

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 4**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management
Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Proposed Plan Change 4 to
the Christchurch District Plan:
Short-Term Accommodation

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF IAN BAYLISS
ON BEHALF OF THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

18 OCTOBER 2021

Christchurch City Council

53 Hereford Street, Christchurch, 8011

PO Box 73016, Christchurch, 8154

Solicitor: Cedric Carranceja / Sophie Meares

Tel: 03 371 3532 / 027 460 6639

Email: cedric.carranceja@buddlefindlay.com / Sophie.Meares@ccc.govt.nz

1. My full name is Ian William Bayliss. I have prepared the Addendum to s42A report dated 1 September 2021 and rebuttal evidence dated 8 October 2021. I outlined my qualifications, experience and commitment to comply with the Environment Court Expert Witness Code of Conduct in the Addendum to s42A report. My evidence considers and makes recommendations on submissions and further submissions on Plan Change 4 Short-Term Accommodation (PC4) and encompasses the original section 42A report by Ms Alison McLaughlin.
2. PC4 recognises a range of adverse effects of short-term accommodation that need to be managed while also recognising that short-term accommodation provides benefits to accommodation providers, to visitors and the City and greater Christchurch area. I consider the PC4 provisions (as now recommended) appropriately manage the adverse effects of short-term accommodation within a territorial authorities' functions, in a way that is efficient and effective, while enabling short-term accommodation to provide benefits to people and communities.
3. Proposed permitted, controlled, discretionary and non-complying activity thresholds and guiding objective and policies that define where the effects of using "residential units" for short-term accommodation are likely to be positive or minor have been considered in detail in the evidence. Standards that require different categories of resource consents when there is a risk of more significant adverse effects and outcomes that are contrary to objectives have been a particular focus. PC4 enables short-term accommodation in many situations without consent and seeks to allow risks to be proactively managed through the resource consent process and for suitable consent conditions to be imposed that are specific to the site and surroundings in others. I consider these thresholds and standards in each zone are fit for purpose and appropriate in terms of practical considerations and the tests for a plan change in the RMA.
4. In relation to the key outstanding matters of disagreement between myself and submitters who have filed evidence, my views are:
 - (a) In relation to **adverse effects**:
 - i. the effects of "hosted visitor accommodation" and "unhosted visitor accommodation" are different to the effects of conventional "residential activities", and subsequently, I consider a separate regime to manage the effects of these activities is appropriate (cf. Mr Matt Bonis);
 - ii. specialist technical reports on the extent of the adverse effects of these activities on residential amenity, character and coherence in Christchurch are not currently before the Panel, however a planning analysis of the consultation

feedback, section 32 material and submissions to PC4 provides a clear picture about the potential for effects to be more than minor (cf. Ms Natalie Hampson).

(b) In relation to **consent requirements:**

- i. the proposed permitted activity framework for “hosted visitor accommodation” and one-off controlled activity consent requirement for “unhosted visitor accommodation” for up to 60 days per year and up to 6 guests per night in residential zones provides a framework that would enable many operators in Christchurch¹ while minimising adverse effects of amenity, character and coherence;
- ii. more significant changes in scale and extent of use that have greater potential to alter expected outcomes (both individually and over the lifetime of the plan) are proposed to require a category of consent that enables broader consideration of objectives, policies, effects and conditions of consent;
- iii. while the provisions in PC4 vary across the Plan, the different consent requirements in different zones will in practice be more efficient and effective in responding to different situations than a greatly simplified approach by reducing consent requirements where this is appropriate (cf. Mr Bonis).

(c) In relation to **definitions:**

- i. including “home sharing” within the Plan’s definition of “residential activity” would greatly reduce the ability of decision makers to address adverse effects of short-term accommodation that differ from those of a residential activity (cf. Mr Bonis);
- ii. adding “hosted visitor accommodation” and “unhosted visitor accommodation” to the definition of “sensitive activities” is unnecessary and adding them to the restricted discretionary activity rules in the 50 dB Ldn Air Noise Contour is also unnecessary to maintain the integrity of the framework for managing activities sensitive to air noise in the Plan (cf. Ms Felicity Blackmore);
- iii. I agree with Ms Blackmore and Mr Brett Giddens in relation to improving the clarity of several definitions and categories of activities and am happy to make drafting suggestions through Council’s Reply or as otherwise directed by the Panel.

¹ Both Ms Hampson and Mr Osborne note that 81% of unhosted providers offer listings for less than 7 guests and 42% of unhosted providers were let for less than 60 days in 2018 and 2020 respectively.