree planting and for stormwater drainage.

Reference 2

The effects of this provision depend on others: will maximum height be increased? Open space requirements decreased? Recession planes increased? Existing inner city residential areas are already very dense by any standard the city choose to apply. These areas worked, are working and will work well again in the future if they are allowed to develop along lines similar to those that existed pre-earthquakes. No further density intensification is necessary. Instead the Council should cease to allow prime residential inner city land to be taken up by non-residential development. For example, about 4000m² at the corner of Salisbury and Colombo Sts was given over to the Salvation Army to establish their regional headquarters. Not only was a large block of housing land lost, but the adjacent neighbourhood will be harmed/compromised by the existence of the Army's activities in the areas. A second example is the application by the Majestic Church to convert 7000m² of L4C land to non-residential use. If allowed, this formerly priceless residential site will be lost. If the Council would preserve and protect current residential land (as in these two examples), then the 'need' for questionable intensification would lessen drastically.

Residential site density – Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

densiuty is realted to accesibility- ie cost to live / low density will be on the whole more expensive

Reference 2

no opinion.

Reference 3

No comment

Reference 4

I do not understand the changes.

Reference 5

Not sure

Reference 6

Again this is where good urban design principles apply. Quite dense inner city developments can be very liveable.

Reference 7

City centres are supposed to be dense. Chch needs to get out of the individual house+lawn format, and offer more intermediate options (apartments, lofts, i.e. properties that require less space).

Residential site density – Other concerns

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Far too simplistic. No

Reference 2

Removal is not practical given the CCC has to supply services. i.e. no limit and the CCC over supplies or under supplies.

Reference 3

green spaces are important in residential developments

Reference 4

Historic Places Canterbury believes that there is a need to control density specifically in some sensitive areas - the areas fronting onto the Arts Centre, Rolleston Ave .

Reference 5

IF YOU ARE THINKING OF LOW INCOME FAMILIES and WORKERS you might have to think the way the rates are calculated for residential high density units and low cost source of energy, of course fast low cost internet, will enable many to work from home.

Travellers accommodation

Travellers accommodation – Specific

Comments received via email and post

Reference 1

3.1. The re-zoning of the Latimer Hotel to Central City Living is opposed. 3.2. P R Knight request that the following properties be rezoned to Living 5:

- 30 Latimer Square and 240 Gloucester Street – Lot 1 DP 338487 and Lot 2 DP 75161.

3.3. A plan indicating the location of the total properties over which Living 5 zoning is sought is attached in Attachment 1.

3.4.

In support of the rezoning, consequent rule changes are required to recognise the introduction of a Latimer Living 5 Zone. The changes requested are set out in Attachment 2. In respect of changes to the rules controlling either site density or percentage site coverage, the percentage site coverage is considered to be the more relevant. The site is constructed to a plot ratio of 1.18 and a requirement to comply with a plot ratio of 0.9 is therefore unnecessarily onerous. A percentage site cover, as applies in some other Living 5 Zones, is more relevant.

3.5. We also request that if there are any minor consequential changes required to other rules or assessment matters etc. to ensure consistency, that these be made.

Reference 2

4. Summary

4.1. P R Knight considers that a Central City Living Zone would not be an appropriate zoning for the Latimer Hotel site. P R Knight seeks that the site be rezoned to Living 5 to better reflect existing and historic activities on the site and provide a more relevant policy and rule regime for the management of hotel activities on the site.

Reference 3

5.1.1 RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITIES AND OTHER ACTIVITIES (EXCEPT TRAVELLERS' ACCOMMODATION) - ALL STANDARDS (LIVING 5 ZONE)

All standards for the above activities shall be those for the zones specified below: • Peterborough

- Montreal • Avon
- Latimer

As for the L4A Central City Living Zone As for the Central City Living Zone As for the L4C Central City Living Zone As for the Central City Living Zone

Reference 4

3.1. The retention of the current Hotel boundaries as Living 5 Zone is supported (see attached proposed Map in Attachment 2, page 37 of 'A Liveable City' document). The rezoning of immediately adjoining sites to Central City Living is opposed.

3.2.

TJK request that the following properties (additional to those already identified in the map in Attachment 2) retain a Living 5 zoning, as is the case under the current City Plan:

• 42 Park Terrace, Lot 1 DP27448 • 1 Kilmore Street, Lot 2 DP 27448 • 3 Kilmore Street, Lot 3 DP 27448 • 5 Kilmore Street, Lot 4 DP 27448 • 7 Kilmore Street, Lot 5 DP 27448 • 9 Kilmore Street, Lot 6 DP 27448 • 17 Kilmore Street, Section 128 TN of Christchurch • 18 Peterborough Street, Section 127 TN of Christchurch.

3.3. A plan indicating the location of the total properties over which Living 5 zoning is sought to be retained is attached in Attachment 3.

3.4. Retention of a Living 5 zoning on these properties will provide the existing TJK land holdings with the flexibility to expand and succeed as necessary in transitioning from old to new while continuing to trade in a viable form. The zoning will be a continuation of what is already present on those sites and will not prevent the ongoing use of those sites for residential purposes should TJK be unable to secure purchase or leases for the land, or should it eventuate that the sites are not in fact required by TJK. Further, in the Living 5 Zone, the rules will default to the Central City Living Zone rules for any activity that is not traveller's accommodation, as is currently the case.

3.5. Fundamentally, the retention of the Living 5 zoning on adjoining sites will provide much-needed flexibility for TJK and The George. It is noted for example that consideration is already being given to expansion of the Hotel activity onto the site at 17 Kilmore Street (proposed to be rezoned to Central City Living), subject to sale and purchase agreement.

3.6. With regard to the specific Living 5 Zone rules, TJK supports the reference to Development Standard 5.2.8 in Rule 5.2. It is not appropriate for neighbouring properties to be involved in commenting on matters of discretion for urban design and external appearance (as a separate consideration to matters such as boundary setbacks and recession planes).

Reference 5

4.1. Ultimately, TJK seeks to ensure that there is sufficient Living 5 Zone land on and adjoining The George Hotel to provide flexibility for succession and possible expansion in the future. The ability to improve the building stock on site and consolidate the Hotel activities is critical to the long term viability of the Hotel and its ongoing contribution to the economic wellbeing of Christchurch.

4.2. TJK therefore supports A Liveable City and the Central City Living Zone provisions, subject to Living 5 zoning being retained over the TJK landholdings and immediately adjoining sites, as per the status quo.

Travellers accommodation – Suggestions

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Their needs to be low end accommodation as well as high end to cater for many different budgets especially as many tourists are squeezed by the high value of the NZ dollar.

Reference 2

No comment except that there is poor affordable traveller accommodation as there is for affordable residential accommodation.

Reference 3

Travellers accommodation should be spread over the city and quality incorporated into the character of areas cf. Melbourne and San Francisco China Town, Union Square, waterfront, river area, city squares etc.

Travellers accommodation – Control impacts

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Interaction with residential is concerning. There MUST be constraints so as not to reduce the quality of living for residents.

Reference 2

Should be notifiable.

Reference 3

I support this idea of splitting into clearer categories - but not sure who's affected here

Reference 4

I oppose the proposal in part. / I support the reduction of the Peterborough site. / I would prefer to have residential architecture on the site immediately west of the existing of the Hotel Montreal building. / I am thrilled to note that the Hotel Montreal site does not extend onto the Montreal/Peterborough corner site (currently occupied by two wooden school rooms) and that that corner is retained as CCLZ.

Reference 5

I don't live in the central city (yet) but I hope you are bring fair to the people who already have homes there.

Reference 6

Ensure that neighbours of the affected areas are consulted and their views are taken into consideration before making this decision.

Reference 7

Cater for christchurch residents first!! The LCP doesn't protect existing neighbourhoods or privacy than protecting existing neighbourhoods. The main changes attack the rights of existing residents and homeowners. by specifically blocking neighbours from being consulted, this seems to go against the entire philosophy of the Resource Management Act.

Reference 8

"the market" hasn't yet delivered a range of dwellings, and it's concerning this seems to be supported by developers trying to make the most cash by allowing more space to be built on in a denser way. All planning theory seems to be out the window, it's absent in the LCP rules which focus on benefits to developers. As a prospective home owner I'd be put off from investing my life savings in such an unregulated environment. /

Reference 9

Cera must not block affected residents from commenting on consent applications. Secondly, the limited grounds to be considered in such applications skews hearings unfairly in favour of developers. Finally, the lower variable height limits should be reinstated to recognize existing inner city neighbourhoods, which are essential to supporting city businesses as the rebuild continues.

Reference 10

Not sure about this. The Peterborough area has its own "characteristics" already and it would be a shame to break it down.

Travellers accommodation – Full support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Agree

Reference 2

agree

Reference 3

agree

Reference 4

okay

Reference 5

ok

Reference 6

I support this proposal.

Reference 7

No concern.

Reference 8

ok

Reference 9

Sounds reasonable.

Reference 10

Agree

Reference 11

This seems reasonable

Comments received via email and post

Reference 12

Zoning

3.1. The retention of the Living 5 (travellers accommodation) zoning of the Holiday Inn on Avon site is supported, as is the proposed application of the Central City Living zone provisions to activities that are not defined as 'travellers accommodation'.

Travellers accommodation – General Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Unless the direct community involved has an issue with this, I have no issues with this

Reference 2

Logical location and proposed provision. Review and refine following implementation.

Reference 3

I oppose the proposal in part. / I support the reduction of the Peterborough site. / I would prefer to have residential architecture on the site immediately west of the existing of the Hotel Montreal building. / I am thrilled to note that the Hotel Montreal site does not extend onto the Montreal/Peterborough corner site (currently occupied by two wooden school rooms) and that that corner is retained as CCLZ.

Reference 4-5

i don't have a problem with this, but i generally think that there should always be discretion allowed, again, urban design panel advice is key, because they're more likely to consider overall impact on neighbourhood than a developer is.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 6

ALPA covers a residential area, with the Avon River being a natural boundary. This has been classified as Central City Living, with a Living 5 zone that includes both residential and commercial. Our local neighbourhood includes a significant number of residential householders, who have been displaced by the earthquakes but will have their homes rebuilt.

Within our area, we have noted that two recent developments that have changed previous commercial activity to residential, i.e. the Commerce Club site (on Kilmore Street) is presently being gutted with two storey apartments being constructed; and the Squash Club rooms (on Bangor Street) where Stonewood Homes are building 22 two-bedroom flats. Already our local neighbourhood committee is planning how to welcome these new residents. This is an example of where there is a higher density, which will result in more inner city residents in our neighbourhood. The scale of development (two storeys) fits with the scale of development within our local neighbourhood. Existing residents, who live in front of these recent developments, have had their amenity protected.

Reference 7

Living 5 zone	Two L5s inside the Central City – Peterborough and Avon Loop.	Peterborough St L5 is now smaller and split into two; one of the balance in the Peterborough block renamed the Montreal St L5. Avon Loop L5 remains. Zone	Zone changes as resolved by CCC. No change to Zone description (it is beyond Minister’s jurisdiction to amend zone descriptions.)	The extent of the L5 zoning is in accordance with the analysis undertaken by the CCC.	1. The Council supports the intent of the boundaries of the new Living 5 Zones as shown on Map 1 of the consultation document.
---------------	---	--	--	---	---

		description amended accordingly.			
--	--	----------------------------------	--	--	--

Reference 8

CN5 and AHL are otherwise supportive as to the application of the Central City Living Zone provisions across the remainder of the Avon Loop.

Reference 9

In respect of the proposed amendments to the Living 5 zone provisions and rules, CN5 and AHL are also generally supportive,

Travellers accommodation – General not support – support existing

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

I support the existing provision

Reference 2

I think perscrptive zoning runs counter to the idea of a city naturally developing and I favour mixed use. So keep existing provision which allows travellers to mix with residents.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 3

Under section 20(3)(b) of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011, Cooper Developments 2013 Limited and Montreal Street 363 Limited provide the following written comments on the draft residential chapter to the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan ('A Liveable City'), publicly notified on 16 July 2014.

The decision to change the zoning of the sites at 363 Montreal Street from Living 5 to Central City Living is objected. The rationale for this decision was that the rezoning reflects the pre-earthquake extent of travellers' accommodation in this area. Although travellers' accommodation activity has not historically occurred at 363 Montreal Street, resource consent has often been approved for hotel complex that extends over this area. Examples include RMA92007765 (approved July 2007) and RMA9201647 (approved June 2010). The approved site plans for these are attached. Further resource consent applications are currently being prepared that include travellers' accommodation on this site, which are intended to be constructed. Therefore the removal of 363 Montreal Street from the Living 5 zone on the rationale that it is not within the pre-earthquake extent of travellers' accommodation activity is refuted.

In addition, the zoning boundary follows the existing subdivision pattern, and does not consider imminent subdivision changes. Subdivision consent for Lot 3 DP 81571 (30 Peterborough Street) was approved on 12 February 2014 by resource consent decision RMA92024156. This was for a three-lot subdivision, with two of the resulting lots being amalgamated with the adjoining lots (therefore being a boundary adjustment). This approved plan is attached. Proposed Lot 2 is to be amalgamated into 363 Montreal Street and proposed Lot 3 is to be amalgamated into 351 Montreal Street. It is considered that the Living 5 – Central City Living zone boundary should follow the subdivision pattern resulting from this approved consent rather than the existing subdivision pattern. Therefore proposed Lot 3 (to be amalgamated with Lot 1 DP 81571 / 351 Montreal Street, which proposed to retain the Living 5 zoning) and proposed Lot 2 (to be amalgamated with Lot 2 DP 81571 / 363

Montreal Street, which is argued above to be incorporated into the new Living 5 zone) should be changed from the proposed Central City Living zone to Living 5.

In conclusion, relief is sought to change the zoning of Lot 2 DP 81571 and Lots 2 and 3 of an approved subdivision of Lot 3 DP 81571 under resource consent decision RMA92024156 from Central City Living to Living 5 on Map 1 of the Planning Maps attached to the Recovery Plan chapter before it is approved

Reference 4

Greater recognition of the non-residential history and status of the Star and Garter site in the zoning provisions is sought, given this site presently has a Living zoning which does not reflect its non-residential history. Extension of the Living 5 (Avon) zone would provide for travellers accommodation activity on the site, consistent with its former use. Moreover, given common ownership of this site and the Holiday Inn on Avon site, a common zoning would provide for comprehensive or complementary development, with development synergies/efficiencies. Such a zoning would still retain an underlying Central City Living zoning to provide a suitable framework for residential or other activities.

3.3. Accordingly, CNS and AHL are opposed to the proposed application of the Central City Living zoning to the Star and Garter site and instead seek extension of the Living 5 (Avon) zone over the site (see Attachment 1).

Reference 5

I do not agree with Travellers accommodation being permitted within the Avon Loop area (bounded by Hurley st, Willow st, and Bangor st).

Travellers accommodation – Oppose commercial use of land

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Disagree. There should be no commercial (including travellers' accommodation) use of land which borders or is in the Avon Loop Red Zone. There is a potential for commercial use to benefit from bordering on this Zone, if it is to become a park. While that potential is possible, I have strong objections to commercial use of the land.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 2

Allowing a hotel (travellers accommodation) in the avon loop area contravenes each one of these objectives. Infact the plan allows the hotel to be of a much larger scale than it was prior to the earthquake (as heights have increased, recession planes relaxed, and set backs from the road reduced). Even if the hotel was restricted to its former pre earthquake size it becomes a far more significant entity within the neighbourhood where red zoning has reduced the area of buildable land.

Prior to the earthquake the hotel covered less than 19% of the land area. After the quake and red zoning of homes the L5 zone covers over 33% of the buildable land area. Any commercial development that occupies over a third of the area will dominate the neighbourhood and will destroy any hope of a residential feel.

The area of the Avon Loop has lost 60% of its residential properties due to Red Zoning. Our community is in desperate need for more residential properties to rebuild our community. We need people to permanently reside in our area to improve our safety, to support our local small businesses (diary,hardresser etc) and to re create a neighbourhood again.

The term "Travellers accommodation" appears to be a soft acceptable name that gives the impression of a low key and inobtrusive accommodation. Prior to the earthquake the travellers accommodation in the Avon Loop was a large

scale commercial Hotel which had extensive car parking, and commercial traffic. They had an industrial central heating unit with an enormous chimney stack that dominated the sky line. Please do not allow such a commercial complex to expand and dominate our environment. If you do I for one am leaving the central city.

Travellers accommodation – Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

No opinion really

Reference 2

I don't know enough about this to comment.

Reference 3

what is the point of splitting this provision? the motivation isn't clear.

Reference 4

No view.

Reference 5

No comment

Reference 6

Not sure

Reference 7

no comment

Reference 8

No

Reference 9

No opinion

Reference 10

Not sure

Reference 11

/ Im concerned the changes will facilitate the construction of really tall, cheap, ugly, small apartments, which is about the opposite of what is needed for a sustainable christchurch.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 12

Under section 20(3)(b) of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011, Cooper Developments 2013 Limited and Montreal Street 363 Limited provide the following written comments on the draft residential chapter to the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan ('A Liveable City'), publicly notified on 16 July 2014.

The decision to change the zoning of the sites at 363 Montreal Street from Living 5 to Central City Living is objected. The rationale for this decision was that the rezoning reflects the pre-earthquake extent of travellers'

accommodation in this area. Although travellers' accommodation activity has not historically occurred at 363 Montreal Street, resource consent has often been approved for hotel complex that extends over this area. Examples include RMA92007765 (approved July 2007) and RMA9201647 (approved June 2010). The approved site plans for these are attached. Further resource consent applications are currently being prepared that include travellers' accommodation on this site, which are intended to be constructed. Therefore the removal of 363 Montreal Street from the Living 5 zone on the rationale that it is not within the pre-earthquake extent of travellers' accommodation activity is refuted.

In addition, the zoning boundary follows the existing subdivision pattern, and does not consider imminent subdivision changes. Subdivision consent for Lot 3 DP 81571 (30 Peterborough Street) was approved on 12 February 2014 by resource consent decision RMA92024156. This was for a three-lot subdivision, with two of the resulting lots being amalgamated with the adjoining lots (therefore being a boundary adjustment). This approved plan is attached. Proposed Lot 2 is to be amalgamated into 363 Montreal Street and proposed Lot 3 is to be amalgamated into 351 Montreal Street. It is considered that the Living 5 – Central City Living zone boundary should follow the subdivision pattern resulting from this approved consent rather than the existing subdivision pattern. Therefore proposed Lot 3 (to be amalgamated with Lot 1 DP 81571 / 351 Montreal Street, which proposed to retain the Living 5 zoning) and proposed Lot 2 (to be amalgamated with Lot 2 DP 81571 / 363 Montreal Street, which is argued above to be incorporated into the new Living 5 zone) should be changed from the proposed Central City Living zone to Living 5.

In conclusion, relief is sought to change the zoning of Lot 2 DP 81571 and Lots 2 and 3 of an approved subdivision of Lot 3 DP 81571 under resource consent decision RMA92024156 from Central City Living to Living 5 on Map 1 of the Planning Maps attached to the Recovery Plan chapter before it is approved.

Reference 13

Rule 5.2.8 (external appearance) now applies to the Living 5 (Avon) zone as a restricted discretionary (rather than controlled) activity and the extent of discretion has been significantly expanded. CN5 and AHL seek that the status quo be retained for the Living 5 (Avon) zone in terms of Rule 5.2.8, or in the alternative, that controlled activity status be maintained (albeit with regard to the wider range of assessment criteria).

- Whilst "A Liveable City" does not propose changes to a number of existing Living 5 rules, the following comments are noted:
- Rules 5.2.9 and 5.2.10 (concerning continuous building length) should no longer apply to the Living 5 (Avon) zone, noting that the continuous building length rules have otherwise been deleted from the Central City Living zone.
- Rules 5.4.4. (access restriction) requires that 'in the Living 5 zone (Avon) there shall be no vehicle access to Hurley Street or Bangor Street'. This rule should be deleted or its activity status revised (particularly in respect of Hurley Street), noting that there are few remaining residential dwellings remaining. Future development in these adjacent streets will predominantly involve 'greenfield/brownfield' development of a fundamentally different character to that which existed at the time this access restriction was introduced. Such development will be fully cognisant of surrounding activities, including the presence of travellers' accommodation activity at the Holiday Inn on Avon site.

3.7. We also request that if there are any minor consequential changes required to other rules or assessment matters etc. to ensure consistency, that these be made.

Urban Design

Urban Design –Consent and right to comment

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Existing residents must retain their say in local development. CCC has shown it's inability in the past to respect the character of the inner city suburbs. This amendment will just enable CCC and developers to destroy the character of the inner city suburbs.

Reference 2

no requirement for potentially affected neighbours agreement is quite simply wrong, one mans economic advantage is often anothers disadvantage and this lack will be counter-productive to the aim of central city residential development /

Reference 3

Opposed consent processes can enhance the product. Additionally this exception is unfair to all who do need to apply.

Reference 4

This article in the Press covers my views very well. / <http://www.stuff.co.nz/the-press/opinion/perspective/10372757/Liveable-City-plan-treats-existing-residents-as-expendable> / It illustrates the devious and dishonest way that CERA is going about changing the plan. / There is no protection for existing residents and property owners rights. / I oppose the changes.

Reference 5

Consent should still be required. My experience as an inner city resident is that developers are always trying to break the rules. This will be even worse if there is no consent process - and it should be a notifiable consent if the planning rules are breached.

Reference 6

I support the existing provision that consent must be applied for and approved by due process (including community/neighbourhood input) before development is undertaken.

Reference 7

Application for consent should never be removed. This is a licence for chaos. Bring back leaky buildings and other problems - with a plan like this.

Reference 8

consent should be required in keeping with the character of areas eg. landscape, water, cultural ethnicity. Diversity is a key element in cities being attractive

Reference 9

Comprehensive developments should always require consent with respect to urban design in order to ensure that street scape, neighborhood aesthetics and neighbors rights are not compromised.

Reference 10

The LCP doesn't protect existing neighbourhoods or privacy than protecting existing neighbourhoods. The main changes attack the rights of existing residents and homeowners. by specifically blocking neighbours from being consulted, this seems to go against the entire philosophy of the Resource Management Act. /

Reference 11

Cera must not block affected residents from commenting on consent applications. Secondly, the limited grounds to be considered in such applications skews hearings unfairly in favour of developers. Finally, the lower variable height limits should be reinstated to recognize existing inner city neighbourhoods, which are essential to supporting city businesses as the rebuild continues.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 12

The removal of notification of applications means that communities will not be involved in the developments in their area. Not only does this mean that property owners/occupiers may not know what is proposed for a neighbouring section, but also that good design and ideas may go unsupported.

I understand that the current restricted discretionary status has not led to delays in processing consents, so do not understand why a change is needed. Further, I understand that the combination of Urban Design Panel and Joint Management Board assessments in the Business Zone is working well and see no reason why it should not be applied to at least some developments in the Living Zone.

Reference 13

The Residents be allowed to make submissions to the Urban Design Panel on specific policy and proposed development before it.

Urban design assessment should be discretionary whenever a developer proposes a non-complying development (unless the notification provisions are changed and neighbouring owners have given written consent). In the case of medium or high density developments (3 or more units) the Council should also have discretion to require oversight by a design panel.

Urban Design – Inconsistencies

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Urban design assessment is well embedded in the major cities across New Zealand. It should also be noted that the Crown employed an array of design professionals to optimise the planning for Anchor Projects. Is the design quality for living environments, particularly multi-unit complexes not equally important? /

Reference 2

Other cities have this, even the central business district has it and the East Frame is likely to.

Reference 3

Auckland and Wellington all have urban design panel requirements and have a thriving inner city attracting people to live there.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 4

Why would CCC/CERA remove the need for qualitative urban design assessments in the Central City Living Zone only yet maintain these controls in the Eastern Frame residential neighbourhood and Breathe demonstration project?

Reference 5

How can you aspire to create the best urban environment in New Zealand when there is no design assessment process for proposed developments?

Reference 6

Other cities throughout New Zealand are strengthening their urban design requirements, not removing them as the proposed changes do.

Reference 7

Years of experience with Resource Planning for the area occupied by the proposed Central City Living Zone showed that to achieve a reasonable level of quality to the urban environment, there, rules such as those set up via Plan Change 53 (CCC City Plan) were necessary. The other main cities in New Zealand have all reached similar conclusions and set rules in place which are aimed at achieving outcomes akin to those which were realistically anticipated to be achieved by Plan Change 53.

I note that Central Government and the Christchurch City Council are signatories to the Urban Design Protocol (2005).

Reference 8

The provisions of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Council Regional Policy Statement – see in particular, Issue 6.1.4. – Amenity and Urban Design (inserted, as I understand it, at the direction of the Minister for Earthquake Recovery) and the related Explanation, are also noted in this context.

I therefore strongly advocate the current Urban Design assessment requirements, based on the Restricted Discretionary approach, be retained.

Reference 9

and appears to be contrary to planning in major cities in New Zealand and around the world.

Reference 10

It is incomprehensible why a city that is rebuilding, and integrating the new and innovative with the old and traditional housing stock should not assess the urban design value of proposals, or indeed use the expert Urban Design Panel that currently operates successfully in other zones of the city.

I note too that both the City Council and Central government are signatories to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol, through which they commit to good urban design, yet are removing all provisions for assessing and promoting that good design through the City Plan.

Reference 11

We note also that removal of the urban design provisions of the existing plan is inconsistent with Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Council Regional Policy Statement which was included in the Regional Plan by the direction of the Minister of Earthquake Recovery.

Reference 12

We also note that Auckland, Wellington, Hamilton etc all have similar urban design panel requirements, some of which are currently being strengthened, and even the Christchurch East Frame seems to have quite strong urban design controls. This would make the Central City Living Zone almost unique in New Zealand cities by not having any design controls at all, with neither detailed rules nor a design panel in place.

Finally we also note that dropping the urban design consideration appears to be inconsistent with Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Council Regional Policy Statement which was included in the Regional Plan by the direction of the Minister of Earthquake Recovery. That RPS said: Issue 6.1.4 - Amenity and urban design

Reference 13

It is also important to note that the removal of the urban design standard is inconsistent with Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Council Regional Policy Statement. This, as the authors of the plan change will be aware, forms part of the Regional Plan, a move that was specifically required by the Minister for Earthquake Recovery. This states:

Issue 6.1.4 – Amenity and urban design

While the speed of recovery is important, so too is the quality of the built form. Poorly designed development can adversely affect urban amenity values, rural amenity values, historic heritage, health and safety, integration with community, educational, social and commercial facilities, and overall liveability. These matters are important for retaining population and attracting skilled workers and new business opportunities. They will affect the timing and the success of recovery.

Explanation

Sometimes the desire to rebuild quickly competes with the desire to build well or build back better. Enabling timely and appropriate development during the recovery period in a manner that does not compromise the key values of either existing or future communities is a challenge that must be recognised at Greater Christchurch, city, district and neighbourhood levels. Rebuilding can also impact on issues of significance to Ngāi Tahu, affecting their relationship with ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. In particular, good urban design will contribute to vibrant and renewed centres and help support wider wellbeing objectives such as quality of life, economic vitality and crime reduction.

It therefore seems unlikely that the plan change in its current form will receive the Minister's approval. In the interests of the efficient and timely implementation of the plan change the provision for urban design assessment should be retained in accordance with the CRC guidelines quoted above.

Reference 14

I also note also that removal of the urban design provisions of the existing plan is inconsistent with Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Council Regional Policy Statement which was included in the Regional Plan by the direction of the Minister of Earthquake Recovery.

Urban Design – Retain existing and reinstate

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

An Urban design standard must be retained to ensure that the style and character of the developments in communities flow and work with each other. Urban planning is currently weak overall and needs to be strengthened to ensure community cohesion and character, especially at this present point in history

Reference 2

I strongly support retention of the Urban Design Panel.

Reference 3

I am not an expert in town planning but I am very concerned that removing the existing planning controls as contained in the Christchurch City Plan has the potential to create an urban wasteland. / / This view is reinforced by reading the Press article Liveable City plan treats existing residents as expendable. / / I would strongly recommend that the existing controls remain. /

Reference 4

. We need the urban design panel to stay.

Reference 5

KEEP EXISTING PROVISION!

Reference 6

I reject the proposal. / / I support the existing provision that consent must be applied for and approved by due process (including community/neighbourhood input) before development is undertaken. What sort of city ignores its community.

Reference 7

The Urban Design Standard has to remain to retain the quality of the developments.

Reference 8

I support the existing provision

Reference 9

/ i beg you to retain urban design requirements.

Reference 10

please, please retain urban design standard requirement.

Reference 11

Very important to retain urban design consideration.

Reference 12

The Urban Design Panel should be retained.

Reference 13

The existing provision has to remain as it gives existing owners the right to have their say about the quality or lack of it of a proposed development.

Reference 14

I think there are some benefits to keeping teh urban design assesment... who wants a bunch of cheap ugly buildings?! Sure, it's nice to assume that the 'market' will demand high quality housing... but I'm not convinced of this!

Reference 15

The urban design element should remain.

Comments received via email and post**Reference 16****5. Retain Urban design panel.**

'Attractive', 'high aesthetic value', 'desirable', 'thriving communities', 'influenced by the local context', and 'safe and secure' are great aspirations in the front half of the A Liveable City chapter. However, the current development rules are very light on detail in relation to design features. Dropping the design check without reinstating detailed rules is only implementing half the system. This then leaves the city exposed to the risk of low-quality buildings in the residential living zone. This actually happened under the 1995 City Plan, leading to the Plan Change 53 which set up the urban design process.

The Central City Business Zone and all Blueprint Anchor Projects within the Central City have Urban Design provisions. This needs to be applied to Central City Living, and the Living 5 zone in our area, so that there is not a double standard.

Any development will require a flexible, site-specific approach to design assessment, especially since the Living 5 zone (i.e. the residential and commercial sites) in the Avon Loop is in a 50 year flood plain (as evidenced on 5 March 2014). The interface between the Avon River Precinct Project (one of the Blueprint Anchor Projects within the Central City) and the Living 5 zone and Central City Living needs this flexible, site-specific approach that having an Urban Design Panel would ensure.

The Urban Design Panel already is providing a quick peer review of current applications and is independent from the Council.

Reference 17

Rule 4.2.7 Urban design appearance and amenity - residential and other activities in the current Christchurch City Council District Plan should remain and the Urban Design Panel process strengthened.

Reference 18

E. Retain Urban Design Provisions.

Reference 19

I therefore strongly advocate the current Urban Design assessment requirements, based on the Restricted Discretionary approach, be retained.

Reference 20

1. Reinstate the Urban Design Assessment for the Central City Living Zone. 2. Streamline the assessment matters .

Reference 21

We request that CERA: 1. Reinstate the Urban Design Assessment (UDA)

Reference 22

Re-instatement of an urban design assessment process for the residential inner city.

Reference 23

Retain the urban design rules that currently apply to all buildings.

Reference 24

Reinstate the Urban Design Panel for Traditional City Living and the Frame within the Central City:

2

The Proposed changes remove the Urban Design Panel from having any input into any development. "A Living City" reflects a contradiction and inconsistent application in CCDU's approach to encouraging a higher quality design of the built environment in the proposed Plan Changes. East Frame:"establish a clear planning environment using rules in the District Plan and/or via other methods including contractual arrangements to ensure that high quality townhouses and apartments are enabled". (page 12 A Liveable City)

Reference 25

Change Required:

At minimum, reinstate the relevant sections of the current CCC City Plan (as set up in Plan Change 53).

The Urban Design Panel be reinstated for the whole Central City and taken as a guiding principle for residential development for traditional central city living. Any proposed design should reflect the context of the surrounding houses and the character of the streetscape.

Reference 26

5. Retain Urban design panel.

In previous times, the City Plan had many detailed rules about the appearance of buildings. The current development rules are very light on detail in relation to design features, because they were rewritten in tandem with a requirement that an urban design panel would have some oversight on acceptable outcomes. Dropping the urban design check without reinstating detailed rules is only implementing half the system. It's like a stool with only one leg.

Reference 27

Changes required: reinstate the section "Urban Design Appearance and Amenity" which was in the February 2014 CERA draft of the Liveable City but has been deleted from the July 2014 document. This section gives the Council limited discretion over larger developments (those with three or more units, or single very large dwellings, etc). The Council discretion is limited to considering a list of design features and how the new development relates to the existing environment and neighbouring area, which all seems appropriate and workable.

Reference 28

Urban Design Panel and its mandate is reinstated, strengthened and empowered to ensure global urban design excellence is delivered in our rebuild. The Panel reviews both the built form and the landscape form of a development. (* please see below). This panel includes members of the Christchurch community along with design specialists.

Reference 29

Retain Urban design panel

The current development rules are very light on detail in relation to design features, on the assumption that a design panel will have some check on acceptable outcomes. Dropping the design check without reinstating detailed rules is only implementing half the system. This then leaves the city exposed to the risk of low-quality buildings. This actually happened under the 1995 City Plan, leading to the Plan Change 53 which set up the urban design process.

Reference 30

Changes required: When residential developments meet the given threshold, these must be subject to an urban design panel, as is the case in the business area and inner-city frames. This will be particularly important for retaining the quality and suitability to context of developments, when the SAMs are removed.

Urban Design – Specific

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Change needed: reinstate the section "Urban Design Appearance and Amenity" which was present in the February 2014 CERA draft of The Liveable City but has been deleted from the July 2014 document.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 2

Changes required: reinstate the paragraphs out of the current City Plan (as set up by Plan Change 53).

Reference 3

Peterborough Village thus seek reinstatement of the urban design rule (4.2.7), its restricted discretionary status (for three or more units) and related assessment matters where the Urban Design Panel can provide advice. It would not be appropriate for the government to support high quality design for residential development in the East Frame, and for business development, but not support quality redevelopment outside of The Core. This would be inequitable.

Reference 4

Decision sought: (requested changes shown in red and Italics)

AMEND Objective 11.9 Role of the Central City Living Zone A predominantly residential environment offering a range of residential opportunities,within the central city to support the restoration and enhancement of a environmentally sustainable and vibrant city centre.

ADD additional bullet point under Objective 11.10 g) provide for environmentally sustainable urban design, technologies and infrastructure.

ADD provisions in development standards These new provisions above also need to be reflected and carried through in 4a.2 Development Standards for Central City Living Zone such as standards for water conservation, solar energy, grey water recycling, sustainable stormwater and wastewater treatment systems, alternative heating etc.

ADD new policy under Objective 11.10 11.10.4 Protect the environment through providing for the sustainable design qualities of the Urban Design Protocol and the Ngāi Tahu Subdivision and Development Guidelines - Mahaanui IMP.

Reference 5

Changes required: reinstate the section "Urban Design Appearance and Amenity" which was in the February 2014 CERA draft of the Liveable City but has been deleted from the July 2014 document. This section gives the Council limited discretion over larger developments (those with three or more units, or single very large dwellings, etc). The Council discretion is limited to considering a list of design features and how the new development relates to the existing environment and neighbouring area, which all seems appropriate and workable.

Urban Design – Suggestions

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

The urban design assessment is slowing raising the bar. While some developers may embrace good design, it is vital that the City Council has the teeth to prevent substandard design. It is counterproductive to remove this assessment as medium density development already has a bad name because of the way it looks. It is only by providing high quality urban design that the stigma will be removed.

Reference 2

Please retain this function of the district plan. It's a way of informing developers of what's aesthetically suitable and appropriate for a neighbourhood.

Reference 3

I can't believe CCDU would take such a huge risk as removing any requirements related to urban design standards. If anything, I'd expect the standards to be STRENGTHENED to ensure that we end up with best that can be managed given the obvious financial constraints.

Reference 4

Increase and the powers of Urban Design experts in Council and the community (Urban Design Panel).

Reference 5

Instead, the Council should adopt stricter urban design requirements and THEN ENFORCE THEM!

Reference 6

Implement a sensible, comprehensive general set of guidelines, enforce them, and then developers will know the 'rules of the game' and will be able to plan accordingly.

Reference 7

make sure that all inner city developments go in front of the urban design panel to have a reasonable control of the outcomes if they tick that box don't worry about any breaches to the rules unless they are safety or affect the direct neighbours. / The ideal scenario would be no rules only a max height and make every proposal within the four avenues fully discretionary - so proposals are assessed on their own merit by the independent urban design panel. Most developers know their job and can create good buildings, if they don't, the urban design panel should assist. /

Reference 8

We need more not less urban design and largely common sense such as size of windows, north-facing living areas, garaging on south side, and stepped dwellings so as every unit gets aspect and outdoor space.

Reference 9

All proposals should be assessed by properly qualified and capable panel of Architects/Urban Design professionals assessing form and streetscape. Appropriate guidelines for assessment are required. All other provisions are well defined within the planning documents.

Reference 10

I agree that 3 units is too small a development to require the cost and time of urban design consultation. / / I think that any development of 6 or more units or where the street frontage is more than 20 metres should necessitate Urban design consultation to minimise the number of eyesores.

Reference 11

Or other methods could at least be proposed like design quality ratings which gives the market signals on the design qualities of the buildings. / / I strongly object to this new provision.

Reference 12

A panel should have to vet designs and be keen to encourage variety of design. /

Reference 13

Market will always go for quick return on investment that rarely equates to quality or attractiveness. This is our opportunity to actually build an attractive city - seize it and rather than dropping planning include a visual consent process and standard to ensure we actually end up with an attractive city that people do want to live in.

Reference 14

I believe there MUST be a good urban design protocol in place - similar to the tool box for sustainability that was discussed by council back in 2005.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 15

The function of Urban Design Panels should be enlarged, not done away with, and should cover all new development.

Reference 16

All of the other major urban centres in New Zealand including Auckland, Wellington, Hamilton, Tauranga, Queenstown, Dunedin and Christchurch (until now), have adopted or are in the process of adopting, and in many instances strengthening, some form of design controls or regulation for medium density residential developments to support better design outcomes.

Reference 17

Urban Design Panel process strengthened.

Reference 18

A preferable course of action would be to reinstate the UDA and remove or simplify more of the rules. The UDA encourages pre-application discussion with CCC and ensures that issues, opportunities and constraints are identified early in the design process. The assessment matters for the UDA are currently unwieldy and need to be more clearly expressed.

Reference 19

Requirements for discretionary Urban Design Assessment of proposals involving 3 or more residential units, using a simplified set of 6 assessment criteria that will be consistent with those intended for application city wide in the District Plan Review.

Reference 20

The Residents be allowed to make submissions to the Urban Design Panel on specific policy and proposed development before it.

Urban design assessment should be discretionary whenever a developer proposes a non-complying development (unless the notification provisions are changed and neighbouring owners have given written consent). In the case of medium or high density developments (3 or more units) the Council should also have discretion to require oversight by a design panel

Reference 21

With regard to developments adjacent to or opposite listed heritage buildings, urban design assessment should be a mandatory requirement, since, as noted above, the setting of heritage buildings is essential to their appreciation and value.

Reference 22

In the case of non-complying developments, urban design assessments should also be discretionary even when affected neighbours have given their consent. (It is not always evident to laypeople what the implications of a development might be unless they seek professional guidance and this provision will help to ensure that affected party approval is not unwittingly given.)

Urban Design – Full Support**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

YES

Reference 2

great

Reference 3

I agree that this should be removed to help speed along the development of the city centre.

Reference 4

ok

Reference 5

Good idea

Urban Design – General Support

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

I agree- encourage the likeliness of development in the city for living will be great. However, what I don't want to happen with the new central city is cheap medium density buildings being erected, only to house beneficiaries. I don't want the living zone to become the slums in 10-20 years time, like the Robert Taylor Project in Chicago, where it was originally meant to house a mix of people, which turned into a centre for gang and homicide activity.
/ / Pretty much get the design bang on and don't let housing NZ too close! /

Reference 2

I think there should be some guidelines, but this is better than the existing provision

Reference 3

Agree, but it could be helpful to have a material's theme for the central city residential eg timber detailing, energy start ratings/ green buildings etc.

Urban Design – Comments disagreeing with removal or advocating retaining

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

An Urban design standard must be retained to ensure that the style and character of the developments in communities flow and work with each other. Urban planning is currently weak overall and needs to be strengthened to ensure community cohesion and character, especially at this present point in history

Reference 2

GET REAL

Reference 3

This is a serious backward step.

Reference 4

By removing this provision Christchurch will be totally out of step with the other major cities around the country and indeed the world who see the value of good urban design.

Reference 5

Do not remove the current urban design assessment requirement.

Reference 6

I disagree with this - there need to be design controls, in particular urban design controls, to avoid designs of the lowest common denominator. The urban design Panel has lifted the standard !! It is an independent group of professionals that can give very good design advice. i have been in front of the panel and found their comments and suggestions very helpful.

Reference 7

I disagree strongly with the proposed removal of this provision. Urban design is really important.

Reference 8

I oppose the proposed provision. / The oversight by urban designers under the urban design standard will ensure that the "market" acts responsibly with regard to urban design principles, rather than building to the lowest common denominator marketable.

Reference 9

I strongly support retention of the Urban Design Panel.

Reference 10

I am not an expert in town planning but I am very concerned that removing the existing planning controls as contained in the Christchurch City Plan has the potential to create an urban wasteland. / / This view is reinforced by reading the Press article Liveable City plan treats existing residents as expendable. / / I would strongly recommend that the existing controls remain. /

Reference 11

Very bad idea.

Reference 12

Do not remove

Reference 13

. We need the urban design panel to stay.

Reference 14

This is a terrible idea if it is not replaced with another mechanism to assure quality control. There are urban design panels and similar ideas around the world because they work and are important. They do not need to be coercive or restriction and can often be used as a way to get high quality design advice for projects if the opportunity is given early enough in a project. / /

Reference 15

KEEP EXISTING PROVISION!

Reference 16

The CSHWP strongly opposes the removal of the urban design standard. It was introduced because of the prevalence in the market of building houses with very poor urban design and quality of amenity.

Reference 17

The need for an urban design assessment should NOT be removed from the city plan. /

Reference 18

This is a really bad idea. Urban design reviews lead to higher quality. The urban design reviews I've been to have been useful and help to guard against low quality developments. The planning rules need a significant overhaul to ensure higher quality developments

Reference 19

I feel it is absolutely critical that for the long term quality of our city the Urban Design Panel and reinforcement of quality design solutions should be provided and continued. / / Speed and expediency is not the way to create a fantastic city in the long term. / / Quality urban places evolve in the context of robust design debate about quality. / / I do not support this requirement being removed.

Reference 20

I reject the proposal. / / I support the existing provision that consent must be applied for and approved by due process (including community/neighbourhood input) before development is undertaken. What sort of city ignores its community.

Reference 21

Urban design assessments form a vital role for developing our city in an acceptable role. Not having this will facilitate the construction of really tall, cheap, ugly, small apartments, which is about the opposite of what Christchurch residents called for in Share an Idea in 2011.

Reference 22

Do not remove the requirement for urban design to be considered. There needs to be some guidance to encourage suitable developments are built.

Reference 23

This is a ridiculous proposition

Reference 24

The Urban Design Standard has to remain to retain the quality of the developments.

Reference 25

BAD idea. These provisions exist for good reason. So that the individual units conform to the man made and natural environment and do not set an adverse precedent.

Reference 26

This provision should not be removed. High quality urban design is incredibly important for Christchurch and it cannot be automatically expected that "the market will provide" as unfortunately history tells us that is not always the case. This consent process is crucial to ensuring Christchurch gets the best possible urban design.

Reference 27

I support the existing provision

Reference 28

consent should be required in keeping with the character of areas eg. landscape, water, cultural ethnicity. Diversity is a key element in cities being attractive

Reference 29

absolutely not. the urban design panel keeps developers 'honest' by asking them appropriate questions and, where necessary, encouraging them to consider their neighbours and the needs of the city as a whole

Reference 30

/ i beg you to retain urban design requirements. as it currently works this is basically free advice to developers, it isn't binding, it encourages them to build 'good neighbours' which is good for everyone, including for their own bottom line. feedback on the panel from developers is currently generally positive.

Reference 31

please, please retain urban design standard requirement. / / we're building for the longterm here, we need QUALITY of public and private realms if we are to have any hope of attracting interesting, young people to our new cbd. while speed of recovery is also important, we must take care not to leave a shoddy legacy of building stock or dubious public spaces - cities who have done this take years to solve such problems, if indeed they ever do.

Reference 32

I think this is a terrible idea. / / I have designed multiple, multi unit apartments in the four aces in the last three years, and the Urban Design Panel have been implicitly useful, not only to us, but to the quality of design in the city.

We found the planning regulations and the Urban Design Panel were at odds with each other, which was pointed out in environment court many times, but if I was to vote to keep one it would be the Urban Design Panel without reservation.

Reference 33

/ The key to residential development in the city is quality of design. And I am absolutely certain this cannot happen without the Urban Design Panel. I am terrified what we will end up with without them.

Reference 34

Beacon Pathway strongly opposes the removal of the urban design standard. These were introduced because of the prevalence in the market of building houses with very poor urban design and quality of amenity, particularly a number of multi-unit development in Christchurch in the 1990s.

Reference 35

Very important to retain urban design consideration. Other cities have this, even the central business district has it and the East Frame is likely to. Plan Change 53 showed that negative outcomes were being experienced with the previous absence of such a panel.

Reference 36

The Urban Design Panel should be retained. I don't believe the market will work in this aspect. The removal of this requirement will increase the risk of low quality buildings/developments. Auckland and Wellington all have urban design panel requirements and have a thriving inner city attracting people to live there.

Reference 37

I totally disagree with this proposal. Comprehensive developments should always require consent with respect to urban design in order to ensure that street scape, neighborhood aesthetics and neighbors rights are not compromised.

Reference 38

I object to this proposal. I see no prospect that removing the urban design standard will increase the attractiveness of the central city - quite the opposite, in fact. Thousands upon thousands of hours of work by urban design professionals and years of community consultation has gone into creating the current standards and it would callous and counterproductive to throw it all out.

Reference 39

The existing provision has to remain as it gives existing owners the right to have their say about the quality or lack of it of a proposed development.

Reference 40

I think there are some benefits to keeping the urban design assessment... who wants a bunch of cheap ugly buildings?! Sure, it's nice to assume that the 'market' will demand high quality housing... but I'm not convinced of this!

Reference 41

The urban design element should remain.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 42

5. Retain Urban design panel.

'Attractive', 'high aesthetic value', 'desirable', 'thriving communities', 'influenced by the local context', and 'safe and secure' are great aspirations in the front half of the A Liveable City chapter. However, the current development rules are very light on detail in relation to design features. Dropping the design check without reinstating detailed rules is only implementing half the system. This then leaves the city exposed to the risk of low-quality buildings in the residential living zone. This actually happened under the 1995 City Plan, leading to the Plan Change 53 which set up the urban design process.

The Central City Business Zone and all Blueprint Anchor Projects within the Central City have Urban Design provisions. This needs to be applied to Central City Living, and the Living 5 zone in our area, so that there is not a double standard.

Any development will require a flexible, site-specific approach to design assessment, especially since the Living 5 zone (i.e. the residential and commercial sites) in the Avon Loop is in a 50 year flood plain (as evidenced on 5 March 2014). The interface between the Avon River Precinct Project (one of the Blueprint Anchor Projects within the Central City) and the Living 5 zone and Central City Living needs this flexible, site-specific approach that having an Urban Design Panel would ensure.

The Urban Design Panel already is providing a quick peer review of current applications and is independent from the Council.

Reference 43

The removal of qualitative urban design assessments for medium density residential developments in the central city living zone is not supported. This change is completely contrary to the aspirational vision for the city centre.

Reference 44

Rule 4.2.7 Urban design appearance and amenity - residential and other activities in the current Christchurch City Council District Plan should remain and the Urban Design Panel process strengthened.

Good urban design based rules and guidelines are fundamental to achieving a good urban design outcome;

In the rebuild of our cities we need a robust urban design process to ensure the city achieves a good built outcome;

The current Urban Design Panel is a good process and has raised the standard of our urban environment since its inception;

Other cities throughout New Zealand are strengthening their urban design requirements, not removing them as the proposed changes do.

Leaving it solely to the developers discretion will not result in Christchurch becoming one of the 'best small cities in the world' or 'an inspiring place to live'.

Reference 45

E. Retain Urban Design Provisions.

Years of experience with Resource Planning for the area occupied by the proposed Central City Living Zone showed that to achieve a reasonable level of quality to the urban environment, there, rules such as those set up via Plan Change 53 (CCC City Plan) were necessary. The other main cities in New Zealand have all reached similar conclusions and set rules in place which are aimed at achieving outcomes akin to those which were realistically anticipated to be achieved by Plan Change 53.

I note that Central Government and the Christchurch City Council are signatories to the Urban Design Protocol (2005).

The provisions of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Council Regional Policy Statement – see in particular, Issue 6.1.4. – Amenity and Urban Design (inserted, as I understand it, at the direction of the Minister for Earthquake Recovery) and the related Explanation, are also noted in this context.

I therefore strongly advocate the current Urban Design assessment requirements, based on the Restricted Discretionary approach, be retained.

Reference 46

Conclusion

The Urban Design Forum laments the extensive loss of the built fabric of Christchurch. While it supports the timely redevelopment of the central area it does not wish to see the heart of the city reinstated in an unsightly, characterless or unsafe manner due to a lack of appreciation of the need to support good urban design through appropriate legislation. We respectfully request that you:

1. Reinstatement of the Urban Design Assessment for the Central City Living Zone.
2. Streamline the assessment matters.
3. Give consideration to a Joint Management Board type process to ensure a quick turnaround and sound outcomes.

Reference 47

Oppose: the removal of urban design standards. Urban design standards would enable city blocks to be developed in a coherent manner, make the city streets more attractive, and encourage more people to live in the inner city. The removal of design standards could potentially result in unhealthy?? urban design and poor amenity values.

Reference 48

We request that CERA: 1. Reinstatement of the Urban Design Assessment (UDA)

Reference 49

The removal of the UDA is definitely a step in the wrong direction and at odds with current thinking.

Reference 50

The removal of any assessment of urban design value from the processing of applications for residential developments is a retrograde step and appears to be contrary to planning in major cities in New Zealand and around the world.

Reference 51

It is incomprehensible why a city that is rebuilding, and integrating the new and innovative with the old and traditional housing stock should not assess the urban design value of proposals, or indeed use the expert Urban Design Panel that currently operates successfully in other zones of the city.

I note too that both the City Council and Central government are signatories to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol, through which they commit to good urban design, yet are removing all provisions for assessing and promoting that good design through the City Plan.

Reference 52

I do not support the fully permitted status for residential development and removal of any notification for non-complying activities. The Council must take a stronger role in assessing aspects of some of the larger or more complex proposed residential developments and should do this through a Discretionary status. The assessment matters should include urban design requirements, and may need to be reviewed in the current context.

The removal of notification of applications means that communities will not be involved in the developments in their area. Not only does this mean that property owners/occupiers may not know what is proposed for a neighbouring section, but also that good design and ideas may go unsupported.

I understand that the current restricted discretionary status has not led to delays in processing consents, so do not understand why a change is needed. Further, I understand that the combination of Urban Design Panel and Joint Management Board assessments in the Business Zone is working well and see no reason why it should not be applied to at least some developments in the Living Zone.

While notification and urban design assessment are unlikely to inhibit well-designed development, they are necessary to prevent inappropriate developments, loss of high value urban character, and deterioration of urban amenity.

Changes sought

Provision for varied building height limits across the zone, to reflect existing and desired character and uses in different areas.

Provision for identification of inner city Special Amenity Areas, together with objectives, policies and methods for their protection and enhancement.

Re-instatement of an urban design assessment process for the residential inner city.

Review of status of applications, assessment matters and notification requirements to allow for more community involvement in inner city design.

Reference 53

I believe that good urban design input to the recovery is essential to maintain the existing areas of high character and enhance those of less value. These provisions are for a residential area - improving the process of community and expert input to the rebuild is important for the recovery of the residents. The provisions set out in "A Liveable City" are blunt instruments that facilitate low quality residential developments; they will lead to the loss of the neighbourhood characteristics that exist now and that the people of Christchurch seek for the future.

Reference 54

Furthermore, the City Council's Plan change 53, which was introduced following proper Resource Management processes and was developed as a consequence of the shortcomings of the City Plan in dealing with urban design issues, should not be set aside lightly because of fears that it might cause delays. The need for urban design assessment is widely recognised throughout the country. The benefits of good urban design well and truly outweigh any slight delay that such rules might cause and the existence of design review provision provides developers with an incentive to pay attention to good design from the outset. As previously noted, the failure to ensure good design will have lasting consequences long beyond the short term need to boost the population of the inner city.

Reference 55

We are also concerned that these adjustment attempts jettison the urban design vision being applied in other aspects of the inner city rebuild. A vibrant well designed city is what is referenced as the draw card to bring residents into the city. However these regulations get rid of requirements that ensure good design. They create a double standard where "special" projects (such as the Eastern Frame) are subject to design standards when the greater residential area is not. No thought seems to be given to existing houses and residents additionally there is a dearth of supporting evidence for any the proposed regulation changes.

Reference 56

Retain the urban design rules that currently apply to all buildings.

Reference 57

Do not remove the Urban Design Panel.

Reference 58

1. Urban Design Panel

We understand the UDP is to be removed from the development process. We strongly submit that this is a mistake.

We have been through the UDP on several occasions and have found it useful in the following ways;

- i. They look at the development from a new angle and provide insight which has been of value to our developments.
- ii. They listen to us if we disagree with their views.
- iii. Taking their input into account makes for a smoother resource consent process.

We have heard disgruntlement about this process from others, however in our opinion they are the types that should be subjected to this process as they tend to foist developments on the city which the wider population do not like – the types of developments which give developers a bad name.

When unpopular developments are foisted on the city then residents, current and especially new, have their confidence knocked. We have seen this over the years with various developments of low quality marring the central city living environment. The UDP has been of considerable benefit and should remain.

Reference 59

Reinstate the Urban Design Panel for Traditional City Living and the Frame within the Central City:

2

The Proposed changes remove the Urban Design Panel from having any input into any development. "A Living City" reflects a contradiction and inconsistent application in CCDU's approach to encouraging a higher quality design of the built environment in the proposed Plan Changes. East Frame:"establish a clear planning environment using rules in the District Plan and/or via other methods including contractual arrangements to ensure that high quality townhouses and apartments are enabled". (page 12 A Liveable City)

Reference 60

Change Required:

At minimum, reinstate the relevant sections of the current CCC City Plan (as set up in Plan Change 53).

The Urban Design Panel be reinstated for the whole Central City and taken as a guiding principle for residential development for traditional central city living. Any proposed design should reflect the context of the surrounding houses and the character of the streetscape.

The Residents be allowed to make submissions to the Urban Design Panel on specific policy and proposed development before it.

Urban design assessment should be discretionary whenever a developer proposes a non-complying development (unless the notification provisions are

4

changed and neighbouring owners have given written consent). In the case of medium or high density developments (3 or more units) the Council should also have discretion to require oversight by a design panel.

Reference 61

Design standards While we anticipate the market to dictate a higher level of design standard to the subject properties locality, it would be desirable for Council to retain some control of design standards, particularly at the ground plane level facing the street.

Reference 62

5. Retain Urban design panel.

In previous times, the City Plan had many detailed rules about the appearance of buildings. The current development rules are very light on detail in relation to design features, because they were rewritten in tandem with a requirement that an urban design panel would have some oversight on acceptable outcomes. Dropping the urban design check without reinstating detailed rules is only implementing half the system. It's like a stool with only one leg.

This then leaves the city exposed to the risk of low-quality buildings. This (very low quality developments) actually happened under the 1995 City Plan, leading to the recent Plan Change 53 which set up the urban design process. We also note that Auckland, Wellington, Hamilton etc all have similar urban design panel requirements, some of which are currently being strengthened, and even the Christchurch East Frame seems to have quite strong urban design controls. This would make the Central City Living Zone almost unique in New Zealand cities by not having any design controls at all, with neither detailed rules nor a design panel in place.

Finally we also note that dropping the urban design consideration appears to be inconsistent with Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Council Regional Policy Statement which was included in the Regional Plan by the direction of the Minister of Earthquake Recovery. That RPS said: Issue 6.1.4 - Amenity and urban design

While the speed of recovery is important, so too is the quality of the built form. Poorly designed development can adversely affect urban amenity values, rural amenity values, historic heritage, health and safety, integration with community, educational, social and commercial facilities, and overall liveability. These matters are important for retaining population and attracting skilled workers and new business opportunities. They will affect the timing and the success of recovery.

Changes required: reinstate the section "Urban Design Appearance and Amenity" which was in the February 2014 CERA draft of the Liveable City but has been deleted from the July 2014 document. This section gives the Council limited discretion over larger developments (those with three or more units, or single very large dwellings, etc). The Council discretion is limited to considering a list of design features and how the new development relates to the existing environment and neighbouring area, which all seems appropriate and workable.

Reference 63

The removal of urban design rules.

For a city coming to terms with extreme rebuilding, it is essential that provisions for good urban design be incorporated into this document. Central Government and the Christchurch City Council are signatories to the "Urban Design Protocol (2005). This protocol must be reflected in the "Liveable City" document. We object to the change from Restricted Discretionary status (for three or more units) – non-notified; to a fully permitted status. This includes the omission of the urban design rule. We consider that the current "notified" provisions be retained. Plan change 53, which was introduced following proper Resource Management processes, was developed as a consequence of the shortcomings of the City Plan in dealing with urban design issues. This should not be set aside because of fears that it might cause delays. The need for urban design assessment is widely recognized throughout the country.

Reference 64

It seems paradoxical that the plan change proposes the removal of the urban design standard in order to promote the redevelopment of the inner city living zones when it is universally recognised that a high standard of urban design is fundamental to achieving desirable urban living environments. While in an ideal society with uniformly high wages and standards of living, market forces would ensure that developments of a high standard would be the norm, this ideal has yet to be achieved in New Zealand, let alone post quake Christchurch, where housing shortages and extortionate rents are the norm. At least for the foreseeable future there will be a ready market in Christchurch for any accommodation that meets the basic standards of being habitable and it is probable that many

developers will build to this standard rather than to the expectations of the draft plan change. Urban design assessments should be recognised as being beneficial to development in that it will help to ensure that desirable outcomes will occur and that property values will be maintained rather than decreased as a result of undesirable outcomes eroding values. It will also promote a climate of property investment rather than speculation in property development, as developers of housing for long-term rental will be more inclined to ensure their investment by meeting good urban design standards, while the investment of purchasers will be protected by ensuring that property values do not fall as a consequences of poor urban design outcomes becoming apparent.

Reference 65

Developers proposing the kinds of designs anticipated by the introduction to *A Liveable City* need have little to fear from urban design assessment of their proposals because by definition they will meet these criteria. The retention of the urban design standard will, however, mitigate the undesirable consequences of less thoughtful developments and ensure that the outcomes intended by the plan change are achieved.

Reference 66

No Urban Design Panel to support the community's wishes such as in the CCC "Share an Idea" forum.

Reference 67

Urban Design Panel and its mandate is reinstated, strengthened and empowered to ensure global urban design excellence is delivered in our rebuild. The Panel reviews both the built form and the landscape form of a development. (* please see below). This panel includes members of the Christchurch community along with design specialists.

Reference 68

dropping the requirement for Urban Design consultation on the appearance of a development

Reference 69

Retain Urban design panel

The current development rules are very light on detail in relation to design features, on the assumption that a design panel will have some check on acceptable outcomes. Dropping the design check without reinstating detailed rules is only implementing half the system. This then leaves the city exposed to the risk of low-quality buildings. This actually happened under the 1995 City Plan, leading to the Plan Change 53 which set up the urban design process.

I also note also that removal of the urban design provisions of the existing plan is inconsistent with Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Council Regional Policy Statement which was included in the Regional Plan by the direction of the Minister of Earthquake Recovery.

Changes required: When residential developments meet the given threshold, these must be subject to an urban design panel, as is the case in the business area and inner-city frames. This will be particularly important for retaining the quality and suitability to context of developments, when the SAMs are removed.

Urban Design –Disagree with removal

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

GET REAL

Reference 2

This is a serious backward step.

Reference 3

By removing this provision Christchurch will be totally out of step with the other major cities around the country and indeed the world who see the value of good urban design.

Reference 4

Do not remove the current urban design assessment requirement.

Reference 5

I disagree with this - there need to be design controls, in particular urban design controls, to avoid designs of the lowest common denominator. The urban design Panel has lifted the standard !! It is an independent group of professionals that can give very good design advice. i have been in front of the panel and found their comments and suggestions very helpful.

Reference 6

I disagree strongly with the proposed removal of this provision. Urban design is really important.

Reference 7

I oppose the proposed provision. / The oversight by urban designers under the urban design standard will ensure that the "market" acts responsibly with regard to urban design principles, rather than building to the lowest common denominator marketable.

Reference 8

Very bad idea.

Reference 9

Do not remove

Reference 10

This is a terrible idea if it is not replaced with another mechanism to assure quality control. There are urban design panels and similar ideas around the world because they work and are important. They do not need to be coercive or restriction and can often be used as a way to get high quality design advice for projects if the opportunity is given early enough in a project. / /

Reference 11

The CSHWP strongly opposes the removal of the urban design standard. It was introduced because of the prevalence in the market of building houses with very poor urban design and quality of amenity.

Reference 12

The need for an urban design assessment should NOT be removed from the city plan. /

Reference 13

This is a really bad idea. Urban design reviews lead to higher quality. The urban design reviews I've been to have been useful and help to guard against low quality developments. The planning rules need a significant overhaul to ensure higher quality developments

Reference 14

I feel it is absolutely critical that for the long term quality of our city the Urban Design Panel and reinforcement of quality design solutions should be provided and continued. / / Speed and expediency is not the way to create a fantastic city in the long term. / / Quality urban places evolve in the context of robust design debate about quality. / / I do not support this requirement being removed.

Reference 15

Urban design assessments form a vital role for developing our city in an acceptable role. Not having this will facilitate the construction of really tall, cheap, ugly, small apartments, which is about the opposite of what Christchurch residents called for in Share an Idea in 2011.

Reference 16

Do not remove the requirement for urban design to be considered. There needs to be some guidance to encourage suitable developments are built.

Reference 17

This is a ridiculous proposition

Reference 18

BAD idea. These provisions exist for good reason. So that the individual units conform to the man made and natural environment and do not set an adverse precedent.

Reference 19

This provision should not be removed. High quality urban design is incredibly important for Christchurch and it cannot be automatically expected that "the market will provide" as unfortunately history tells us that is not always the case. This consent process is crucial to ensuring Christchurch gets the best possible urban design.

Reference 20

absolutely not. the urban design panel keeps developers 'honest' by asking them appropriate questions and, where necessary, encouraging them to consider their neighbours and the needs of the city as a whole

Reference 21

I think this is a terrible idea. / / I have designed multiple, multi unit apartments in the four aves in the last three years, and the Urban Design Panel have been implicitly useful, not only to us, but to the quality of design in the city. We found the planning regulations and the Urban Design Panel were at odds with each other, which was pointed out in environment court many times, but if I was to vote to keep one it would be the Urban Design Panel without reservation.

Reference 22

/ The key to residential development in the city is quality of design. And I am absolutely certain this cannot happen without the Urban Design Panel. I am terrified what we will end up with without them.

Reference 23

Beacon Pathway strongly opposes the removal of the urban design standard. These were introduced because of the prevalence in the market of building houses with very poor urban design and quality of amenity, particularly a number of multi-unit development in Christchurch in the 1990s.

Reference 24

I totally disagree with this proposal.

Reference 25

I object to this proposal. I see no prospect that removing the urban design standard will increase the attractiveness of the central city - quite the opposite, in fact. Thousands upon thousands of hours of work by urban design professionals and years of community consultation has gone into creating the current standards and it would callous and counterproductive to throw it all out.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 26

The removal of qualitative urban design assessments for medium density residential developments in the central city living zone is not supported. This change is completely contrary to the aspirational vision for the city centre.

Reference 27

Oppose: the removal of urban design standards. Urban design standards would enable city blocks to be developed in a coherent manner, make the city streets more attractive, and encourage more people to live in the inner city. The removal of design standards could potentially result in unhealthy?? urban design and poor amenity values.

Reference 28

The removal of the UDA is definitely a step in the wrong direction and at odds with current thinking.

Reference 29

The removal of any assessment of urban design value from the processing of applications for residential developments is a retrograde step and appears to be contrary to planning in major cities in New Zealand and around the world.

Reference 30

I do not support the fully permitted status for residential development and removal of any notification for non-complying activities. The Council must take a stronger role in assessing aspects of some of the larger or more complex proposed residential developments and should do this through a Discretionary status. The assessment matters should include urban design requirements, and may need to be reviewed in the current context.

The removal of notification of applications means that communities will not be involved in the developments in their area. Not only does this mean that property owners/occupiers may not know what is proposed for a neighbouring section, but also that good design and ideas may go unsupported.

I understand that the current restricted discretionary status has not led to delays in processing consents, so do not understand why a change is needed. Further, I understand that the combination of Urban Design Panel and Joint Management Board assessments in the Business Zone is working well and see no reason why it should not be applied to at least some developments in the Living Zone.

While notification and urban design assessment are unlikely to inhibit well-designed development, they are necessary to prevent inappropriate developments, loss of high value urban character, and deterioration of urban amenity.

Changes sought

- 1 Provision for varied building height limits across the zone, to reflect existing and desired character and uses in different areas.
- 2 Provision for identification of inner city Special Amenity Areas, together with objectives, policies and methods for their protection and enhancement.
- 3 Re-instatement of an urban design assessment process for the residential inner city.
- 4 Review of status of applications, assessment matters and notification requirements to allow for more community involvement in inner city design.

Reference 31

I believe that good urban design input to the recovery is essential to maintain the existing areas of high character and enhance those of less value. These provisions are for a residential area - improving the process of community and expert input to the rebuild is important for the recovery of the residents. The provisions set out in "A Liveable City" are blunt instruments that facilitate low quality residential developments; they will lead to the loss of the neighbourhood characteristics that exist now and that the people of Christchurch seek for the future.

Reference 32

Do not remove the Urban Design Panel.

Reference 33

5. Urban Design Panel

We understand the UDP is to be removed from the development process. We strongly submit that this is a mistake.

We have been through the UDP on several occasions and have found it useful in the following ways;

- i. They look at the development from a new angle and provide insight which has been of value to our developments.
- ii. They listen to us if we disagree with their views.
- iii. Taking their input into account makes for a smoother resource consent process.

We have heard disgruntlement about this process from others, however in our opinion they are the types that should be subjected to this process as they tend to foist developments on the city which the wider population do not like – the types of developments which give developers a bad name.

When unpopular developments are foisted on the city then residents, current and especially new, have their confidence knocked. We have seen this over the years with various developments of low quality marring the central city living environment. The UDP has been of considerable benefit and should remain.

Reference 34

Design standards While we anticipate the market to dictate a higher level of design standard to the subject properties locality, it would be desirable for Council to retain some control of design standards, particularly at the ground plane level facing the street.

Reference 35

The removal of urban design rules.

For a city coming to terms with extreme rebuilding, it is essential that provisions for good urban design be incorporated into this document. Central Government and the Christchurch City Council are signatories to the "Urban Design Protocol (2005)". This protocol must be reflected in the "Livable City" document. We object to the change from Restricted Discretionary status (for three or more units) – non-notified; to a fully permitted status. This includes the omission of the urban design rule. We consider that the current "notified" provisions be retained. Plan change 53, which was introduced following proper Resource Management processes, was developed as a consequence of the shortcomings of the City Plan in dealing with urban design issues. This should not be set aside because of fears that it might cause delays. The need for urban design assessment is widely recognized throughout the country.

Reference 36

It seems paradoxical that the plan change proposes the removal of the urban design standard in order to promote the redevelopment of the inner city living zones when it is universally recognised that a high standard of urban design is fundamental to achieving desirable urban living environments. While in an ideal society with uniformly high wages and standards of living, market forces would ensure that developments of a high standard would be the norm, this ideal has yet to be achieved in New Zealand, let alone post quake Christchurch, where housing shortages and extortionate rents are the norm. At least for the foreseeable future there will be a ready market in Christchurch for any accommodation that meets the basic standards of being habitable and it is probable that many developers will build to this standard rather than to the expectations of the draft plan change. Urban design assessments should be recognised as being beneficial to development in that it will help to ensure that desirable outcomes will occur and that property values will be maintained rather than decreased as a result of undesirable outcomes eroding values. It will also promote a climate of property investment rather than speculation in property development, as developers of housing for long-term rental will be more inclined to ensure their investment by meeting good urban design standards, while the investment of purchasers will be protected by ensuring that property values do not fall as a consequence of poor urban design outcomes becoming apparent.

Reference 37

Developers proposing the kinds of designs anticipated by the introduction to *A Liveable City* need have little to fear from urban design assessment of their proposals because by definition they will meet these criteria. The retention of the urban design standard will, however, mitigate the undesirable consequences of less thoughtful developments and ensure that the outcomes intended by the plan change are achieved.

Reference 38

No Urban Design Panel to support the community's wishes such as in the CCC "Share an Idea" forum.

Reference 39

dropping the requirement for Urban Design consultation on the appearance of a development

Urban Design – Disagree with rationale – Removing will result in poor quality, ugly buildings etc, not increase attractiveness

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

History clearly shows that it is developers that dictate the quality of housing in an area, so removing the requirement to conform to an urban design requirement will result in ill-fitting developments that are not in harmony with their communities. / /

Reference 2

However, what I don't want to happen with the new central city is cheap medium density buildings being erected, only to house beneficiaries. I don't want the living zone to become the slums in 10-20 years time, like the Robert Taylor Project in Chicago, where it was originally meant to house a mix of people, which turned into a centre for gang and homicide activity. / / Pretty much get the design bang on and don't let housing NZ too close! /

Reference 3

GET REAL - WITHOUT CLEAR GUIDELINES FROM CERA, market will defer to lowest cost most profit default and leave us with ugly cheap buildings. SEE JAPAN FOR WHAT THIS LOOKS LIKE!!

Reference 4

This is a serious backward step. There is no way that removing this requirement will make development more attractive. You only have to look at some of the awful development that exists within the L4 and L3 zones, built before this assessment was introduced.

Reference 5

Short time fixes like this will lead to long term slums.

Reference 6

We like attractive buildings with interesting design features that add character to the city, not just cookie cutter tilt slab boxes designed to bring in the maximum return to the developer without regard to the neighbourhood or future residents that will live in them.

Reference 7

Still think someone should keep an eye on the developments to ensure it is good urban design and not just a 'slap it up and she'll be okay' design.

Reference 8

Oh dear.....experience just does not support this expectation. The reason urban design standards were needed in the first place was because of the problems brought about by very bad design. SAMs were used (at one time quite successfully) to curb developers' tendency to ignore good / sympathetic design and/or to build 'cheap and nasty' if they could. With the added cost of meeting current EQ codes, the very likely outcome will be to ignore good design. / / After all the heartache and all we've lost,

Reference 9

Removing it will not increase the attractiveness of the central city, it will only make unfettered development easier.

Reference 10

I get that things need to be easier in general but that doesn't mean everything needs to be removed. While the market might be best placed to manage things like demand for car parks in one individual residential development, I don't think the market will take a wider point of view as a matter of course, and I think it's sensible to include a requirement for developers to show how their development will interact with the wider environment. These residential developments will have such a long-lasting and potent effect on the environment of this city. They must be developed thoughtfully with their surroundings, and I think this provision (or something like it) is the only way to ensure that this happens. / / For me, as a young professional who is highly likely to want to purchase my first home in a few years' time, is keen to look in the central city, and is basically your target market, I assure you that urban design is a CRITICAL factor influencing my decision. I don't mind having slightly less space, maybe less car parking options, etc - but I MUST live somewhere that has a logical, functional and pleasant environment.

Reference 11

Urban design is needed. I am appalled that garages can occupy north-facing aspect, 2 meter high hard fences are allowed, outdoor space can be minimal if money is contributed to the Council's "green fund" and usually spent elsewhere in Christchurch not Central City.

Reference 12

Again disagree this would set a dangerous precedent for dull & boring cheap housing, while cheap affordable housing is needed we don't want to create slums of the future. this requirement must be maintained.

Reference 13

In my experience, developers can not be counted on to build to attractive design. Neighbourhoods, and to a lesser extent the city at large, need to have some say in respect of design of new developments.

Reference 14

This will certainly lead to low quality development.

Reference 15

The market will not make it attractive - look at St Albans (Madras and Barbadoes in particular) - the development there from the past 20 years is incredibly ugly and badly designed.

Reference 16

Removing design standards will result in lower quality of buildings - deregulation doesn't work see leaky buildings.

Reference 17

The commercial construction built to date has been of very mixed quality and the CSHWP is concerned that removing the urban design standard will result in a similar mix of quality, with some bad urban design and amenity outcomes as a result. The residential houses built, even more than commercial buildings, are likely to be around for 50-100 years. There is only one opportunity to ensure that they deliver the high amenity outcomes that are necessary to attract people to want to live back in the central city. The experience across New Zealand is that

without urban design standards some very poor amenity developments result. Once poor quality development is in place, this can have a spiralling downward effect on the quality of further developments built.

Reference 18

. It allows developers to build cheap homes which may well be affordable but which will for decades be a blot on our landscape. It is vital to have design standards.

Reference 19

. there is no way that removing the urban design standard will 'increase the attractiveness of the city' to anyone other than those hoping to make money out of it - we're already challenged by building costs vs profit, resulting in cheapest everything, and this further erodes the potential for quality.

Reference 20

we're building for the longterm here, we need QUALITY of public and private realms if we are to have any hope of attracting interesting, young people to our new cbd. while speed of recovery is also important, we must take care not to leave a shoddy legacy of building stock or dubious public spaces - cities who have done this take years to solve such problems, if indeed they ever do.

Reference 21

The removal of this requirement will increase the risk of low quality buildings/developments.

Reference 22

I see no prospect that removing the urban design standard will increase the attractiveness of the central city - quite the opposite, in fact. Thousands upon thousands of hours of work by urban design professionals and years of community consultation has gone into creating the current standards and it would callous and counterproductive to throw it all out. Removing this requirement will lead to more cheap and nasty, ugly blocks which lower the attractiveness of the city as a place to live and visit. If you are serious about creating the best small city in the world then you will ditch this proposal.

Reference 23

Inner city Christchurch will become a slum lord ghetto where no-one will want to live except itinerant workers and poor students. Share and Idea was about building a sustainable green inner city that the world would want to come and visit and live in. We have the opportunity to rebuild the most beautiful inner city in the world.

Reference 24

Im concerned the changes will facilitate the construction of really tall, cheap, ugly, small apartments, which is about the opposite of what is needed for a sustainable christchurch. /

Reference 25

Removing the design standard will not increase the attractiveness of thr inner city for citizens or developers. What it does increase is the likely hood of poor low quality developments which equals future slums not attractive sustainable inner city living.

Reference 26

Some developers have no regard to the attractiveness of buildings only their saleability.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 27

Dropping the design check without reinstating detailed rules is only implementing half the system. This then leaves the city exposed to the risk of low-quality buildings in the residential living zone. This actually happened under the 1995 City Plan, leading to the Plan Change 53 which set up the urban design process.

Reference 28

The Urban Design Forum laments the extensive loss of the built fabric of Christchurch. While it supports the timely redevelopment of the central area it does not wish to see the heart of the city reinstated in an unsightly, characterless or unsafe manner due to a lack of appreciation of the need to support good urban design through appropriate legislation

Reference 29

While notification and urban design assessment are unlikely to inhibit well-designed development, they are necessary to prevent inappropriate developments, loss of high value urban character, and deterioration of urban amenity.

Reference 30

This standard is proposed to be removed in order to increase the attractiveness of the central city for residential development. It is expected that the market will demand the high quality residential housing that will help make central Christchurch an attractive place to live. As noted above, there is little evidence from existing multi-unit developments that the market will reliably deliver attractive, high quality residential housing. Urban design assessment should be compulsory where any development is adjacent to or opposite listed heritage buildings. Urban design assessment should be discretionary whenever a developer proposes a non-complying development (unless the notification provisions are changed and neighbouring owners have given written consent). In the case of medium or high density developments (3 or more units) the Council should also have a discretion to require oversight by a design panel. If a development is indeed of high quality and has adequate regard for the amenity of the area it is located in then developers should have little to fear from such a provision but in other cases approval of an urban design panel has the potential to raise the level of amenity provided by developments. Poor urban design can have very long lasting effects. Short of the sort of catastrophic changes wrought by a disaster such as the earthquake, poor urban design can be very difficult to remedy once it has occurred. Although HPC favours greater flexibility for development to meet changing needs and to allow for creative design solutions which rigid planning controls can inhibit, we believe that allowing urban design overview needs to be a concomitant of allowing for greater flexibility in the rules.

We note also that removal of the urban design provisions of the existing plan is inconsistent with Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Council Regional Policy Statement which was included in the Regional Plan by the direction of the Minister of Earthquake Recovery.

Reference 31

Christchurch City council Plan 53 involved a lengthy review process over several years to address deficiencies in housing amenity within the Living Zones 3& 4. We are concerned that through the loss of design reviews we will in our neighbourhood see a reversion to poor quality developments (such as the 1990's "Hyslop" developments in the inner city east) for short term gains.

Reference 32

In our Village, with most buildings being demolished, redevelopment is currently demonstrating both an increased density and also high quality amenity. The document displays a number of Village developments as examples, and yet these are known to have benefitted considerably from measures such as advice from the Urban Design Panel. Residential developers have also commented that meetings with neighbouring interests have also enabled them to improve their designs. In providing these comments on the proposed regime, residential developers spoken to have stated that the Urban Design Panel's advisory service benefitted their development and that neighbours opinion has been sought and respected. They do not support deletion of these provisions.

Reference 33

This then leaves the city exposed to the risk of low-quality buildings. This (very low quality developments) actually happened under the 1995 City Plan, leading to the recent Plan Change 53 which set up the urban design process.

Reference 34

While the speed of recovery is important, so too is the quality of the built form. Poorly designed development can adversely affect urban amenity values, rural amenity values, historic heritage, health and safety, integration with community, educational, social and commercial facilities, and overall liveability. These matters are important for retaining population and attracting skilled workers and new business opportunities. They will affect the timing and the success of recovery.

Reference 35

As Chair of an inner city body corporate, I have been favourably impressed by the oversight and standards currently being expected of our new build. As well as all the usual oversight, CCC is keeping a close eye on the protection of the historic garages and existing trees as well as ensuring noise protection by prescribing commercial grade window glass. Importantly, the consent took into account the overall look of the place.

To remove or water down such requirements can only mean a lower quality of buildings and would deplete the quality of life not only of those in smaller, less regulated accommodation, but also for those of us currently owning and living in inner city dwellings.

If, as in the proposal, new developments do not have to undergo Urban Design consultation, the Central City spaces could be filled with ugly, skimpy apartment blocks.

Reference 36

The absence of an urban design panel (since there are essentially no rules) will result in mediocre buildings. I'm in the property investment business so I see them all the time. Without checks and balances one will generally get the lowest grade buildings possible.

Urban Design – Disagree with rationale – leaving to market and developers

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

This will be interesting to see if it delivers, some developer only have their eye on the dollar for them in a project particularly some from out of / I must say I have some doubts about this one

Reference 2

It is not the market who will decide the design of residential development. If a developer decides to build an unattractive development there will always be people who will live in them.

Reference 3

My experience under the RMA is that good design is not ordinarily provided by the 'market', there needs to be leadership and this should be championed by Council which is for the benefit of the wider community, context and place making rather than motivated solely by private profit.

Reference 4

Bit dodgy to let some developers decide on what is good urban design, some will only consider what they can get away with to improve their bottom line. Still think someone should keep an eye on the developments to ensure it is good urban design and not just a 'slap it up and she'll be okay' design.

Reference 5

Totally disagree. / Urban Design is critical and cannot be left to "the market".

Reference 6

Reliance on 'the market' to ensure 'high quality' housing will be a mistake, one that has been demonstrated repeatedly in previous years with the many dull, uninviting housing projects on the eastern side of the city. The market (meaning investors) will only seek to maximise their return on capital in the most expedient way, leaving those who reside in the resulting units to live with the often less-than-ideal results.

Reference 7

The planners will decide not the market. Housing NZ flats will be built and rows and rows of identical apartments by landlords for the cheap end of the market. Tenants are quite happy to move into a cheap ugly flat as they do not own it and can move on at any time to another one. In the meantime the neighbours have to live next door to an ugly building. I know as I live with an architectural designer and he is pressured by his employer (a developer) to design poor buildings that are not liveable but are cheap to build.

Reference 8

Completely disagree. Just as the market has produced so many other desirable outcomes Why on earth do you imagine that this will increase attractiveness. Surely we have learnt the outcomes of light regulation - leaky homes and shonky buildings.

Reference 9

While the market might be best placed to manage things like demand for car parks in one individual residential development, I don't think the market will take a wider point of view as a matter of course, and I think it's sensible to include a requirement for developers to show how their development will interact with the wider environment.

Reference 10

I oppose the proposed provision. / The oversight by urban designers under the urban design standard will ensure that the "market" acts responsibly with regard to urban design principles, rather than building to the lowest common denominator marketable.

Reference 11

Please learn from previous attempts to "let the market decide", such as the leaky buildings saga. / From our experience in the central city, developers ALWAYS choose the cheapest options, and ignore long term community needs. /

Reference 12

I believe that developer-led design will lead to character-less and bland buildings. I believe the urban design requirement is crucial for a "liveable city".

Reference 13

In residential development, the market is sorely unbalance, with the developer almost always better informed than any potential purchaser... this has led time and again to low quality development both here and overseas (otherwise, one would argue that the market should have prevented leaky homes etc). / / Also, the market does not represent the interests of the general public who will share the public realm... without Urban design standards to protect the public realm, this will almost certainly lead to lower quality development. / / A very short-sighted provision that Christchurch may suffer from for decades to come.

Reference 14

No - the Urban Design Panel gives great feedback to developers. The market will not make it attractive - look at St Albans (Madras and Barbadoes in particular) - the development there from the past 20 years is incredibly ugly and badly designed. We need the urban design panel to stay.

Reference 15

I think you are wrong on this, I don't think the market will have a say - it'll be developers trying to make money that will determine what residential developments look like. Retaining this could help to get a more variation.

Reference 16

Developers should be held accountable to a level of quality in design. It won't result in an increase in attractiveness rather it gives free reign for developers to pillage the central city for a quick dollar.

Reference 17

The idea that the market will develop high quality design solutions without any controls is stupid. This will lead to market failures (not all developments but enough to damage the city) that Christchurch will have to live with for decades. Look at some of the dense and low quality housing in Auckland to see what will happen.

Reference 18

The LCP also favours developers by dropping any requirement for Urban Design consultation about the appearance of significant redevelopments, and greatly reducing the minimum permitted size of apartments. In Share an Idea 2011 Christchurch residents called for something different from what is likely to go up under the proposed scheme - tall, cheap small, ugly apartments. That is not what we as Christchurch residents want. Is it what you want.?

Reference 19

Consent should still be required. My experience as an inner city resident is that developers are always trying to break the rules. This will be even worse if there is no consent process - and it should be a notifiable consent if the planning rules are breached.

Reference 20

The market should not be dictating urban design - it will always and only go for the cheapest (potentially ugliest, least sustainable option)

Reference 21

The CSHWP strongly opposes the removal of the urban design standard. It was introduced because of the prevalence in the market of building houses with very poor urban design and quality of amenity.

Reference 22

There must be some regulatory safeguard to prevent the sort of mass-housing developments that we have seen in Auckland and other cities. Presumably 'the market' 'demanded' them too. Without any urban design assessment what will stop unscrupulous developers from saddling Christchurch with a few of them simply because they believe there is a market for cheap and nasty central-city apartments? Even if they are wrong and their developments fail, their mistakes will be a blight on the city centre for decades. Someone must be demanding of each and every proposal for comprehensive development that it is contributing positively to a beautiful and vibrant city centre. It cannot be left up to 'the market'. /

Reference 23

This is nonsense and the requirement should stay. Without this "The market" will end up suffering what the profit driven developers provide as there won't be enough alternatives. Time and time again this has been shown to be disastrous and Christchurch deserves much better.

Reference 24

It is disingenuous to state that the market forces will make the central city an attractive place to live. Just as there is a segment of the market that might demand high quality developments there is also a large segment of the market who just wants a cheap place to live. It is dishonest to argue that developers will only target the high end, they could just as easily target the low end and without the consenting requirements local communities have zero input.

Reference 25

Consent must be a requirement of all buildings. There needs to be checks and balances on developers who will otherwise be motivated by economic considerations to cut costs where possible, as past experience has shown.

Reference 26

The market should not be relied on for social or environmental needs since it is a purely economic concept. The housing market has shown that it does not work well in a post disaster environment. / /

Reference 27

I think urban design consent is needed. Otherwise this will be a developer led rebuild - which will result in an ugly ramshackle where profit is the main consideration. Environmental standards also need to be met.

Reference 28

The market works to encourage profit. Since when did market driven profit motives constitute 'high quality', whatever that is supposed to mean?

Reference 29

of all my comments on the plan, this is the one i most urge you not to implement. we desperately need big picture and long term thinking for the good of our city and its residents. if we leave it to the market to determine quality, i fear we will end up with much more of what we already regret.

Reference 30

/ Beacon submits that it is short-sighted for the CCDU to “expect that the market will demand high quality residential housing that will make central Christchurch an attractive place to live.” The commercial construction built to date has been of very mixed quality and Beacon is concerned that removing the urban design standard will result in a mix of quality, with some bad urban design and amenity outcomes as a result.

Reference 31

High quality is not required by the market. Profit is and this leads to high density and low quality

Reference 32

Market will always go for quick return on investment that rarely equates to quality or attractiveness. This is our opportunity to actually build an attractive city - seize it and rather than dropping planning include a visual consent process and standard to ensure we actually end up with an attractive city that people do want to live in.

Reference 33

I don't believe the market will work in this aspect.

Reference 34

Expecting that market forces will create high quality and attractive housing is naive and absolutely ridiculous.

Reference 35

Who is this expected by? Not by me. Lessening constraints might make it more attractive to developers because it will enable them to do whatever they like, and many of the things they like will make it less attractive for other people to actually live there.

Reference 36

I have no confidence in the market building attractive residential developments without the guidance of the urban design assessment. I believe this provision is being removed to allow developers to build large blocks of tiny apartments to ensure maximum financial return without consideration for the long term city scape that will be recreated

Reference 37

I personally do not trust the market will produce anything for the greater good, especially when it comes to good urban design that takes into account liveability, functionality, cost, and relationship to the surrounding environment.

Reference 38

This is a serious mistake, you can't rely on the market to provide good urban design, if that were true then New Zealand would be full of great urban spaces. I work with developers and their objective is to make money, that's their job, they will comply with the minimum standards and that's it the only way that they will provide better urban solutions is if they have to (legislation) or if the public demand it. Most New Zealanders are used to quarter acre sections and lots of space and have probably not experienced denser, well designed urban spaces, and so will not demand this.

Reference 39

"the market" hasn't yet delivered a range of dwellings, and it's concerning this seems to be supported by developers trying to make the most cash by allowing more space to be built on in a denser way. All planning theory seems to be out the window, it's absent in the LCP rules which focus on benefits to developers. As a prospective home owner I'd be put off from investing my life savings in such an unregulated environment. / /

Reference 40

I think there are some benefits to keeping the urban design assessment... who wants a bunch of cheap ugly buildings?! Sure, it's nice to assume that the 'market' will demand high quality housing... but I'm not convinced of this!

Comments received via email and post

Reference 41

We do not consider that removal of urban design assessments will increase the attractiveness of the central city for residential development. We also do not believe the market will necessarily deliver high quality residential housing.

Reference 42

Leaving it solely to the developers discretion will not result in Christchurch becoming one of the 'best small cities in the world' or 'an inspiring place to live'.

Reference 43

For instance while it will be possible to build Traditional Central City Living as shown on page 10, it is far more likely something much less desirable will eventuate given the lack of design control in the proposed District Plan provisions, in particular the removal of the Urban Design Assessment.

Reference 44

The Urban Design Protocol developed by the Ministry for the Environment in 2005 recognises that urban design has economic, environmental, cultural and social dimensions. The Protocol now has 183 signatories including Central Government departments and Christchurch City Council. By endorsing the Protocol, signatories indicate their commitment to the pursuit of quality urban design. By removing the Urban Design Assessment the Government and Christchurch City Council (with apparently little say in the matter) will be renegeing on this commitment.

There is very little rationale for the changes. Is there any evidence to demonstrate that the existing statutory framework is inhibiting development and that these changes will make a difference? Or could it be that other factors, such as lack of capacity in the development and construction sector, cost of land, and ease of building on greenfield sites, are the culprits?

Is there any evidence that the existing provisions are causing delays? Information released by the Christchurch City Council shows that across the 2013-14 year as a whole, 99% of resource consent applications were processed within statutory timeframes. This figure includes all of the resource consents which require restricted discretionary urban design consent in the Living 3 and Living 4 Zones and the Central City Business Zone.

There is no analysis of the implications of the changes. We would expect to see at least some testing of the rules to be made available in order to understand the parameters of development that would be permitted.

Reference 45

Urban Design Assessment

We are told that: "The urban design standard is proposed to be removed in order to increase the attractiveness of the central city for residential development". Does this mean only attractive for developers. What about attractive for residents as promised in the vision?

The need is to encourage good developers and raise the standard of the not so good ones. Experience in Auckland and Wellington, as well as other urban centres around the country has shown that a combination of the requirement for a design assessment, advice from an UDF Submission on A Liveable City - draft residential chapter 12 August 2014

1

urban design panel and published design guidance is working well to raise the bar on the quality of urban development. This qualitative approach is much more successful in achieving good urban design outcomes than relying on quantifiable standards. The proposed changes not only remove the requirement for a design assessment but are not accompanied by a corresponding increase in design rules.

It is difficult to understand why it is thought fit to leave urban design to the market in the residential areas in contrast to the Central City Business Zone where there are urban design controls, an Urban Design Panel process and the Joint Management Board. High density residential developments are complex and can benefit enormously from expert scrutiny.

Reference 46

Good urban design makes economic sense

A report entitled The Value of Urban Design, commissioned by the MfE in 2004, found that good urban design "does not necessarily cost more and delivers enhanced benefits to both the developer and the wider community". While many developers appreciate the economic value of good urban design this is not necessarily the case particularly with smaller or novice developers or those operating at the lower end of the market.

Reference 47

It is naive in the extreme to expect " that the market will demand the high quality residential housing that will help make central Christchurch an attractive place to live". Experience shows that the market does not consistently deliver a good quality product when developers are given a free hand. Poor quality examples abound in the Living 4 and Living 3 Zones. Development which is not sensitive to its context, is crammed onto its site and is visually unappealing, deters would-be central city residents. Medium density residential development has a bad name because of what the market has delivered.

Reference 48

Comment: CCDU does not trust the "market" and seeks to directly influence yet denies central city long term residents a say . CCDU's position would rightly be perceived as "hypercritical"!

Reference 49

While in an ideal society with uniformly high wages and standards of living, market forces would ensure that developments of a high standard would be the norm, this ideal has yet to be achieved in New Zealand, let alone post quake Christchurch, where housing shortages and extortionate rents are the norm.

Urban Design – Other concerns

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

The plans do away with any meaningful controls on poor design. / / THAT IS NOT WHAT THE RESIDENTS OF THE CITY CLEARLY WANTED IN THEIR SUBMISSIONS TO THE MANY OPPORTUNITIES TO COMMENT. / IT IS DRIVEN BY THE WISHES OF GET-RICH QUICK CRAP BUILDING DEVELOPERS AND "ARCHITECTS"

Reference 2

This will potentially have an unintended consequence of creating NIMBYism and potentially create the illusion that only wealthy, conservative older men will be allowed (or can afford) to live in the central city. Also by unnecessarily demolishing older buildings and subsequently telling small land owners to "take a hike" A huge opportunity has been lost to create some wonderful loft style apartments with retail/hospitality on the ground floors. Sadly because of this a lot of character will be missing from inner central living areas, and I fear that the central city living areas will be sterile and unwelcoming.

Reference 3

My experience under the RMA is that good design is not ordinarily provided by the 'market', there needs to be leadership and this should be championed by Council which is for the benefit of the wider community, context and place making rather than motivated solely by private profit.

Reference 4

as before

Reference 5

as it currently works this is basically free advice to developers, it isn't binding, it encourages them to build 'good neighbours' which is good for everyone, including for their own bottom line. feedback on the panel from developers is currently generally positive.

Reference 6

/ Residential houses built, are likely to be around for 50-100 years. There is only one opportunity to ensure that they deliver the high amenity outcomes that are necessary to attract people to want to live back in the central city. Once poor quality development is in place, this can have a spiralling downward effect on the quality of further developments built. / / For example new development on Victoria Street where all new buildings are built to the boundary has resulted in a narrow street corridor with little opportunity for street activity other than motor vehicles. Future developments need to consider the first 2-3 metres from street to create quality spaces for street activity (cafes, gardens, seating) along side walking and cycling. /

Reference 7

Plan Change 53 showed that negative outcomes were being experienced with the previous absence of such a panel.

Reference 8

I currently have two such quake rebuilds taking place. My insurer has most of the control over how these developments will be implemented and is entirely motivated to do so for the cheapest possible cost. They are not at all focused on the impact on the neighborhood or urban design implications. It is essential that there continue to be some vetting of designs to ensure that good urban design is maintained and that neighbors are not disenfranchised. We want a beautiful and aesthetically pleasing streetscapes. We do not want to go back to tedious industrial looking tilt slab constructions that dominate the landscape, reduce our property values and direct the neighborhood towards long term decline.

Reference 9

Now we are being told by central government that all we are allowed is an inner city of tall concrete boxes - because that is all that residential developers are prepared to build. Our city is being held ransom to developers who are only interested in short term profit gain. Only central and local government have the power to demand that inner city residential development meet urban design standards. /

Reference 10

Will there be a requirement or incentive for building accessible housing - life time design that includes consideration for those who are blind or have low vision?

Reference 11

There is very little rationale for the changes. Is there any evidence to demonstrate that the existing statutory framework is inhibiting development and that these changes will make a difference? Or could it be that other factors, such as lack of capacity in the development and construction sector, cost of land, and ease of building on greenfield sites, are the culprits?

Comments received via email and post

Reference 12

Why would CCC/CERA remove the need for qualitative urban design assessments in the Central City Living Zone only yet maintain these controls in the Eastern Frame residential neighbourhood and Breathe demonstration project?

The current Urban Design Panel process may be frustrating for some developers but it has without question raised the standard of our urban environment since its inception. It has also educated developers about good urban design principles.

How can you aspire to create the best urban environment in New Zealand when there is no design assessment process for proposed developments? Good urban design based rules and guidelines are fundamental to achieving this. Bulk and location are critical qualitative controls essential for good urban design outcomes. The existing urban design rule is as close as we can get to ensure that projects at the very least have a design assessment of some sort.

Reference 13

If the intention of changes is to expedite development and avoid having to present to the Urban Design Panel rather than follow a fixed rules based process a viable alternative would be pre-lodgement meetings with planners and urban design professionals at an early

concept design stage. A discretionary route for assessing the merits of a development offers much more versatility but still maintains a level of qualitative urban design assessment.

Reference 14

Affordable Housing:

Making housing affordable is a challenging issue that must be addressed if the vision for the Central City Living zone is to be realised

The proposed planning changes introduced by liveable City' will help make housing more affordable by making it easier to develop a broad range of housing options including apartments, townhouses and stand-alone dwellings to suit the requirements of a diverse population living in the central city.

When senior politician's within government are making comments like

"There is no point having beautifully designed cities if 90 percent of New Zealanders can't afford to live in them. We might have to get a bit ugly".

... this is of major concern given the high level involvement of the government in the rebuilding of city. The misconception that good design translates to additional costs needs to be addressed. The recent Cantabrian House initiative is a fine example of how quality affordable low cost dwellings can be provided with the benefit of good design.

If the vision for 'A Liveable City' is to create genuine diversity it is not inconceivable that Social and State housing developments could also be accommodated in the central city. The removal of qualitative urban design assessments for social and state housing in the central city zone is of major concern.

Is this the approach we want to take for Christchurch given the long history of fine architecture as part of New Zealand's social and state housing programmes?

There are numerous precedents in New Zealand and Internationally where high quality affordable housing developments and social housing developments have been provided. The outcomes from these developments have proven that good design not only improves the health and well being of the residents but the residents also make a much greater contribution to community.

We have an opportunity to not only rebuild what we had to rebuild better than what we had before.

It is critical that qualitative urban design assessments are maintained for medium density affordable housing and social /state housing developments with the Central City Living zone.

Reference 15

Good urban design based rules and guidelines are fundamental to achieving a good urban design outcome;

In the rebuild of our cities we need a robust urban design process to ensure the city achieves a good built outcome;

The current Urban Design Panel is a good process and has raised the standard of our urban environment since its inception;

Reference 16

Over the past decade, following the development of the Urban Design Protocol by the Ministry for Environment there has been greater recognition in New Zealand of the importance of good urban design. Many District Plans around the country now incorporate design assessments. The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement Policy 6.3.2. Development Form and Urban Design (which the Land Use Recovery Plan directed to be inserted) requires that residential development give effect to the principles of good urban design. This is to be achieved by objectives, policies and rules in District Plans.

The UDA replaced some rules which are standard in other zones, such as the Continuous Building Length rule, which is a crude means of trying to avoid bulky buildings, but better than nothing. It is helpful in ensuring that larger buildings are designed to fit with the finer grain of existing residential areas. Because of the amount of demolition, it is now more likely for sites to be amalgamated, this means there is a real danger of large bulky buildings being erected with Council having no opportunity to control their modulation and articulation. If the UDA is to be removed rules need to be included which cover the matters considered in the UDA, including addressing the street, CPTED, building modulation and articulation, layout and location of access and parking, privacy and outlook, environmental efficiency.

Reference 17

The Council notes that Policy 6.3.2 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement requires that residential development should give effect to the principles of good urban design, and that territorial authorities should include objectives, policies and rules in their district plan to give effect to this policy. The draft chapter proposes removing the urban design assessment matters proposed by the Council from the draft changes to the City Plan. The deleted assessment matters address turangawaewae (or sense of place), integration, connectivity, safety (including CPTED), choice and diversity, environmentally sustainable design and creativity and innovation. The

Council considers that the proposed rule changes are contrary to Policy 6.3.2 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Reference 18

Standardisation of Height to 14m

14. The council strongly opposes this standardisation of height to a single uniform level on the basis that it eliminates the opportunity for the creation and/or maintenance of distinctive, diverse and attractive central city residential communities. A uniform height limit does not take into account the existing built context, the relationship with significant open spaces, such as Hagley Park, and the effect of change on existing residents. This seems contrary to the intentions of the vision set out at the start of the chapter:

“Throughout the central city there will be opportunities for residential development that recognises and is influenced by the local context. (Emphasis added, Page 6.)

“These standards will benefit new residents and protect the amenity of those residents who have already made their home in the central city.” (Emphasis added, Page 8.)

Reference 19

Removing the requirements for Urban Design Assessments 25. Page 8 of “A Liveable City” notes that the Recovery Plan ...

“aims to improve the living environment with good urban design and comprehensive development.”

With the exception of rules retaining Urban Design Assessment for the Living 5 Zone (Travellers Accommodation) and the recognition that Breathe (the Housing Demonstrator project) was subject of an international urban design competition, urban design is not otherwise mentioned in “A Liveable City”.

Reference 20

The Council “Technical input” summary of the “Overview Central City Living Zone Review and Proposed District Plan Changes” at page 11 clearly sets out the background to Plan Change 53: Living 3 and 4 Zones. That discussion is repeated here for easy reference:

The current City Plan was publicly notified as the then proposed City Plan in 1995 and during the late 1990s there were a number of multi-unit developments that complied with yet did not provide a particularly good standard of design and appearance and were of a considerably greater height and bulk than surrounding residential properties. Concerns were raised by residents’ associations, Council officers, and members of professional bodies such as the New Zealand Institute of Architects about the perceived low quality of such developments.

Christchurch City Council Feedback on the Draft “A Liveable City” (August 2014) 7

.... Widespread community dissatisfaction with the quality of the design of some higher density development has continued. A Mayoral Forum was established to address a range of commercial and residential issues within the Four Avenues, and this led to a detailed review of the Living 3 and Living 4 zone provisions, in particular there was an investigation into whether the design and appearance of multi-unit developments could be improved while still providing for higher density development close to the City Centre. The Council prepared an issues and options paper for the Living 4 Zones. These discussion papers formed the basis of a round of public consultation that was undertaken in 2007. This issues and options paper is attached in Appendix 8 and was one of the reports that informed this review.

28. It appears that this advice, developed through extensive experience and genuine engagement with the community, has been overlooked during the 17 months that it has taken to develop “A Liveable City”. The Council provided a copy of the investigation paper “Issues and Options Paper: The design and scale of buildings within the

Central City Living 4 Zones” as technical appendix 8 to its plan. The Council stands by its analysis of the Plan Change 53 provisions.

Reference 21

“A Liveable City” proposes that it will improve the living environment through its Central City Living Zone planning rules. However, like the City Plan when it was publicly notified in 1995 (and which was subsequently proven to have failed prompting the Plan Change 53 process), these rules only define a range of standards and parameters within which buildings need to fit. In effect these broadly define how much development can be achieved on a site and its broad configuration. Developers will have their own set of parameters and, subject to any other site constraints, it is the interaction of factors which will determine what the form of residential development takes on sites in the city. The Minister is reminded that Plan Change 53 went through a Section 32 Analysis as part of a Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 process and was found to have met the purpose of the Act. It should not be set aside merely because of a perception (considered to be erroneous) that urban design impedes development. This is further discussed at paragraph 31.

Reference 22

Furthermore, policy 6.3.2 “Development Form and Urban Design” of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, as amended by the Minister on 6th December 2013 (to which district level planning frameworks must give effect) expects the principles of good urban design to be employed within new development. To this end the council engaged with CERA throughout the drafting of “A Liveable City”, with professionals from both organisations agreeing, in principal, that Urban Design Assessment was a critical part of decision making in relation to new residential development.

31. It is understood that subsequent to this, the Minister raised concerns that Urban Design Assessment introduces uncertainty for developers and that it has acted to hold back new development. In response to these points it is argued and noted that,

- The Council has dramatically simplified its matters for assessment down to just 5 matters. This compares to the 43 matters currently applied to Medium Density Housing in the operative city plan. These same 5 matters, subject to consultation and hearings, are proposed within the District Plan Review (Phase 1).

- That the Council’s rules around Urban Design Assessment already apply, generally, to sites delivering 3 or more new homes. There is no intention to reduce this threshold.
- The Council offers design advice to applicants and is prepared to work with them in advance of lodging resource consent applications. The advice is pragmatic and responsive to constraints faced by applicants.
- 99% of Resource Consent Applications were determined within statutory timeframes in 2013/14. This included consents that require Urban Design Assessments including the multi-unit residential

Christchurch City Council Feedback on the Draft “A Liveable City” (August 2014) developments in the Living 4 zones (which are the subject of the proposed plan change). A summary of consenting performance supplements this submission.

- A significant majority of applications for multi-unit developments breach one or more development standards (other than the urban design rule) and would be required to apply for a resource consent anyway. The Council considers that urban design rule does not impose an unreasonable level of additional regulation on new developments.
- Urban Design Assessment is well embedded in other cities across New Zealand, including Auckland, Wellington, Tauranga, Dunedin, Hamilton and Queenstown. Why should such assessment not be available to the City Council in managing the transformation of its central city residential areas. Furthermore, the Crown has employed urban designers, landscape designers and an array of other professionals to optimise how the Anchor projects contribute to the future functioning and appeal of the central city. Is the quality of living environments for future residents, particularly multi-unit complexes and large site redevelopments, not equally important?

- The minister is applauded for the fact that the Land Use Recovery Plan is readily applying Urban Design Assessment in newly introduced City Plan rules for sites where urban intensification is being incentivised (e.g. the Enhanced Development Mechanism and Community Housing Redevelopment Mechanism) and is actively seeking further step changes in design quality and innovation through Exemplar projects identified under Action 8 of that Plan. No doing so in a similar manner within the central city would be inconsistent with this approach.

32. In summary therefore, to satisfy the overall aims of the draft Residential Chapter and the policies of the Regional Policy Statement, the Council must have the ability to apply the principles of urban design in its decision making.

It is requested that the Minister reflects upon the points in the preceding section which should satisfy him that Urban Design Assessment is an asset, not a barrier, in promoting new development. Further to this, Council recommends CERA/CCDU officials re-engage in the productive dialogue achieved with Council staff towards including a simplified Urban Design Assessment framework within “A Liveable City” that is consistent with the wider District Plan Review. A range of background information related to Council’s Plan Change 53 is provided to reinforce the importance of the role of Urban Design in managing better quality outcomes. Appendix 5 – Urban Design Review of Recent Residential Development – which forms part of that material, is a particularly important source of information.

Reference 23

Furthermore, the City Council's Plan change 53, which was introduced following proper Resource Management processes and was developed as a consequence of the shortcomings of the City Plan in dealing with urban design issues, should not be set aside lightly because of fears that it might cause delays. The need for urban design assessment is widely recognised throughout the country. The benefits of good urban design well and truly outweigh any slight delay that such rules might cause and the existence of design review provision provides developers with an incentive to pay attention to good design from the outset. As previously noted, the failure to ensure good design will have lasting consequences long beyond the short term need to boost the population of the inner city.

Reference 24

We are also concerned that these adjustment attempts jettison the urban design vision being applied in other aspects of the inner city rebuild. A vibrant well designed city is what is referenced as the draw card to bring residents into the city. However these regulations get rid of requirements that ensure good design. They create a double standard where “special” projects (such as the Eastern Frame) are subject to design standards when the greater residential area is not. No thought seems to be given to existing houses and residents additionally there is a dearth of supporting evidence for any the proposed regulation changes.

Reference 25

The existing central city residents are restricted: "However, the assessment of the consent application will be limited to the assessment matters clearly set out in the zone provisions. Where an application for consent is required, it will not be notified. Instead, the consenting authority will give appropriate consideration to the amenity of third parties as part of its consideration of the specified assessment matters." (page 16) No provision is made for the Urban Design Panel to have input. CCDU seeks to influence the quality of design for its own Eastern Frame development but deliberately denies the central city resident right to have direct input and/or the Urban Design Panel to have an input in the quality of the design as is allowed in the CCC City Plan.

Reference 26

Exclusion of Sustainable development and Urban Design Principles Oppose: Ngai Tahu oppose the lack of any mention and provision for ecologically sustainable residential development in the Changes to Volume 2 and 3 of the City Plan.

Our reasons are: Sustainable development is a key tenet of the Resource Management Act (RMA). The RMA also states that people managing resources under the act must take kaitiakitanga into account. The RMA defines kaitiakitanga as ‘the exercise of guardianship by the tangata whenua of an area in accordance with tikanga Māori in relation to natural and physical resources; and includes the ethic of stewardship’. However, ecological sustainable development and the principle of kaitiakitanga are absent in the Changes to Volume 2 and 3 of the City Plan.

Furthermore, Ngāi Tahu assert that the rebuild development of the Christchurch city be undertaken in a sustainable manner in accordance with the principle of Kaitiakitanga as outlined in He Huanui Ara mo Waitaha – a pathway to recovery for Canterbury 2011. This involves minimizing adverse impacts on the natural environment and the protection of indigenous biodiversity. As such, this means that residential development should include “‘green’ and ecologically- sustainable urban design, technology and infrastructure”. This approach is incorporated in the Ngāi Tahu Subdivision and Development Guidelines (pg 107) in the Mahaanui IMP. These guidelines must be read in conjunction with the rest of the Mahaanui IMP, but consider the following; cultural landscapes, stormwater, earthworks, water supply and use, waste treatment and disposal, design guidelines, landscaping and open space.

Decision sought: (requested changes shown in red and Italics)

AMEND Objective 11.9 Role of the Central City Living Zone A predominantly residential environment offering a range of residential opportunities, within the central city to support the restoration and enhancement of an environmentally sustainable and vibrant city centre.

ADD additional bullet point under Objective 11.10 g) provide for environmentally sustainable urban design, technologies and infrastructure.

ADD provisions in development standards These new provisions above also need to be reflected and carried through in 4a.2 Development Standards for Central City Living Zone such as standards for water conservation, solar energy, grey water recycling, sustainable stormwater and wastewater treatment systems, alternative heating etc.

ADD new policy under Objective 11.10 11.10.4 Protect the environment through providing for the sustainable design qualities of the Urban Design Protocol and the Ngāi Tahu Subdivision and Development Guidelines - Mahaanui IMP.

Urban Design – Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Although the intent is sound, my belief is that there is a requirement to master plan a significant portion of the inner city living zone. An overall vision for the mixed use zone and living zone would be helpful to developers, who could then plan their projects according to a master plan. A large scale mixed use development should be initiated which provides amenity for inner city living. So much amenity has been destroyed in the central city so Urban Design on a large scale should be undertaken. The Master Plan should not only include residential, but also all the other ingredients which make up mixed use, such as Education, Live/Work, Offices, Retail, studios, Civic, Arts, Laneways, Hospitality, CCDU should engage a team of professionals who have undertaken mixed use planning and are a world authority on Mixed Use Master Planning. Do not rely on Christchurch Planners who do not have this experience. We have one chance to get this right for the future of Christchurch.

Reference 2

neither option will really work- the existing provision will take too long and limit possibilities, yet the market will not necessarily demand what is envisaged. central to what is proposed is the question- who will live in the central city, who can afford to live in the central city and what is there for these people to do- and where will their children

go to school? / the tension is that 'high quality' means usually, high cost- so will the central city become a type of rich gated community? /

Reference 3

As long as recession planes are adhered to, sunlight and privacy is retained, extra parking provided and a neutral colour scheme is proposed then Urban Design Panel type conversations are just a waste of time. These things can be ticked off in the permit stage....which, by the way, takes FIVE MONTHS...and counting...

Reference 4

no opinion

Reference 5

I do not support this requirement being removed in relation to the area currently designated SAM 30. This is an area comprising of homes, timber in structure, historical in character and forming a unique part of the central city whose preservation must be encouraged. Any new developments such as those at 90 and 92 Chester Street East for which resource and building consents have issued, must compliment and enhance the development of this special area.

Reference 6

I oppose the proposed provision. Urban design panel standards are fundamental to good urban design. In the CERA Draft of February 2014, 4a.2.12 Urban Design existed. It has now been deleted. There is no guarantee the market will look after "appearance and amenity". Every major city in NZ recognises this and many have strengthened their rules and requirements to that ensure good design is considered in central city areas. The provisions contained in the CERA Draft of February 2014 should be returned to this document to ensure that existing appearance and amenity of environments and neighbouring areas are considered in development permissions.

Reference 7

Good design will come with experience, the council have been too rigid in the past with their requirements.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 8

Good urban design cannot be achieved by complying with rules. The UDA is a means of encouraging design flair and enabling site characteristics and context to be taken into account. With the introduction of an UDA, provision of design guidance by CCC and free advice from the City Council's Urban Design Panel there has been some improvement in the design and appearance of residential proposals.

Reference 9

For example: Auckland City urban design assessment is seen as important: "Good urban design is critical in enabling Auckland to become the world's most liveable city".

In Nelson: "Improving urban design is a priority for both Nelson City and Tasman District Councils. Both are signatories to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol. The establishment of an Urban Design Panel is a key way of spearheading better urban design outcomes."

Edinburgh, Scotland has the "Edinburgh Urban Design Panel [which] gives design advice. Its aim is to raise the quality of new buildings, streets and spaces in Edinburgh".

And Vancouver: "The Urban Design Panel (UDP) advises City Council and staff about development proposals or policies, including major development applications, rezoning applications, and other projects of public interest."

As well, the panel helps the Planning Department and City Council create urban design policy, including the design and interrelationship of all physical components of the City."

Retain Urban design panel

The current development rules are very light on detail in relation to design features, on the assumption that a design panel will have some check on acceptable outcomes. Dropping the design check without reinstating detailed rules is only implementing half the system. This then leaves the city exposed to the risk of low-quality buildings. This actually happened under the 1995 City Plan, leading to the Plan Change 53 which set up the urban design process.

Reference 10

Changes required: When residential developments meet the given threshold, these must be subject to an urban design panel, as is the case in the business area and inner-city frames. This will be particularly important for retaining the quality and suitability to context of developments, when the SAMs are removed.

East Frame Central Park

East Frame – Central Park – Cafes

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Café.

Reference 2

cafes would be good too

Reference 13

Allow cafes.

Reference 4

More interested in seeing the coffee shops / bars / restaurants / galleries and offices that open out onto it.

East Frame - Central Park – BBQ, Picnic, Seating Spaces

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

BBQ areas

Reference 2

seating and areas to relax in,

Reference 3

Picnic,

Reference 4

People walking or sitting on park benches amongst well chosen shrubbery.

Reference 5

/ Permanent tables and benches. Covered areas for bbq.

Reference 6

Picnic tables and attached seats, barbecue areas

Reference 7

Large and small picnic tables so large and small families can sit together at the appropriate sized table.

Reference 8

Plenty of seating. Picnic surfaces.

Reference 9

Carefully chosen seating with backs at the right angle - sitting is a valuable pleasure. Bird tables.

Reference 10

courtyards and amphitheaters

Reference 11

seating and a barbecue

Reference 12

A small amphitheater or bermed area

Reference 13

It is important to make sure that the public feels welcome in these areas and that they don't become an extended private space of the property owners. To achieve this good places for pub gathers need to be included such as bbq areas, area's for picnics

Reference 14

Family friendly picnic/bbq areas.

Reference 15

outdoor cooking areas

Reference 16

picnics,

East Frame - Central Park – Community Gardens and Similar, rain garden**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

Forget the central park, use the space for private gardens.

Reference 2

Community gardens, rain gardens and green walls would be interesting

Reference 3

Yes agree - see previous answer re community gardens.

Reference 4

Forget community gardens, open to exploitation, misuse, conflict and greed. CHC is moving beyond mediaeval, and in reality is not a 'feel good' city

Reference 5

Occupiers will not generally be interested in community produce gardens - think sophistication.

Reference 6

a food garden

Reference 7

community gardens are a must and organisations such as Agropolis and Garden City 2.0 are leading the charge here and could take up the responsibility for this

Reference 8

The inclusion of community gardens is good but this needs careful design and governance development for it to blossom.

Reference 9

I like the idea of communitiy gardens

Reference 10

A community garden, and composting!

Reference 11

community vegetable gardens, community orchards,

Reference 12

Like the idea of a rain garden.

Reference 13

Community gardens, including fruit trees.

Reference 14

community vegetable gardens / planetd herb stations near outdoor cooking areas /

Reference 15

Allotment gardens that people can lease and that have strict rules to keep in a tidy manner. These would be well coordinated with an on site supervisor. I do not want a scruffy community garden in a central spot unless it is managed well and looks aesthetically pleasing .

Reference 16

Like the idea of rain gardens & community gardens.

Reference 17

Community gardens if there is security so people don't damage them on purpose or steal from them, and they should be practical eg edible. These sort of things could be on rooftops as they are in the UK.

Reference 18

If there are community gardens the sprays they use need to be controlled so they don't impact on residents nearby.

East Frame - Central Park – Cycle, Skate, Walking Paths, Dogs

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

dog friendly spaces,

Reference 2

cycling

Reference 3

skate boarding

Reference 4

Cycle paths.

Reference 5

I would love to see the East frame as an open green space criss-crossed with walking and cycle paths.

Reference 6

And wide tracks for children to bike on

Reference 7

as well as cycle paths

Reference 8

Bike parks, cycle ways

Reference 9

Dog parks.

Reference 10

bike paths, dog walking areas with strict laws

Reference 11

Running, walking, cycling

East Frame– Central Park – Disagree or comments on Size of Park

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

I think that a grassed area or what-not of approx. 50 metres is rather wide, maybe 30-40 max? I definitely agree on a space which is welcome to not just residents, but there still needs to be some density.

Reference 2

Don't have the park going between the too wide.

Reference 3

Forget the central park, use the space for private gardens. Latimer Square is a good size and needs all the activity it can get to make it safe

Reference 4

I would like to express my very great disappointment with the extreme reduction in scale of the green frame when compared with the original concept. The Central Recovery Plan actually states 40-50 metres, not the 50 metres mentioned above. This looks to be about 25% of the width of Latimer Square - it will be disproportionately long and narrow - not much more than a green road. Latimer Square's width would be acceptable. / / The safety argument is alarmist and cynical. If the green belt is to be bordered by medium density apartment buildings, it could be far wider than this. Safety requires good lighting, not cramped spaces. This is clearly an excuse to release more land for development. / /

Reference 5

On this basis Hagley Park is an unsafe area exploited by anti-social activities!

Reference 6

I think your 'too wide' is dangerous is ridiculous. The streets of Christchurch aren't 50 m wide and look at the behaviour of drunk bar patrons.

Reference 7

The draft plan shows a frame full of either housing or other development and very little open space. I oppose any development within the frame and would like to see it treated like Hagley Park.

Reference 8

The central park is very narrow in width, more so than had been envisaged, and should be much greater in width. I am concerned that the shadow effect from high rise apartments will obstruct morning and late afternoon sun, making the park less enjoyable and dull on certain days and times. The Margaret Mahy Family Playground also appears to have diminished in size, and initial plans showed the whole block to Madras Street as being reserve. I do not support any development on that site where shown as it will detract from the playground. I am also disappointed that the reference to Elsie Locke Park is deleted.

Reference 9

. If the land taken from property owners is not to be used for the park, it should be returned to them as it was taken on false pretences.

Reference 10

Land taken from those in the Eastern Frame which is not to be used as part of the park but is instead going to be used as commercial or residential development should be returned to the original property holders.

East Frame - Central Park – Events, Festivals, Art, Music

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Community activities with the occasional events for the wider community

Reference 2

A Park is an open green space for mostly passive activities. If a mixed use model was developed (as described in my previous comments) , then it will be a place of focus for the community that is developed in the Eastern Frame. It would be used for creating Events, Festivals, Markets, Kiosks, Carts, Programs. All these things need to be organised and then you will create a community. / You need to create a much better name than " Eastern Frame Community".... needs a simple clear name that will help create community!

Reference 3

Provisions for the area to be used for outdoor concerts (provided there are not too many NIMBYs)

Reference 4

Space available to community organised activities.

Reference 5

A hub for arts and community events and festivals.

Reference 6

Public art/sculpture.

Reference 7

Performance space/s.

Reference 8

Little open auditoriums where street theatre could take place. No need for special structures but just space and trees and soft decorative lighting.

Reference 9

We need to create a festival special to Central Christchurch something similar to the Lantern Festival in Dunedin or a giant puppet festival.

Reference 10

open art galleries/installations, open air functions.

Reference

Community events (fairs, markets etc).

Reference 12

A small amphitheater or bermed area for open air theatre, movies and concerts such as in the Botanic Gardens over Summer

Reference 13

Public art, both temporary and permanent with a variation of scale and type.

Reference 14

and music

Reference 15

Concerts,

Reference 16

buskers, low noise music activities, outdoor theatre,

Reference 17

Community events,

East Frame – Central Park - Exercise Equipment**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

Also, maybe dotted along the stretch could be some 'exercise stations,' like in Hagley Park, where you head to each station and do the exercise or use the equipment at that station- Spain has some great examples in their parks with

outdoor exercise equipment. Please search 'outdoor exercise equipment' in Google- when I was in Spain, I had great fun on these- kiwi's would love them! / / I

Reference 2

Also, I think it would be awesome to have outdoor exercise equipment along these parks in between housing.

Reference 3

Some beaut outdoor gym equipment such as in Hagley Park nr Victoria Lake.

Reference 4

, exercise areas.

Reference 5

Fitness parks

Reference 6

Training sports/exercise

East Frame - Central Park – Markets

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Markets,

Reference 2

A market area similar to the former Art Centre Markets and the Riccarton Markets.

Reference 3

Community markets.

Reference 4

A proper produce market selling properly grown produce from outlying areas, Eastern red-zone land market garden, existing produce gardeners etc.

Reference 5

markets etc).

Reference 6

small markets

Reference 7

/ markets for sale of local produce,

East Frame - Central Park – Playgrounds

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

A swing set strong enough for adults to sit on and think whilst idly swinging to and fro at night!!

Reference 2

Play equipment for children.

Reference 3

A playground like the Heathcote one.

Reference 4

and perhaps even other things like small play grounds

Reference 5

children's play parks

Reference 6

Playground

Reference 7

Special features like Margaret Mahy playground, labyrinth, contemplation park, scented park,

Reference 8

No children's equipment they've gotten enough recognition in all the other initiatives.

East Frame - Central Park – Safety, Good Design**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

as opposed to prostitution, winos, drug abuse, homeless people, rape, assault, muggings etc. Care needs to be taken that these areas do not turn in to "no go" areas after dark like Latimer Square was before the quakes. Walkways need to be safe after dark so people travelling from the residential zones in the east to CBD feel safe to walk through the area and don't have to take a long detour to avoid it or drive a short distance in to the city.

Reference 2

No prostitutes, no homeless people, signs of careful maintenance of park. I dread to think it could be as depressing as Cranmer or Latimer squares.

Reference 3

Barrier surfaces to discourage skaters where appropriate. Lighting.

Reference 4

all sounds great. PLEASE invest in design quality, use someone who has done something similar e.g. Wellington waterfront or Britomart or Wynyard. We desperately need inspiration that our city will not be left to whims of profit-makers!

Reference 5

Don't mind as long as well designed. More interested in seeing the coffee shops / bars / restaurants / galleries and offices that open out onto it.

Reference 6

Anything, but good lighting and good design to discourage hooligans, graffiti etc is key

Reference 7

Accessible Design to ensure the space is able to be used by everyone - not just those who have wheeled mobility devices but include those who are blind or have low vision.

Reference 8

There is a huge land shortage, ridiculous distances people are having to travel by wiping out masses of the city and excluding housing. We have the technology using rib raft foundations to make rebuilding there safe. Perhaps not too many stories is the answer?! Seen heaps of places in the UK where antisocial behaviour is an issue.

East Frame– Central Park – Sports, Recreation

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

I have always loved petanque, which would be a great sociable activity in the area, and would fit well, being long and narrow.

Reference 2

Perhaps some chess tables dotted along the area, like the ones found in parks in other countries (U.S, France).

Reference 3

archery, sports etc

Reference 4

Sports and social activities.

Reference 5

Have some Junior sports fields in there, so that its used by Chch residents in the weekend, Netball, skate boarding rugby & soccer, as well as a couple of basketball courts

Reference 6

Outdoor table tennis (popular in London)

Reference 7

/ an outdoor game activity to give people a reason to be in the space

Reference 8

A space that is welcoming for a quick game of soccer

Reference 9

Outdoor sports areas, jogging.

Reference 10 -

Passive recreation,

Reference 11

Sports

Reference 12

sports - chess

Reference 13

Training sports/exercise

Reference 14

'bumping in spaces' - places can play majong, chess etc as in other great cities.

East Frame - Central Park – Trees, Grass, Plants, Landscaped, Shelter**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

native planting,

Reference 2

LOTS OF TREES!

Reference 3

Many trees. Not exclusively natives.

Reference 4

Clever landscaping.

Reference 5

well chosen shrubbery.

Reference 6

trees and shade.

Reference 7

I support lots of trees

Reference 8

create sheltered spots (wind)

Reference 9

I'd like to see garden areas that look more organic than newer parks often do. I like variety - not just native plantings, also some Europeans - and please not the same plants that you see everywhere all over Christchurch subdivisions. In fact, if you want a guideline for what will appeal to me - DO NOT REPRODUCE A SUBURBAN SUBDIVISION. Variety is key.

Reference 10

East Frame should landscaped, treed

Reference 11 -

Trees and grass areas

Reference 12

A major consideration must be the Easterly. Wind breaks, Shelter belts, covered ways will all assist to make the park liveable.

Reference 13

and lots of trees and grass

Reference 14

Also like places where people can gather comfortably out of the wind

East Frame– Central Park – Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

enough space to play games but not impinge on foot traffic,

Reference 2

green space to offset the intensive developments, ensuring that sun and light is maximised

Reference 3

/ I can't wait to see new developments springing up- I know the city is going to be great!

Reference 4

Bellbirds used to sing in Hagley Park, along Park Terrace (and sometimes in my garden) every morning. / About a year after the September quake the bellbirds vanished. Too many noisy God-whats in the park. / / Limit the bands, loud hailers and fireworks and you may get bellbirds. Everybody likes them and they're free.

Reference 5

A village square atmosphere. Gentle, quiet relaxation. Sitting on the grass under trees.

Reference 6

No permanent activities

Reference 7

Stormwater treatment !!! most important part,

Reference 8

places to interact casually include things for young people not just the standard playequipment - make the entire park a innercity playground for everyone , with seats to sit and climb, water features to play with that also cool the summer air , berms to roll down , lie on and skate down, create easy walking as well as challenging pths like hopping over the stormwater areas, trees to cling into with real swings! allow the park to be gradually inhabited and changed by people to make it their own. Allow as much as possible restrict as little as possible /

Reference 9

However we already have a lot of open space in the central city, so would prefer to see it used for activities.

Reference 10

withheld under section 9(2)(a)

Bird tables. Talk to [REDACTED] CCC Ranger, about this

Reference 11

Allow the frame to be flexible, and maybe changeable over time

Reference 12

Duckpond.

Reference 13

or to lie in the sun reading a book

Reference 14

Sounds very simplistic.

Reference 15

The green areas should have a very wide range of activities. The important thing is that there isn't big areas of initialised areas

Reference 16

Like the central park focus.

Reference 17

emphasis on children and water features.

Reference 18

All the above sounds good. Let it be public.

Reference 19

There need to be licensing of some activities where there could be a public health impact on users e.g. Things that may break the skin or burn the skin. Also things like alcohol, psychoactive substances smoking etc need to be well controlled

Reference 20

Similarly no water features that promote mosquitoes!!

Comments received via email and post**Reference 21**

10. Chester Street: Specific Concerns; Aside from the above mentioned retention of SAM 30 for Chester Street East. We are concerned about the proposed Central City park which appears to have been reduced in size along with the proposed Margaret Mahy Children Playground with high density buildings proposed along Madras Street. This means from a design and planning viewpoint the playground is hidden from the residents of Chester Street and will be confined visually solely to the residents of the "Frame". This is a lost opportunity to create something special for the Playground.

Change Required:

CCDU in its development plans ensure there is no shadow effect for the residences in Chester Street East resulting from the development of the "Frame" along Madras Street. The proposed development based on the "Poplars" site be scrapped and the playground be extended so it is open to the residences opposite and along Madras Street (including the new high density buildings).

East Frame Amenities**East Frame Amenities – Aesthetics****Comment received online****Reference 1**

I would like there to be many green roofs and walls.

East Frame Amenities – Cycle Ways

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

access to cycle ways

Reference 2

Cycle ways,

Reference 3

bike paths and safe bicycle access to city bike paths, slow traffic speeds

Reference 4

Shared cycles.

East Frame Amenities – Education, Culture

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Pre-school

Reference 2

Pre school, primary school,

Reference 3

daycare

Reference 4

Good local amenities, e.g. The central library, art gallery, concert venues.

Reference 5

Pre-schools, and childcare

Reference 6

Easy access to a proper performing arts facility and cultural activities

East Frame Amenities – Entertainment

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

maybe a small arthouse movie theatre.

Reference 2

Movie theatres are good,

Reference 3

entertainment,

Reference 4

entertainment facilities

East Frame Amenities – Healthcare

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

doctors.

Reference 2

doctors,

Reference 3

medical centers

Reference 4

medical centre

East Frame Amenities – Hospitality

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Cafe

Reference 2

Small cafes and bars

Reference 3 -

restaurants

Reference 4

hospitality

Reference 5

cafés

Reference 6

Cafe's and small local businesses.

Reference 7

small cafes, small bars, small pubs

Reference 8

cafes

Reference 9

also restaurants and cafes , bistros

Reference 10

Cafes

Reference 11

bars, cafes, restaurants etc.

Reference 12

Cafes

East Frame Amenities – Markets, Food Shops

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Convenience stores

Reference 2

a farmers market

Reference 3

a convenience store

Reference 4

supermarket/dairy

Reference 5

markets,

Reference 6

Places to shop for ordinary things - food,

Reference 7

Supermarket

Reference 8

small grocers selling fresh produce.

Reference 9

dairy,

Reference 10

bakery, and other fresh food, butcher etc.

Reference 11

temp markets/stalls

Reference 12

convenience stores.

Reference 13

Food stalls.

Reference 14

food shopping, proper produce market,

East Frame Amenities – Nature, Environment

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

I would like to have 30% of the inner city covered with tree canopy.

Reference 2

well lit green spaces

Reference 3

Green space

Reference 4

no graffiti, no vandalism, rubbish removed promptly ie good caretaker on site

Reference 5

Wide open green recreational space as original proposed.

Reference 6

Gardens, parks, village squares,

Reference 7

parks, seating, walkways

Reference 8

park/s, shelter from noise from traffic and late-night drinkers

East Frame Amenities – Parking

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

awareness that central city residents will work outside the CBD so car parking facilities are important

Reference 2

Safe, secure car and bicycle parking, off the streets

Reference 3

Car parking. Plenty of service vehicle access.

Reference 4

also consider a small rent a care by the hour for those that do not have individual cars (no carparking!!

Reference 5

Some parking availability but does not necessarily have to be right outside my front door

East Frame Amenities – Public Facilities

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

community gardens, picnic areas, community BBQ's, areas to relax in ie. reading spots

Reference 2

parks,

Reference 3

Inner city dog park including dog agility activities.

Reference 4

A pool.

Reference 5

footpath seating, water fountains, public phones, public wifi.

Reference 6

Availability of space to grow things, e.g. community gardens either within a development or public community gardens. Good local amenities, e.g. The central library, art gallery, concert venues.

Reference 7

Toilets, playgrounds

Reference 8

I don't have kids but love the proposal for the big playground. I understand it's kind of for adults as well, so that's cool.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 9

This could be home to a host of features that support community development such as vegetable gardens, allotments, and transitional space projects.

East Frame Amenities – Public Transport

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

good reliable and safe (ie not threatening like the current bus service) public transport,

Reference 2

Transport option around the inner city.

Reference

public transport

Reference 4

bus transport close by

East Frame Amenities – Professional Services

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

lawyers, accountants

East Frame Amenities – Retail

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

a wine shop,

Reference 2

a few small boutique style shops that would never be in a shopping mall

Reference 3

shops,

Reference 4

clothing,

Reference 5

specialty shops,

Reference 6

, florist and giftshop all of these should be small boutique style shops not bigbox or chain retail

Reference 7

and or tourist facilities, not residential living

East Frame Amenities – Safety

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Green spaces that were safe from the hoodie boys, the gangs and the drunks and drugged.

Reference 2

sufficient and efficient lighting for walking to and from town

Reference 3

People need to be able to live where they reside and not use a car necessarily. If you get a lot of foot traffic, this enhances safety and grows a sense of community.

Reference 4

visible police patrols

East Frame Amenities – Services

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

hairdresser

Reference 2

hair dresser

Reference 3

drycleaner, hairdresser, internet cafe

Reference 4

a bike repair,

Reference 5

Storage facilities.

Reference 6

Laundry facilities.

East Frame Amenities – Sporting, Exercise

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

kayak launching spots, cycle tracks,

Reference 2

gym

Reference 3

swimming pool and gym,

Reference 4

The council should focus on what people do want and things that would improve their health and wellbeing such as pools and gyms for the Eastern Frame.

East Frame Amenities – Specific

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Centennial Pool was nice and convenient. Thanks for that. It was nice to have a swimming pool within easy walking distance from home.

Reference 2

My favourite Bar & Restaurant before the EQs, The Bicycle Thief being retained and allowed to return to its former site (latimer Square) / Provisions for a range of different shaped and sized homes (including heratige

homes) to be allowed. Also retail and offices should be allowed. The retention of the IRD and Pavillion buildings along with the Art Deco former MED building on Armagh St, The loss of the Majestic Theatre and Centennial Pool are huge losses and frankly stupid decisions for which I have heard no explanation for. / An area that reflects the areas rich social history.

Reference 3

retention of the former Cashel Chambers building, Christchurch club building and other similar buildings.

Reference 4

creat a small node of services ie on manchester and lichfield corner close to the central bus station may be a small covered fresh produce market

East Frame Amenities – Transport

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

also consider a small rent a care by the houyr for those that do not have individual cars (no carparking!!

Reference 2

light-rail connection to elsewhere,

East Frame Amenities – Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

What I a suggesting is a village, where I can get most of what I need and I can chose to go or not go into the city

Reference 2

Very difficult to support amenities in new residential areas unless publicly funded

Reference 3

Long-term, mixed age and status residents to create neighbourhoods, and NOT just short-term party boys and girls, old unemplyed males, druggies, the prostitutes and their minders.

Reference 4

Noise standards between floors and unit walls far in excess of what is currently allowed

Reference 5

Again if you had lived in multi-unit complexes where these standards are met as opposed to the norm in NZ you would understand what is possible and what should be mandatory

Reference 6

music on the sidewalks as in New Orleans

Reference 7

Spaces for community groups - have you thought about whether churches will be able to be located anywhere near?

Reference 8

meeting areas and rooms.

Reference 9

No comment.

Reference 10

I see the East Frame as a park that gives the eastern side of the central city a recreation space similar to Hagley Park. However in the draft plan the east frame has been reduced to a thin internal plaza within a high density housing area that no one else will ever see - I vehemently oppose this.

Comments received via email and post

Reference 11

We would also like to encourage community participation in the layout of the eastern frame area.

Reference 12

The current layout as proposed is in need of some good design application to make the space more people orientated and at a human scale. By doing this it is a way to bring cohesion to wider neighbourhood areas and improve desirability of central city living for others.

East Frame Living Density

East Frame Living Density –Access or transport related

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Ease of access, adequate visitor car parking - especially for families and friends visiting, efficient local public transport,

Reference 2

Cycleways, on-street parking kept to a minimum

Reference 3

two-lane instead of one lane on Barbadoes St and Madras St, it seems like the East frame would be a bit isolated by the traffic either side.

Reference 4

out of site car parking

Reference 5

Public transport stops near to housing.

Reference 6

Underground carparking

Reference 7

Much improved public transport (ideally a shared vehicle system like ZipCar).

Reference 8

The CSHWP submits that the East Frame must provide sustainable neighbourhoods that: / • make it easier to walk, cycle and take the bus. Walkable neighbourhoods tend to be friendlier and safer. Recent Australian research has shown that nearly three quarters of urban motor vehicle use can be predicted on the basis of two factors: access to full-time public transport, and street layout. Transport costs are the second largest costs to most households, after the cost of housing.

Reference 9

Suitable parking facilities,

Reference 10

Easy access for pedestrians and cyclists.

Reference 11

Good public transport

Reference 12

reduced traffic

Reference 13

safe roads

Reference

and parking provision

Reference 15

limited parking access close by for 1 car per 2 people

Reference 16

access to public transport,

Reference 17

Beacon submits that the East Frame must provide sustainable neighbourhoods that: / • make it easier to walk, cycle and take the bus. Walkable neighbourhoods tend to be friendlier and safer. Recent Australian research has shown that nearly three quarters of urban motor vehicle use can be predicted on the basis of two factors: access to full-time public transport, and street layout. Transport costs are the second largest costs to most households, after the cost of housing.

Reference 18

Parking should be coherently planned for all the dwellings so there is only an maximum of 1 entrance/exit per (old fashioned) block, thereby allowing it to be a place for people (and not all about the darned car).

East Frame Living Density – Affordability**Comments received through online survey**

Reference 1

Affordable accommodation

Reference 2

Affordability,

Reference 3

affordability - value for money.

Reference 4

Affordable

Reference 5

Affordable rent.

Reference 6

affordability,

East Frame Living Density – Amenities, facilities and services**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

amenities such as cafes and small bars, community markets (ie farmers market) to complement supermarkets.

Reference 2

access to cafes restaurants and bars,

Reference 3

,easy access to supermarket

Reference 4

A pool.

Reference 5 -

availability of shops - not poncy gift boutique or grotty, over-priced "convenience stores but a mid-size supermarket or greengrocers, dairy, butcher shop.

Reference 6

storage available

Reference 7

Cafes, restaurants and convenience stores nearby

Reference 8

The area should provide access to pre-school and childcare, as well as outdoor and indoor recreation and socialising areas.

Reference 9

Communal laundry. Communal IT centre.

Reference 10

Good facilities such as gyms, pool and cafes

Reference 11

Quality developments with good ongoing management of maintenance and security.

Reference 12

Proximity to work/shopping/entertainment locations.

Reference 13

Access to a good quality nearby public park.

Reference 14

Not having a stadium on my doorstep, but small developments of B/C grade... rather than high end. Culture! Arts!

Reference 15

provide local services - offering good shopping, services and facilities locally, builds a strong sense of community.

Reference 16

plenty of shops, cafes at ground level (like European cities)

Reference 17

, community facilities,

Reference 18

some retail closely at hand

Reference 19

shared areas for families and activities,

Reference 20

walkable supermarket

Reference 21

Apart from that - local play/swim area for children,

Reference 22

Attractive cafes - prefer old heritage buildings for them!

Reference 23

lots of restaurants, bars and cafes and nice shops.

Reference 24

opportunity for offices to work in near by.

Reference 25

Good amenities.

Reference 26

bike paths, walking areas for you and dogs,

Reference 27

quirky shopping and eating areas, local produce, not MALLS

Reference 28

and most of all, lots of community facilities to appeal not only to workers but also children and the elderly - e.g. parks, gyms, libraries, and most of all, interesting urban experiments such as gap filler etc are already doing.

Reference 29

East Frame living should provide benefits of inner city living: connection to night life, culture art, eateries and supermarkets within walking distance.

Reference 30

provide local services - offering good shopping, services and facilities locally, builds a strong sense of community.

East Frame Living Density – Building Design**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

developments with high levels of soundproofing, solar energy and central heating

Reference 2

in addition to shared open spaces,

Reference 3

with good-sized rooms, plenty of storage space, garage and private outdoors area. Warm, well insulated and able to catch the sun.

Reference 4

On the existing outlook, none, / If the places had real space, good design, storage, and car-parking then they would because inner city living makes far more sense than suburban trekking

Reference 5

townhouses with greened front courtyards and low open fences rather than a slew of cold slab fronted buildings. Consider features such as outdoor front stairways to 2nd level units in 2-storey buildings. Building with varied frontages for character.

Reference 6

sunny

Reference 7

really good acoustic insulation,

Reference 8

Ground floor garage/storage facilities in each block, sufficient for the residents of each block. This will maximise the outdoor space for the use of residents and visitors. / One apartment per floor, although some could be a dual type apartment where both would be owned by one family, and that one side could be a smaller version of the other, self-contained, that could be rented or kept for

Reference 9

storage available

Reference 10

Stepped or terraced apartments with green space in the centre plus a verandahed wide walkway around the development.

Reference 11

The right to hang washing outside if desired. One heating system which services the entire building.

Reference 12

Stringent noise insulation requirements,

Reference 13

Adequately sizes apartments.

Reference 14

An absence of 3 bedroom dwellings. / / One and two bedroom apartments might attract some owner-occupiers. Three bedroom dwellings only attract tenants who are usually collections of flatmates. They only stay for a year and do not 'invest' in the area. They are more likely to disturb neighbours with noise or rubbish.

Reference 15

Having some outdoor space,

Reference 16

and good sun.

Reference 17

, shared open spaces,

Reference 18

Diversity in materials, block forms, roof pitches. Bringing in a human scale.

Reference 19

Some outdoor area even if it is just a balcony.

Reference 20

Design, sunlight access, sound insulation,

Reference 21

Some disability access single level living.

Reference 22

good outdoor space - both shared and private

Reference 23

The quality of the housing needs to be excellent in terms of noise mitigation/ noise control which can be done with good quality walls, and provision needs to be made for this in the plan. This can help to make the environment calmer. Look to how a country such as Switzerland, or the Netherlands, plans and build communities for people - they don't build one block at a time, but rather have an overall aesthetically pleasing plan for an area.

East Frame Living Density – Building Height**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

buildings kept to a consistent height of 4-5 storeys,

Reference 2

Please have a nice consistent density of housing in the city, of 3-5 storeys high

Reference 3

Low rise terraced houses with their own garage/car port and small garden i.e; an urban village. This vision of Central Park New York is totally alien to Christchurch and the New Zealand way of life. The central park is something which only looks good on paper, in reality it is likely to be boring and windswept. Hobsonville Point is a good NZ example of how to build attractive higher density living or look to U.K. and Europe for a better model than six storey appartments.

Reference 4

no more than 4 floors,

Reference 5

Maximum of three storeys.

Reference 6

the height restriction is also good but it needs to also make suure that there are some variations in height to avoid creating continuous blocks and address the issue of shading each other and shading the park

Reference 7

Not that - too high. The four storeys that was originally proposed would be better.

Reference 8

I would want a mix of building heights, and dwelling sizes so that a good mix of residents is attracted i.e. single people living separately or sharing, families with more than one child, business people with and without children, and retired people.

Reference 9

Lower height limits for one, no more than three storeys for a sense of connection to the park and community.

Reference 10

Prefer lower max height.

Reference 11

I would not like to see too much shadow effect on the central park.

Reference 12

6 storeys ok

Reference 13

Six storeys is too high for residential blocks. Limit it to 4.

Reference 14

Low rise, no higher that 2 floors

East Frame Living Density – Density

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

The Eastern Frame will require a lot more than housing and an open park to create a community. Also at this early stage of the rebuild the Eastern Frame is too isolated from high quality real estate of the West. It is a proven

principal of real estate development that " do not build high value real estate next to low value real estate if you wish to make a profit". The Eastern Frame is too close to low value real estate in the Madras Street to Fitzgerald Avenue. I doubt if 750 apartments around a park will work. The first sales will be very difficult. I believe the density will need to be much higher, with mixed use amenities attached, for it to be successful economically. If the density was much higher and there was live/work, offices, retail and studio, hospitality, Education, small theatres, galleries etc then it may work in my view.

Reference 2

high density with a variety of residential typologies, the park and the mixed use component.

Reference 3

Compact but efficient/clever use of space, and storage available.

Reference 4

I would want a mix of building heights, and dwelling sizes so that a good mix of residents is attracted i.e. single people living separately or sharing, families with more than one child, business people with and without children, and retired people.

Reference 5

have enough people to thrive. A higher density neighbourhood has enough population to support thriving town centres and make public transport viable. It also reduces city sprawl allowing people to live closer to city centres and jobs, and needs less new roading and costly water and drainage infrastructure.

Reference 6

have enough people to thrive. A higher density neighbourhood has enough population to support thriving town centres and make public transport viable. It also reduces city sprawl allowing people to live closer to city centres and jobs, and needs less new roading and costly water and drainage infrastructure.

East Frame Living Density – Diversity

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Vibrant community within a mixed use urban model people live work play, a village environment

Reference 2

Lots of people,

Reference 3

mixed developments,

Reference 4

Residential development that employs good urban design techniques and is not too standardised - I don't want to live in a neighbourhood where everything looks like Sim City.

Reference 5

A mix of accommodation for all sorts of social units.

Reference 6

A mix of apartments /dwellings that allows both first home buyers and more established people to purchase

Reference 7

This should be a vibrant broad cross section of the community rather than an enclave for the rich.

Reference 8

The eastern frame is potentially a great concept. However it needs to be developed so that it doesn't just become a domain for rich boomers to inhabit the city. To achieve this it needs a variety of stock, of different sizes and qualities. It should have some provision for social housing, and include other small non-residential types of buildings to keep the area of interest for non-residents.

Reference 9

provide choices of housing types and sizes - allowing people to stay in the neighbourhood as their circumstances change.

Reference 10

Need it's of variety of height and design - we don't want a boring uniform city. Keep as much heritage as possible also

Reference 11

Mixed use area - left to organically grow.

Reference 12

diversity,

Reference 13

Mix of use would make living in the East Frame attractive rather than separating residential and non residential.

Reference 14

provide choices of housing types and sizes - allowing people to stay in the neighbourhood as their circumstances change. /

East Frame Living Density – Enviro-friendly

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Must be good north facing orientation for all units. / Energy efficient housing - e.g. solar water heating; insulation, double glazing, a district heating scheme; rain water collection;

Reference 2

and energy efficiency

Reference 3

Also people were very clear in the share an idea that they wanted an environmentally focused city, this government led housing provides and extraordinary opportunity to develop affordable and good quality and environmentally progressive housing as an example for the market. Without these examples the market will not develop.

Reference 4

provide opportunities for shared local energy and water schemes. Neighbourhoods could provide the right scale to develop renewable energy systems and to address water issues, particularly grey water systems and storm water. /

Reference 5

reduced Easterly wind factor. Quality construction with eco-sustainable values

Reference 6

good natural light - reduce heating/ventilation through mechanical means /

Reference 7

provide opportunities for shared local energy and water schemes. Neighbourhoods could provide the right scale to develop renewable energy systems and to address water issues, particularly grey water systems and storm water. /

East Frame Living Density – Natural Environment**Comments received through online survey****Reference 1**

(more trees & landscaping),

Reference 2

pretty much just TREES, TREES, and more TREES! By having a look at all of the more expensive neighbourhoods of the city (e.g. Cashmere, Merivale, Sumner) these suburbs have mostly tree-lined streets, which looks amazing! / /

Reference 3

well maintained grounds

Reference 4

What would attract me is the original concept of the eastern frame, being a wide expanse of green grass framing the city, not an narrow strip of land hardly visible and bounded by 6 storey developments.

Reference 5

open spaces

Reference 6

community gardens, allotments,

Reference 7

Ability to have an enclosed communal garden plot per apartment block to grow vegies and small fruits etc.

Reference 8

It's very important for me that there are pleasant spaces nearby to relax in the outdoors and to wander around - these would be most attractive if they are not developed too uniformly and have a variety of types of spaces with some shelter. For example, long rows of identical trees and a square garden filled with identical tussocks are a big no-no. I'd also like to see a variety of plantings - some natives, some Europeans, and lots of colour.

Reference 9

Communal gardens.

Reference 10

A clear public space that is well activated with community gardens and activities welcoming all into the central city and engagement with their town.

Reference 11

create a sense of community through parks and public spaces where people can get together and where natural habitats are preserved

Reference 12

areas to exercise and play outdoors.

Reference 13

good landscaping and gardens

Reference 14

green space

Reference 15

Lots of greenery

Reference 16

Communal vegetable gardens where everyone has a patch in which they can grow their own vegetables. A very popular concept overseas.

Reference 17

good outdoor space - both shared and private

Reference 18

green space,

Reference 19

community gardens,

Reference 20

create a sense of community through parks and public spaces where people can get together and where natural habitats are preserved

East Frame Living Density – Privacy

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

private spaces

Reference 2

Private.

Reference 3

privacy

Reference 4

privacy from neighbours,

Reference 5

Privacy.

Reference 6

privacy,

East Frame Living Density – Safe, well lit, security

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

good lighting and security,

Reference 2

Safety in access - well-lit, etc.

Reference 3

Good security and environments which reduce crime.

Reference 4

safe roads and safe neighbourhoods.

Reference 5

Good security

East Frame Living Density – General

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Diversity of design. / Quality. / Interaction with surroundings.

Reference 2

Extremely well built,

Reference 3

beautiful architecture.

Reference 4

High quality construction (insulation, finishes etc).

Reference 5

Overall quality. Removing planning rules will lead to even lower quality than we have now. The rules need to be revisited with the long term future of Christchurch in mind. If poor quality buildings and outdoor areas are made then they will either be pulled down in under 20 years(which is very unsustainable) or they will remain in perpetuity

Reference 6

Good design,

Reference 7

good quality apartments and townhouses

Reference 8

Excellent design. High design standards and these controlled by a specialist panel. Developers can build very cheaply. Look at the south side of Riccarton Road - a disaster!!!

Reference 9

Beautiful buildings,

Reference 10

well designed

Reference 11

high quality urban space, high quality buildings,

East Frame Living Density – Other

Comments received through online survey

Reference 1

Prostitution should be taken off the streets and confined to brothels or limited with minimum distances from residential areas specified.

Reference 2

a special "Heratige" zone where heratige homes from the residential red zone are relocated in the "east frame" No gated communities, and provisions for younger people to be able to live in the central city oh and also stop "compulsarily acquiring" building and allow the building owners to come up with their own plans instead of acting like NZ is Communist China. Property rights area n important pillar of democracy which the CCDU appears to have shown contempt for. This makes people uneasy and is a major turn off for me in terms of living within the central city.

Reference 3

rental restrictions,

Reference 4

What would attract me is the original concept of the eastern frame, being a wide expanse of green grass framing the city, not an narrow strip of land hardly visible and bounded by 6 storey developments.

Reference 5

Absolutely nothing!

Reference 6

I object to using the eastern frame for residential development, this should be a green space, with amenities only, their is enough space within the Central City for residential living, as per the CCDU initial plan this should be a large green park

Reference 7

Options to purchase that are feasible for a first time buyer.

Reference 8

Water.

Reference 9

Ability to keep animals such as cats and small dogs.

Reference 10

The location of the east frame is great and it would be a great place to live. Being surrounded by a park-like frame would be a big plus. However in the current draft the park has been reduced to thin internal plaza so that benefit is mostly gone.

Reference 11

Wouldn't live in the east

Reference 12

Not much if there are going to be six storeyed buildings with 750 apartments.

Reference 13

sense of community - spaces that provide engagement for this

Reference 14

Good public spaces.

Reference 15

houses built around lanes and parks not roads

Reference 16

Beacon submits that neighbourhoods are the scale at which people live their daily lives - the way neighbourhoods are laid out and organised impacts on how a home performs, the quality of life for residents and on the costs to households.

Reference 17

OK with this